GEOTECHNICAL INVESTIGATION THE RISE Cupertino, California

Prepared For:

Vallco Property Owner, LLC Menlo Park, California

Prepared By:

Langan Engineering and Environmental Services, Inc. 1 Almaden Boulevard, Suite 590 San Jose, California 95113

Jenna Fontaine Senior Staff Engineer

John Gouchon, GE #2282 Principal/Vice President

4 December 2023 770633101

1 Almaden Boulevard, Suite 590 San Jose, CA 95113 T: 408.283.3600 F: 408.283.3601 www.langan.com

> New Jersey • New York • Connecticut • Massachusetts • Pennsylvania • Ohio • Illinois • North Carolina • Virginia • Washington, DC California • Texas • Arizona • Utah • Colorado • Washington • Florida | Athens • Calgary • Dubai • London • Panama

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LANGAN

REFERENCES

FIGURES

APPENDICES

DISTRIBUTION

770633101.28 Geotechnical Investigation Report_THE RISE_Cupertino

ATTACHMENTS

FIGURES

APPENDICES

- Appendix A Boring Logs and Laboratory Test Results from Previous Investigations
- Appendix B Logs of Test Borings
- Appendix C Downhole Suspension Logging
- Appendix D Laboratory Data
- Appendix E Cone Penetration Tests
- Appendix F Soil Corrosivity Evaluation and Recommendations for Corrosion Control
- Appendix G Site Specific Ground Motions for Previous Development Scheme

GEOTECHNICAL INVESTIGATION THE RISE Cupertino, California

1.0 INTRODUCTION

This report presents the results of the geotechnical investigation by Langan for the proposed project called The Rise at 10123 N. Wolfe Road in Cupertino, California. The approximate location of the project is shown on Figure 1.

The site is north of the intersection of N. Wolfe Road and Stevens Creek Boulevard and encompasses approximately 30 acres. It is bound by Stevens Creek Boulevard to the south, Perimeter Road and residential housing to the west, Perimeter Road, and Interstate 280 to the north and commercial buildings to the east, as shown on Figure 2. N. Wolfe Road runs north-south through the site.

Currently, the site is occupied by remnants of the Vallco Shopping Center. The shopping center included a two-level shopping center building, multi-level parking structures, surface parking lots, a pedestrian bridge spanning N. Wolfe Road, a vehicle tunnel crossing below N. Wolfe Road, and several stand-alone buildings. The portion of the shopping center west of N. Wolfe Road has been razed. We understand that the portion of the shopping center east of N. Wolfe Road will be razed in the future during a separate phase.

Based on design development drawings [Kohn Pederson Fox Associates (KPF) 2023], the proposed residential, retail, and office buildings will be constructed in four phases and will be laid out in a grid forming 15 blocks, as shown on Figures 2 and 3, respectively. Phases 1 through 3 are west of N. Wolfe Road and Phase 4 is east of N. Wolfe Road, as shown on Figure 2. Blocks 1 through 10 and 13 will be located west of N. Wolfe Road and Blocks 11, 12, 14, and 15 will be located east of N. Wolfe, as shown on Figure 3. A brief description of the proposed development is presented in Table 1.

								Preliminary
							Approximate	
		Building	Basement	Podium	Tower		Roof Height	
Phase	Block	Number	Levels	Levels	Levels	Stories	(feet)	
		1A			$\overline{4}$	6	85	
	1	1B		$\overline{2}$	$\overline{4}$	6	85	1,450
		2A	One ¹		5	8	85	2,000
1	$\overline{2}$	2B		3	5	8	85	2,000
		5A	--		5	8	85	1,550
	5	5B	--	3	5	8	85	1,550
	3	3		$\overline{2}$	5	$\overline{7}$	85	1,300
	$\overline{4}$	$\overline{4}$	One ²	$\overline{4}$	16	20	230	5,050
$\overline{2}$	6	6	--	--	3	3	35	350
	$\overline{7}$	$\overline{7}$	--	3	$\overline{4}$	$\overline{7}$	85	1,500
	8	8A	--	$\overline{4}$	$\overline{4}$	8	85	1,750
		8B	--		14	18	205	4,450
	9	9	--	3	5	8	85	1,550
	10	10A	--	3	5	8	85	1,550
3		10B			5	8	85	1,550
	13	13A	One ²	5	7	12	155	3,700
		13B			6	11	140	3,450
$\overline{4}$	11	11A	--	3	5	8	85	1,550
		11B	$\overline{}$		5	8	85	Dead Plus Live Foundation Bearing Pressures (psf) 1,450 1,550 1,550 3,800 3,950 4,300 4,550 5,100
	12	12A	--	3	5	8	85	
		12B	$\overline{}$		12	$\overline{15}$	170	
	14	14		$\overline{}$	11	11	170	
		15A	Three ³	6	6	12	195	
	15	15B			7	13	210	
		15C			9	15	225	

TABLE 1 Summary of Proposed Development

Notes:

1. According to correspondence with KPF on 8 November 2023, we understand that generally the basement heights will be 13 feet plus a 4-foot-thick mat foundation. For Blocks 1 and 2 specifically, we anticipate the excavation for the structures will be approximately 16 to 20 feet, which includes localized excavations for the elevator pits.

2. For Blocks 4 and 13, we anticipate a 13-foot basement height and a 4-foot-thick mat foundation, for a total excavation depth of 17 feet.

3. For Blocks 14 and 15, we anticipate each basement level will be 13 feet in height in addition to a 4-foot-thick mat foundation, for a total excavation depth of 43 feet.

According to DCI, the project structural engineer, we understand that, with the exception of the townhomes (shown as Block 6 on Figure 3) and any ancillary structures, the structures for the project are planned to be supported on mat foundations.

LANGAN

Based on a topographic survey of the project site (Sandis, 2016), the existing ground surface elevations range from Elevation 176.4 feet¹ at the north side of the project to Elevation 198.4 feet at the southwestern portion of the project.

2.0 SCOPE OF SERVICES

Our scope of services was outlined in our proposals dated 10 August 2016 and 2 June 2023 and our budget increase requests dated 1 November 2019 and 17 August 2020. We reviewed available subsurface information for the site and vicinity from our files and further explored subsurface conditions at the site by drilling borings and advancing cone penetrometer tests (CPTs). We conducted laboratory tests on samples recovered from the borings and used the results from our field exploration to perform engineering analyses and develop conclusions and recommendations regarding:

- anticipated subsurface conditions including groundwater levels;
- 2019 California Building Code (CBC) site classification, mapped values SS and S1, modification factors Fa and Fv and SMS and SM1;
- site seismicity and potential for seismic hazards including liquefaction, lateral spreading, fault rupture;
- appropriate foundation type(s) including shallow foundations and alternatives for deep foundations, as necessary;
- design parameters for the recommended foundation type(s), including vertical and lateral capacities and associated estimated settlements;
- lateral earth pressures for temporary and permanent shoring;
- lateral earth pressures for permanent basement walls;
- subgrade preparation for slab-on-grade floors and exterior slabs and flatwork, including sidewalks;
- site preparation, grading, and excavation, including criteria for fill quality and compaction;
- corrosivity, including a corrosion evaluation report;
- construction considerations.

¹ All elevations reference North American Vertical Datum of 1988 (NAVD88).

3.0 FIELD EXPLORATION AND LABORATORY TESTING

We began our investigation by reviewing previous geotechnical investigations performed at or in the vicinity of the site. To further investigate subsurface conditions at the site, we drilled five test borings, and performed five CPTs.

Prior to performing the field exploration, we:

- obtained a soil boring/monitoring well permit from the Santa Clara Valley Water District (SCVWD);
- notified Underground Service Alert;
- checked the boring locations for underground utilities using a private utility locator.

Details of the field exploration activities and laboratory testing are described in the remainder of this section.

3.1 Previous Investigation

We reviewed existing subsurface information from a report titled "Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation, The Hills at Vallco, Cupertino, California," dated 19 November 2015, by TRC.

We used the information provided on the boring logs from the above referenced report to supplement the information developed from our exploration of the site. The approximate locations of the previously drilled borings by TRC are shown on Figures 2 and 3. Logs of borings and the associated laboratory test results presented in the TRC report are presented in Appendix A.

3.2 Borings

Our field exploration included drilling five borings. The borings, designated as B-1 through B-5, were drilled at the site at the approximate locations shown on Figures 2 and 3. Borings B-1 and B-2 were drilled using truck mounted rotary wash drilling equipment from 6 through 8 September 2016 by Pitcher Drilling Company. The borings were drilled to depths of 101.5 and 141 feet bgs. Borings B-3 to B-5 were drilled using truck mounted hollow stem auger drilling equipment on 13 and 14 September 2016 by Exploration Geoservices. The borings were drilled to depths of 50 to 100 feet bgs.

During drilling, our field engineer logged the borings and obtained representative samples of soil encountered for visual classification and laboratory testing.

Logs of the borings are presented in Appendix B on Figures B-1 through B-5. The soil encountered in the borings was classified in accordance with the Classification Chart, presented on Figure B-6.

Samples were obtained using the following split-barrel sampler types.

- Sprague & Henwood (S&H) sampler with a 3.0-inch outside diameter and 2.5-inch inside diameter, lined with steel or brass tubes with an inside diameter of 2.43 inches.
- Standard Penetration Test (SPT) sampler with a 2.0-inch outside diameter and 1.5-inch inside diameter, without liners.

The sampler types were chosen on the basis of soil type and desired sample quality for laboratory testing. In general, the S&H sampler was used to obtain samples in medium stiff to very stiff cohesive soils. The SPT sampler was used to evaluate the relative density of granular soils.

For the rotary wash borings (Borings B-1 and B-2), the SPT and S&H samplers were driven with a 140-pound, above-ground, automatic safety hammer falling 30 inches. The blow counts required to drive the S&H and SPT samplers were converted to approximate SPT N-values using factors of 0.7 and 1.1, respectively, to account for sample type and hammer energy and are shown on the boring logs.

For the hollow stem auger borings (Borings B-3 to B-5), the SPT and S&H samplers were driven with a 140-pound, downhole, wireline safety hammer falling 30 inches. The blow counts required to drive the S&H and SPT samples were converted to approximate SPT N-values using factors of 0.6 and 1.0, respectively, to account for sample type and hammer energy and are shown on the boring logs. Boring B-4 was drilled with two different drilling rigs due to equipment issues. The conversion factors to account for sample type and hammer energy were similar between both drilling rigs and hammers.

The SPT and S&H samplers were driven up to 18 inches and the hammer blows required to drive the samplers every six inches of penetration were recorded and are presented on the boring logs. A "blow count" is defined as the number of hammer blows per six inches of penetration or less if the blow count approached 50 blows. The driving of sampler was discontinued if the observed (recorded) blow count was 50 for six inches or less of penetration.

The blow counts used for this conversion were: 1) the last two blow counts if the sampler was driven more than 12 inches, 2) the last one blow count if the sampler was driven more than six inches but less than 12 inches, and 3) the only blow count if the sampler was driven six inches or less.

NorCal Geophysical was retained to perform in-situ downhole suspension logging to measure the shear wave velocity of the subsurface materials within boring B-1. The details of the suspension logging methodology, procedures, and the results are presented in Appendix C.

Upon completion of drilling or suspension logging, the borings were backfilled with grout consisting of cement, bentonite, and water in accordance with the requirements of SCVWD. The borings were completed at the ground surface with cold patch asphalt. The soil cuttings and drilling fluid were placed in 55-gallon drums stored temporarily at the site, tested, and have been transported off-site for proper disposal.

3.3 Laboratory Testing

The soil samples recovered from the field exploration program were re-examined in the office for soil classification, and representative samples were selected for laboratory testing. The laboratory testing program was designed to evaluate engineering properties of the soil at the site. Samples were tested to measure moisture content, dry density, plasticity (Atterberg Limits), gradation, shear strength, and compressibility, where appropriate. Results of the laboratory testing are included on the boring logs and in Appendix D on Figures D-1 through D-15.

3.4 Cone Penetration Test

To supplement the soil boring data, five CPTs, designated as CPT-1 through CPT-5, were performed on 29 and 30 September 2016 by Gregg Drilling and Testing (Gregg) at the approximate locations shown on Figures 2 and 3. The CPTs were advanced to depths of approximately 75 feet bgs.

The CPTs were performed by hydraulically pushing a 1.7-inch-diameter, cone-tipped probe, with a projected area of 15 square centimeters, into the ground. The cone tip measures tip resistance, and the friction sleeve behind the cone tip measures frictional resistance. Electrical strain gauges or load cells within the cone continuously measured the cone tip resistance and frictional resistance during the entire depth of each probing. Accumulated data was processed by computer to provide engineering information, such as the types and approximate strength characteristics of the soil encountered. The CPT logs, showing tip resistance and friction ratio by depth, as well as interpreted SPT N-Values, friction angle, soil strength parameters, and interpreted soil classification, are presented in Appendix E on Figures E-1 through E-5. Soil types were estimated using the classification chart shown on Figure E-6.

After completion, the CPTs were backfilled with cement-bentonite grout in accordance SCVWD requirements. The CPTs were completed at the ground surface with cold patch asphalt.

3.5 Soil Corrosivity Testing

To evaluate the corrosivity of the soil near the foundation subgrade, we performed corrosivity tests on samples obtained at depths of 18½ feet, 26 feet and 63½ feet. The corrosivity of the soil samples was evaluated by CERCO Analytical using the following ASTM Test Methods:

- Redox ASTM D1498
- \bullet pH ASTM D4972
- Resistivity (100% Saturation) ASTM G57
- Sulfide ASTM D4658M
- Chloride ASTM D4327
- Sulfate ASTM D4327

The laboratory corrosion test results and a brief corrosivity evaluation by JDH Corrosion are presented in Appendix F.

4.0 SITE AND SUBSURFACE CONDITIONS

The existing site and subsurface conditions observed and encountered at the site, respectively, are discussed in this section.

4.1 Site Conditions

Previously the site was a shopping mall development that included a two-level shopping center located on the east and west sides of N. Wolfe Road, multi-level parking structures, surface parking lots, a pedestrian bridge spanning N. Wolfe Road, a vehicular tunnel crossing below N. Wolfe Road, and several stand-alone buildings. However, the portion of the mall west of N. Wolfe Road has been razed. Based on a topographic survey of the project site (Sandis, 2011), the range of existing ground surface elevations is:

- West of N. Wolfe Road: Ground surface elevations range from Elevation 178.1 feet at the northern portion of the parcel to 198.4 feet at the southwest corner of the parcel;
- East of N. Wolfe Road: Ground surface elevations range from Elevation 176.4 feet at the northwest corner of the parcel to Elevation 198.0 feet at the eastern portion of the parcel.

4.2 Subsurface Conditions

Where asphalt pavement was encountered, the section consists of 1½ to 6 inches of asphalt concrete (AC) over 3 to 10 inches of aggregate base (AB). In general, the project site is underlain by alluvial deposits consisting of stiff to hard clays and sandy clays and medium dense to very dense sand and gravel. TRC (as Lowney Associates) encountered 1½ and 4½ feet of clay fill in borings LB-6 and LB-8, respectively. The surficial clayey soil has moderate to high expansion potential²; where tested, the upper clay layers have plasticity indices of 25 and 39. Where tested, laboratory test results of the undrained shear strength of relatively undisturbed samples of the alluvium ranges from 1,220 to 4,750 pounds per square foot (psf). An undrained shear strength of 640 psf was recorded during testing of a disturbed sample collected from boring B-1 at a depth of 75½ feet bgs. In addition, the consolidation laboratory test results indicate the alluvium is overconsolidated³ and has compression ratios ranging from 0.1 to 0.12.

Idealized subsurface profiles, Figures 4 and 5, illustrate the general subsurface conditions at the site.

Based on our review of published maps (California Division of Mines and Geology, 2002), historic high groundwater in the project vicinity is deeper than 50 feet bgs. Based on previous geotechnical investigations at or nearby the project site, (Langan Treadwell Rollo, 2014 and TRC, 2015), groundwater was encountered at depths of approximately 65 to 75 feet bgs. During our current investigation, the groundwater levels were measured at depths of approximately 48 and 96 bgs (corresponding to Elevations 146 to 86 feet) at Borings B-1 and B-4, respectively. However, this depth was measured during drilling and may not represent a stabilized ground water level. Groundwater levels may fluctuate due to seasonal rainfall.

Pore-pressure dissipation tests⁴ (PPDTs) were attempted at CPT-1 through CPT-5 at depths of approximately 62 feet to 75 feet bgs; groundwater was not encountered at those depths. Groundwater depth and elevation data from the current and prior investigations are summarized in Table 2.

⁴ PPDTs are conducted at various depths to measure hydrostatic water pressures and to determine the approximate depth of the groundwater level. The variation of pore pressure with time is measured behind the tip of the cone and recorded.

 2 Highly expansive soil undergoes large volume changes with changes in moisture content.

 $^3\,$ An overconsolidated clay has experienced a pressure greater than its current load.

Summary of Groundwater Depth and Elevation Data

Notes:

1. Groundwater level obscured by drilling method in Boring B 2.

2. Groundwater not encountered in Borings B 3, B 5, and CPT 1 to CPT 5.

3. TRC (as Lowney Associates or Lowney Kaldveer Associates) borings that did not encounter groundwater are not included.

Downhole suspension logging was performed in Boring B-1. Shear wave velocities ranged from about 790 to 2,498 feet per second in the alluvial deposits. A plot of shear wave velocity with depth is presented in Appendix C.

5.0 REGIONAL SEISMICITY

The project site is in a seismically active region. Numerous earthquakes have been recorded in the region in the past, and moderate to large earthquakes should be anticipated during the service life of the proposed development. The Monte Vista - Shannon, San Andreas, and Calaveras faults are the major faults closest to the site. These and other faults of the region are shown on Figure 6. For each of these faults, as well as other active faults within about 100 kilometers (km) of the site, the distance from the site and estimated mean Moment magnitude5 [2014 Working Group on California Earthquake Probabilities (WGCEP) (2015) and Uniform California Earthquake Rupture Forecast Version 3 (UCERF3) as detailed in the United States Geological Survey Open File Report

⁵ Moment magnitude is an energy-based scale and provides a physically meaningful measure of the size of a faulting event. Moment magnitude is directly related to average slip and fault rupture area.

2013-1165] are summarized in Table 3. The mean Moment magnitude presented on Table 3 was computed assuming full rupture of the segment using Hanks and Bakun (2008) relationship.

	Approx.		Mean Characteristic
	Distance from	Direction	Moment
Fault Segment	fault (km)	from Site	Magnitude
Monte Vista - Shannon	4.4	Southwest	7.0
San Andreas 1906 event	10	Southwest	8.1
Pilarcitos	13	West	6.7
Butano	16	Southwest	6.7
Total Hayward-Rodgers Creek Healdsburg	19	Northeast	7.6
Sargent	22	Southeast	6.8
Total Calaveras	22	East	7.5
Mission (connected)	23	Northeast	6.1
Total San Gregorio	32	West	7.6
Greenville	46	East	7.1
Monterey Bay-Tularcitos	46	South	7.2
Mount Diablo Thrust	48	Northeast	6.6
Franklin	58	North	6.7
Contra Costa (Lafayette)	59	North	6.1
Contra Costa (Larkey)	60	North	6.0
Clayton	61	North	6.4
Great Valley 07 (Orestimba)	62	Northeast	6.8
Ortigalita (North)	63	East	6.6
Concord	64	North	6.4
Contra Costa Shear Zone (connector)	65	North	6.6
Quien Sabe	71	Southeast	6.4
San Andreas (Creeping Section)	75	Southeast	7.3
Contra Costa (Dillon Point)	77	North	6.1
Great Valley 05 Pittsburg - Kirby Hills	80	North	6.3
Green Valley	80	North	6.8
Ortigalita (South)	81	East	6.9
Contra Costa (Vallejo)	89	North	5.6
Contra Costa (Lake Chabot)	90	North	5.6
Great Valley 09 (Laguna Seca)	94	East	6.6
West Napa	95	North	6.8

TABLE 3 Regional Faults and Seismicity

Note:

1. The table above is a summary and does not include all the fault segmentation, alternate traces and low activity faults included in the UCERF3 model.

Figure 6 also shows the earthquake epicenters for events with magnitude greater than 5.0 from January 1800 through August 2014. Since 1800, four major earthquakes have been recorded on the San Andreas fault. In 1836 an earthquake with an estimated maximum intensity of VII on the Modified Mercalli (MM) scale (Figure 7) occurred east of Monterey Bay on the San Andreas fault (Toppozada and Borchardt 1998). The estimated Moment magnitude, M_{w} for this earthquake is about 6.25. In 1838, an earthquake occurred with an estimated intensity of about VIII-IX (MM), corresponding to a M_{w} of about 7.5. The San Francisco Earthquake of 1906 caused the most significant damage in the history of the Bay Area in terms of loss of lives and property damage. This earthquake created a surface rupture along the San Andreas fault from Shelter Cove to San Juan Bautista approximately 470 kilometers in length. It had a maximum intensity of XI (MM), an M_w of about 7.9, and was felt 560 kilometers away in Oregon, Nevada, and Los Angeles. The Loma Prieta Earthquake occurred on 17 October 1989 in the Santa Cruz Mountains with a $M_{\rm w}$ of 6.9; the epicenter of the earthquake was approximately 34 km from the site.

In 1868 an earthquake with an estimated maximum intensity of X on the MM scale occurred on the southern segment (between San Leandro and Fremont) of the Hayward fault. The estimated M_{w} for the earthquake is 7.0. In 1861, an earthquake of unknown magnitude (probably an M_{w} of about 6.5) was reported on the Calaveras fault. The most recent significant earthquake on this fault was the 1984 Morgan Hill earthquake ($M_w = 6.2$).

The most recent earthquake to affect the Bay Area occurred on 24 August 2014 and was located on the West Napa fault, approximately 95 km northeast of the site, with a M_W of 6.0.

The 2016 U.S. Geologic Survey (USGS) predicted a 72 percent chance of a magnitude 6.7 or greater earthquake occurring in the San Francisco Bay Area in 30 years (Aagaard et al. 2016). More specific estimates of the probabilities for different faults in the Bay Area are presented in Table 4.

TABLE 4

Estimates of 30-Year Probability (2014 to 2043) of a Magnitude 6.7 or Greater Earthquake

6.0 GEOLOGIC HAZARDS

During a major earthquake on a segment of one of the nearby faults, strong to very strong shaking is expected to occur at the site. Strong shaking during an earthquake can result in ground failure such as that associated with soil liquefaction⁶, lateral spreading⁷, and seismic densification⁸. Each of these conditions has been evaluated based on our literature review, field investigation, and analyses, and is discussed in this section.

6.1 Liquefaction and Associated Hazards

When saturated soil with little to no cohesion liquefies during a major earthquake, it experiences a temporary loss of shear strength as a result of a transient rise in excess pore water pressure generated by strong ground motion. Flow failure, lateral spreading, differential settlement, loss of bearing, ground fissures, and sand boils are evidence of excess pore pressure generation and liquefaction.

The site is not within a zone designated for liquefaction, as identified by the California Geologic Survey (CGS) in a map titled, *State of California Seismic Hazard Zones, Cupertino Quadrangle*, prepared by the California Geologic Survey, dated September 23, 2002 (CGS 2002a).

⁸ Seismic densification (also referred to as Differential Compaction) is a phenomenon in which non-saturated, cohesionless soil is densified by earthquake vibrations, causing ground-surface settlement.

 6 Liquefaction is a transformation of soil from a solid to a liquefied state during which saturated soil temporarily loses strength resulting from the buildup of excess pore water pressure, especially during earthquake-induced cyclic loading. Soil susceptible to liquefaction includes loose to medium dense sand and gravel, low-plasticity silt, and some low-plasticity clay deposits.

 7 Lateral spreading is a phenomenon in which surficial soil displaces along a shear zone that has formed within an underlying liquefied layer. Upon reaching mobilization, the surficial blocks are transported downslope or in the direction of a free face by earthquake and gravitational forces.

Saturated loose sand was not encountered in the borings and CPTs drilled at the site. The high groundwater level observed at the site is approximately 48 feet bgs, corresponding to Elevation 146.2 feet. Blow count data indicates the cohesionless soil below the groundwater table is dense to very dense. Therefore, we conclude the potential for liquefaction and liquefaction-induced failures including lateral spreading is nil.

6.2 Seismic Densification

Seismic densification (also referred to as cyclic densification and differential compaction) can occur during strong ground shaking in loose, clean granular deposits above the water table, resulting in ground surface settlement. Up to five feet of medium dense clayey sand and silty sand was encountered in B-1 and B-2 above the groundwater table. This layer could densify in a major earthquake. Using the Tokimatsu and Seed (1984) method for evaluating seismically-induced settlement in dry sand, we estimate settlement will be less than ½ inch. The soil above the groundwater table encountered in the other borings is either very clayey or has sufficient density to resist seismic densification; therefore, we conclude the potential for seismic densification to occur is low at these locations.

6.3 Fault Rupture

Historically, ground surface ruptures closely follow the trace of geologically young faults. The site is not within an Earthquake Fault Zone, as defined by the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act and no known active or potentially active faults exist on the site. Additionally, the site is not within an area mapped has having the fault rupture potential (County of Santa Clara, 2015). Therefore, we conclude the risk of fault offset through the site from a known active fault is low. In a seismically active area, the remote possibility exists for future faulting in areas where no faults previously existed; however, we conclude that the risk of surficial ground deformation from faulting at the site is low.

7.0 DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

We conclude the proposed development is feasible from a geotechnical standpoint, provided the recommendations presented in this report are incorporated into the project plans and implemented during construction. Average excavation depths of 19 to 34 feet bgs will be required to achieve the floor slab and foundation subgrades for the proposed buildings.

The primary geotechnical issues for this project include:

• presence of moderately to highly expansive clay at the ground surface

- selection of an appropriate foundation system to support the building loads and accommodate estimated static and seismic settlements;
- support for proposed excavations and adjacent structures during construction
- providing a stable subgrade and adequate working surface at the base of the excavation.

Our conclusions regarding these and other geotechnical issues are discussed in the remainder of this section.

7.1 Expansive Soil Considerations

The existing near-surface soil has moderate to high expansion potential. Moisture fluctuations in near-surface expansive soil could cause the soil to shrink or swell resulting in movement and potential damage to improvements that overlie them. Potential causes of moisture fluctuations include drying during construction, and subsequent wetting from rain, capillary rise, landscape irrigation, and type of plant selection.

The excavation for the basement levels will be below the zone of seasonal moisture change and expansive soil, if present, should not impact the foundations or basement slabs. For improvements at-grade, the volume changes from expansive soils can cause cracking of foundations, floor slabs and exterior flatwork. Therefore, foundations, slabs and concrete flatwork near existing grades should be designed and constructed to resist the effects of the expansive soil. These effects can be mitigated by moisture conditioning the expansive soil and providing select, non-expansive fill below interior and exterior slabs and supporting foundations below the zone of severe moisture change.

In addition, the expansive clay may be susceptible to pumping and rutting during construction, especially if it becomes wet. If localized soft or wet areas of material are encountered it may be necessary to overexcavate the material 18 to 24 inches, place a geotextile fabric such as Mirafi 500X or its equivalent, and backfill with granular material to stabilize the area and bridge the soft material.

Alternatives to importing select fill include lime treatment of the near surface soil. The addition of lime can reduce the swell potential and increase the shear strength of the soil. Lime stabilization of the subgrade for exterior concrete flatwork may be a cost-effective means of improving on-site soils for use as non-expansive fill beneath the improvements. In addition, if the surface soil becomes wet, it may be difficult to compact during the winter. Lime treatment could be used to winterize the site and to aid in compaction.

The degree to which lime will react with soil depends on such variables as type of soil, minerals present, quantity of lime, and the length of time the lime-soil mixture is cured. The quantity of lime added generally ranges from 5 to 7 percent by weight and should be determined by laboratory testing. If lime is intended to reduce swelling potential and/or increase the strength of the soil, the lime treatment contractor should collect a bulk sample of the soil and perform laboratory tests to determine if the lime will react with the soil, the amount of lime required and the resulting plasticity index. We should be provided with the results to evaluate the effectiveness of the lime.

7.2 Foundations and Settlement

Based on the design development drawings (KPF, 2023), we understand the residential, retail, and office buildings located west of N. Wolfe Road at Blocks 1 and 2, 4, and 13 will have one basement level (basement finished floor at approximately 13 feet below street grade) and the office buildings located east of N. Wolfe Road at Blocks 14 and 15 will have three basement levels (basement finished floor at approximately 39 feet below street grade). The residential, retail, and office buildings at Blocks 3, and 5 through 12 will be at-grade.

7.2.1 Settlement of Buildings with Basements

Where the buildings will have basements, we judge the soil at the bottom of proposed excavations will consist of stiff to hard clay and medium dense to very dense sand and gravel. Therefore, provided the estimated settlements are tolerable, we conclude that buildings with basements can be supported on mat foundations. Design recommendations for the foundations for buildings with basements are presented in Section 8.2.

Laboratory test results indicate the clay below the proposed bottom of the excavations is overconsolidated, with overconsolidation ratios (OCRs) of about 2.1 to 2.2. The average net pressure from the weight of the structures (considering the stress relief from the existing and proposed basement excavations) is generally less than the preconsolidation pressure, therefore static settlements should be limited to immediate settlement. For the purposes of estimating immediate settlements under the applied foundation bearing pressures provided by DCI, we did not include the self-weight of the foundation. We assumed that the portion of immediate settlement of a mat foundation will occur during concrete curing of the mat and is not counted as part of the settlement of the structure immediately after construction.

Initially, as the proposed excavations are made, we expect the removal of soil will create pressure relief and the base of the excavation should rebound (rise), especially near the center of the excavation. We estimate rebound near the center of the excavation should be about ¾ inch after

excavation of a one-level basement and 1¾ inches after the excavation of a three-level basement. After the new foundation is constructed and new building loads are applied, the pressure will increase, and the clay layer should partially recompress. Table 5 provides estimates of the static total and differential settlement for the proposed structures under the preliminary foundation bearing pressures provided by DCI. The estimates do not include the rigidity of a mat foundation system, which would tend to reduce the differential settlement.

7.2.2 Settlement of At-Grade Buildings

Where the buildings will be at-grade, we judge the soil at the foundation subgrade elevation will generally consist of stiff to hard clay. Therefore, provided that the estimated settlements are acceptable, we conclude that the at-grade buildings can be supported on spread footings or mat foundations. As noted in Section 1.0, per correspondence with DCI on 17 November 2023, we understand spread footings are only under consideration for the support of the Block 6 townhomes and ancillary structures and that mat foundations are planned for all other at-grade buildings. Design recommendations for the foundations for at-grade buildings are presented in Section 8.2. If the settlements are deemed to be excessive, ground improvement consisting of drilled displacement columns (DDC), or rigid inclusions could be performed, and shallow foundations could then bear on these elements. These types of ground improvement are typically designed and installed by specialty contractors.

Laboratory test results indicate the clay below the proposed shallow foundation subgrade is overconsolidated, with OCRs of about 2.1 to 2.2. For the purposes of estimating immediate settlements under the applied foundation bearing pressures provided by DCI, we did not include the self-weight of the foundation. We assumed that the portion of immediate settlement of a mat foundation will occur during concrete curing of the mat and is not counted as part of the settlement of the structure immediately after construction.

After the new foundations are constructed and new building loads are applied, the pressure will increase, and the clay layer should compress. Table 5 provides estimates of the static total and differential settlement for the proposed structures under the preliminary foundation bearing pressures provided by DCI. The estimates do not include the rigidity of a mat foundation system, which would tend to reduce the differential settlement.

Summary of Building Settlement Estimates

Notes:

1. psf = pounds per square foot. Dead plus live foundation bearing pressures do not include the foundation weight and are based on the maximum height of each building, i.e., not including reduced foundation pressures at tower setbacks.

2. Total and differential settlements are static and based on the foundation bearing pressures proved by DCI Engineers on 27 October 2023. Total settlements for buildings including excavations are net settlements including rebound effects where soil unloading is estimated assuming excavation depths of 13 feet per basement level plus 4 feet for mat foundation.

3. Differential settlements are over a horizontal distance of 30 feet. The estimates do not include the rigidity of a mat foundation system, which would tend to reduce the differential settlement

Footings supporting the townhomes or lightly loaded, ancillary at-grade structures designed in accordance with the recommendations provided in Section 8.2.2 should not settle more than one

inch; differential settlement between adjacent footings, typically 30 feet apart, should not exceed ½ inch. Additional recommendations for footings are presented in Section 8.2.2.

7.3 Groundwater Considerations

Groundwater levels encountered in the borings range from Elevation 146 feet at B-1 to Elevation 86 feet at B-4. On the basis of our knowledge of groundwater in the area, we conclude design groundwater elevations on the project site can be linearly interpolated between Elevation 146 feet at the southwest end and Elevation 86 feet at the northeast end.

7.4 Shoring Considerations

We understand that Blocks 1 and 2, Block 4, and Block 13 will have a one-level basement for parking with an average depth of about 17 feet, which accounts for a four-foot-thick mat. We understand Blocks 14 and 15 will have a three-level basement for parking with an average depth of about 43 feet, which accounts for a four-foot-thick mat. Temporary shoring recommendations for the one- and three-level basements are presented herein.

The excavation for the one-level basements may be sloped back if there is sufficient space, which is likely not possible on sides where the excavation would abut existing roadways. Alternatively, during excavation of any basements, the adjacent property and streets may be supported by temporary shoring. There are several key considerations in selecting a suitable shoring system. Those we consider to be primary concerns are:

- protection of surrounding improvements, including roadways, utilities, and adjacent structures;
- penetration of shoring supports into the predominantly sand and gravel soils below the bottom of the excavation;
- proper construction of the shoring system to reduce the potential for ground movement;
- cost.

Based on our experience on projects with similar excavation depths, soldier pile and timber lagging or overlapping soil-cement-mixed columns, in lieu of timber lagging may be the most economical shoring system for the excavations for this project.

Soldier pile and lagging consists of soldier piles placed in predrilled holes, which are backfilled with concrete or installed with a soil-cement mixing drill rig. Wood lagging is typically placed between the soldier beams as the excavation proceeds.

Alternatively overlapping soil-cement-mixed columns between soldier piles may be used in lieu of wood lagging. Soil-cement-mixed columns are installed by advancing hollow-stem augers and pumping cement slurry out through the tips of the augers during auger penetration. The soil is mixed with the cement slurry in situ, forming continuous overlapping soil-cement columns or continuous walls. Steel beams are placed in the soil-cement columns or walls at pre-determined spacing to provide rigidity.

The contractor should review the available boring logs in the previous reports and be prepared to encounter dense to very dense sand and gravel layers at various depths. Drilling of the shafts for the soldier piles may require casing and/or the use of drilling mud to prevent caving of any sand layers that are present. To reduce movements and caving, it may be necessary to limit the unsupported height of the excavation to the height of the lagging boards.

Excavations deeper than about 10 to 15 feet may require either post grouted tiebacks or internal bracing for lateral support unless the shoring is stiffened. The adjacent property owners should be notified of the planned excavation and consulted regarding any special requirements they may have for construction. It may be difficult to obtain permission to install tiebacks on their property.

During excavation, the shoring system is expected to yield and deform, which could cause surrounding improvements to settle and move. The magnitude of shoring movements and resulting settlements are difficult to estimate because they depend on many factors, including the method and the shoring contractor's skill in the installation. If cohesionless layers are encountered, some caving may occur while lagging boards are installed. We estimate a properly installed shoring system will limit lateral movements and settlements to adjacent improvements to about 2/3 inch for a one-level basement. Typical maximum movement for a properly designed and constructed shoring system for the three-level basement should be within about 1½ inches. The settlement should decrease linearly with distance from the excavation and should be relatively insignificant at a distance twice the excavation depth. A monitoring program should be established to evaluate the effects of the construction on surrounding improvements, as discussed in Section 8.13.

The soil cement-mixed columns would be relatively rigid compared to wood lagging and could further limit lateral deflections and ground subsidence related to the shoring. Where movements could be detrimental to adjacent existing improvements the soil cement mixed columns could be used. A combination of the soldier pile and lagging and soil cement mixed column systems could be used depending on the required performance along the various excavation faces.

The selection, design, construction, and performance of the shoring system (see Section 8.7) should be the responsibility of the contractor. A civil engineer knowledgeable in this type of construction should be retained to design the shoring. We should review the final shoring plans to check that they are consistent with the recommendations presented in this report.

7.5 Excavation and Monitoring

The soil to be excavated from the site consists of materials that can be excavated with conventional earthmoving equipment such as loaders and backhoes, except where foundations and slabs of existing buildings are encountered. The presence of any existing structures within the zone of planned excavation will need to be verified in the field. Removal of these may require the use of jackhammers or hoe-rams. The equipment to be used should conform to vibration requirements set forth in Section 17.04 of the City of Cupertino Municipal Code. Excavations resulting from the removal of foundations, slabs and underground utilities that extend below the bottom of the proposed foundation/floor level should be cleaned of any loose soil/debris and backfilled with lean concrete or properly compacted fill. Existing basement walls and footings that interfere with the shoring system will need to be removed prior to installing the shoring.

The surficial soil is clayey and moderately to highly plastic. If earthwork is performed in wet weather conditions, it may be difficult to compact the soil; it may need to be aerated during dry weather. Light grading equipment may be needed to avoid damaging the subgrade.

7.6 Corrosion Potential

Because corrosive soil can adversely affect underground utilities and foundation elements, laboratory testing was performed to evaluate the corrosivity of the near surface soil.

CERCO Analytical performed tests on soil samples to evaluate corrosion potential to buried metals and concrete. The results of the tests are presented in Table 6 and Appendix F.

Test Boring	Sample Depth (feet)	рH	Sulfates (mg/kg)	Resistivity (ohms-cm)	Redox (mV)	Chlorides (mg/kg)
$B-3$	18.5	7.56	210	1.200	350	32
B-4	63.5	7.77	N.D.	3,900	350	N.D.
B-5	26	7.95	21	1,700	350	21

TABLE 6 Summary of Corrosivity Test Results

N.D. = None Detected

Based upon resistivity measurements, the soil samples tested are classified as "moderately corrosive" to "corrosive" to buried iron, steel, cast iron, ductile iron, galvanized steel and dielectric coated steel or iron. The chemical analysis indicates reinforced concrete and cement mortar coated steel, will be affected by the corrosivity of the soil. To protect reinforcing steel from corrosion, adequate coverage should be provided as required by the building code. Corrosivity test results are presented in Appendix F.

8.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendations for site preparation foundation design, temporary shoring and other geotechnical aspects of this project are presented in the following sections.

8.1 Earthwork

The following subsections present recommendations for site preparation and lime treatment.

8.1.1 Site Preparation

Demolition in areas to be developed should include removal of existing pavement and underground obstructions, including foundations of existing structures. Any vegetation and organic topsoil should be stripped in areas to receive new site improvements. Stripped organic soil can be stockpiled for later use in landscaped areas, if approved by the owner and architect; organic topsoil should not be used as compacted fill.

Demolished asphalt and concrete at the site may be crushed to provide recycled construction materials, including sand, free-draining crushed rock, and Class 2 aggregate base (AB) provided it is acceptable from an environmental standpoint.

Existing underground utilities beneath areas to receive new improvements should be removed or abandoned in-place by filling them with grout. The procedure for in-place abandonment of utilities should be evaluated on a case-by-case basis and will depend on location of utilities relative to new improvements. However, in general, existing utilities within four feet of final grades should be removed, and the resulting excavation should be properly backfilled.

We recommend at least 18 inches of select material be placed beneath slab-on-grades for proposed at-grade structures that will be at or near existing grades and 12 inches beneath exterior concrete flatwork. Materials for the capillary break (sand and gravel) do not count as part of the select fill. The select fill should extend at least five feet beyond structure footprints and two feet beyond exterior concrete flatwork. Criteria for select fill are presented later in this section. Prior to placing fill, the subgrade exposed after stripping and site clearing, as well as other portions of

the site that will receive new fill or site improvements, should be scarified to a depth of at least eight inches, moisture-conditioned to at least three percent above the optimum moisture content, and compacted to at least 88 percent relative compaction⁹, where the exposed material consists of moderately to highly expansive soil. Expansive surface soil that has a moisture content of less than 20 percent (the approximate plastic limit of the soil) should be excavated, moisture-conditioned to at least three percent above optimum moisture content, and recompacted to between 88 and 93 percent relative compaction to reduce its expansion potential. Where lean clay or sandy soil are encountered during grading, the scarified surface should be moisture-conditioned to above the optimum moisture content and compacted to at least 90 percent relative compaction. An exception to this general procedure is within any proposed at-grade vehicle pavement areas supported on soil, where the upper six inches of the pavement subgrade should be compacted to at least 95 percent relative compaction regardless of expansion potential.

Heavy construction equipment should not be allowed directly on the final basement subgrade. The clay or sand exposed at the foundation/basement level may be susceptible to disturbance under construction equipment loads. It may be necessary to place a minimum 12-inch working pad consisting of crushed rock on top of the subgrade to minimize disturbance; the need for a working pad should be evaluate during construction as the bottom of the excavation is reached.

Any select fill placed during grading should meet the following criteria:

- be free of organic matter;
- contain no rocks or lumps larger than three inches in greatest dimension;
- have a low expansion potential (defined by a liquid limit of less than 40 and plasticity index lower than 12)
- \bullet have a low corrosion potential¹⁰
- be approved by the geotechnical engineer.

All fill placed beneath the basement and other improvements should meet the criteria for select fill. All select fill should be moisture-conditioned to near optimum moisture content, placed in horizontal lifts not exceeding eight inches in loose thickness, and be compacted to at least

 10 Low corrosion potential is defined as a minimum resistivity of 2,000 ohms-cm and maximum sulfate and chloride concentrations of 250 parts per million.

⁹ Relative compaction refers to the in-place dry density of soil expressed as a percentage of the maximum dry density of the same material, as determined by the ASTM D1557-12 laboratory compaction procedure.

90 percent relative compaction, except for fill that is placed within the proposed pavement areas. In these situations, the upper six inches of the final soil subgrade and aggregate baserock should be compacted to at least 95 percent relative compaction. Where used, sand containing less than 10 percent fines (particles passing the No. 200 sieve) should also be compacted to at least 95 percent relative compaction. Samples of on-site and proposed import fill materials should be submitted to Langan for approval at least three business days prior to use at the site.

8.1.2 Lime Treatment (Optional)

Alternatively, the upper 18-inches of the existing surface soil may be lime treated to reduce the expansion potential and help winterize the site. We recommend that at least 5 percent lime by weight of the soil be used to treat the upper 18-inches of native soil for at-grade structures. A specialty contractor should be engaged to evaluate the type and amount of lime needed to reduce the plasticity index of the soil to meet the select fill criteria and provide laboratory test results to confirm the plasticity index of the soil after treatment.

Lime treatment of fine-grained soils generally includes site preparation, application of lime, mixing, compaction, and curing of the lime treated soil. Field quality control measures should include checking the depth of lime treatment, degree of pulverization, lime spread rate measurement, lime content measurement, and moisture content and density measurements, and mixing efficiency. Quality control will also include laboratory tests for unconfined compressive strength tests on representative samples.

The lime treatment process should be designed by a contractor specializing in its use and who is experienced in the application of lime in similar soil conditions. Based on our experience with lime treatment, we judge that the specialty contractor should be able to treat the moderate to highly expansive on-site material to produce a non-expansive fill for building subgrade.

If the lime treatment alternative is selected, we recommend that the specialty contractor prepare a treatment specification for our review prior to construction.

8.2 Foundations

The following section provides recommendations for mat foundations and spread footings.

8.2.1 Mat Foundation

Provided the static settlements estimates discussed in Section 7.2 are acceptable, we conclude the proposed buildings can be supported on a mat bearing on stiff to hard clay or medium dense to very dense sand and gravel.

The estimated static settlements associated with an estimated allowable dead plus live foundation bearing pressures provided by project structural engineer are presented in Table 5. The proposed buildings are currently anticipated to have average foundation bearing pressures ranging from 350 to 5,100 psf, excluding the weight of the foundation. We should provide revised static settlement estimates if the average dead plus live foundation bearing pressures exceed those shown in Table 5 by more than 10 percent. The structural engineer should evaluate the settlements of the structure using a modulus of subgrade reaction method.

The recommended static and dynamic moduli of subgrade reaction for mat foundations constructed at-grade, with a one-level basement, and with a three-level basement are presented in Table 7.

Case	Reaction $(kcf)^1$	Static Modulus of Subgrade Dynamic Modulus of Subgrade Reaction (kcf)
At-Grade	25	30
One-Level Basement	60	70
Three-Level Basement	200	240

TABLE 7 Moduli of Subgrade Reaction for Mat Foundations

Note: 1. $kcf = kips$ per cubic foot

The moduli values are representative estimates of the anticipated settlement under the building foundation bearing pressures. After the mat analysis is completed, we should review the computed settlement and bearing pressure profiles to check that the modulus values are appropriate.

Resistance to lateral loads can be mobilized by a combination of passive pressure acting against the vertical faces of the mat and friction along the base of the mat. To calculate the passive resistance against the vertical faces of the basement walls or mat foundations supporting buildings with basement levels, we recommend an equivalent fluid weight of 400 pounds per cubic foot (pcf) with a maximum value of 2,000 pcf. To calculate the passive resistance against the vertical faces of mat foundations supporting at-grade structures, we recommend an equivalent fluid weight of 250 pcf with a maximum value of 1,250 pcf. The upper foot should be ignored unless confined by a slab. If waterproofing is used, the allowable friction factor will depend on the type of waterproofing used at the base of the foundation. For bentonite-based waterproofing membranes, such as Paraseal and Voltex, a friction factor of 0.15 should be used.

Friction factors for other types of waterproofing membranes should be provided by the manufacturer. If waterproofing is not used, frictional resistance should be computed using a base friction coefficient of 0.3. These values include a factor of safety of about 1.5 and may be used in combination without reduction.

If weak soil is encountered at the mat excavation bottom, it should be over-excavated and replaced with engineered fill or lean concrete. The bottom and sides of mat excavations should be wetted following excavation and maintained in a moist condition until concrete is placed. If the foundation soil dries during construction, the foundation will heave when exposed to moisture, which may result in cracking and distress.

We should observe mat subgrade prior to placement of reinforcing steel. The excavation for the mat should be free of standing water, debris, and disturbed materials prior to placing concrete.

8.2.2 Spread Footing Foundations

For footings supporting at-grade ancillary structures and the Block 6 townhomes, we recommend a minimum embedment of 36-inches below the lowest adjacent soil subgrade. For the recommended minimum embedment, footings bearing on firm native soil or engineered fill may be designed for an allowable bearing pressure of 3,000 psf for dead plus live loads, with a onethird increase for total loads, including wind and/or seismic loads.

Footings should be at least 18 inches wide for continuous footings and 24 inches for isolated spread footings. Footings adjacent to utility trenches (or other footings) should bear below an imaginary 1.5:1 (horizontal to vertical) plane projected upward from the bottom edge of the utility trench (or adjacent footings).

Lateral forces can be resisted by a combination of friction along the base of the footing, and passive resistance against the vertical faces of the foundation and, where applicable, the basement walls perpendicular to the direction of earthquake shaking. Frictional resistance should be computed using a base friction coefficient of 0.30. If waterproofing is used, the allowable friction factor will depend on the type of waterproofing used at the base of the foundation. For bentonite-based waterproofing membranes, such as Paraseal and Voltex, a friction factor of 0.15 should be used. Friction factors for other types of waterproofing membranes should be provided by the manufacturer. If passive pressure on the walls is relied upon for lateral resistance, the walls should be designed to resist the passive pressure. To calculate the passive resistance against the vertical faces of the basement walls or footings, we recommend an equivalent fluid weight of 400 pcf with a maximum value of 2,000 pcf. To calculate the passive resistance against

the vertical faces of footings supporting at-grade structures, we recommend an equivalent fluid weight of 250 pcf with a maximum value of 1,250 pcf. The upper foot should be ignored unless confined by a slab. The values for the friction coefficient and passive pressures include a factor of safety of 1.5 and may be used in combination without reduction.

A firm subgrade should be exposed at the bottom of the proposed footing excavations. If isolated areas of soft material are encountered in the bottom of the excavation, they should be removed to expose firm material. Resulting overexcavations should be backfilled with lean or structural concrete. The bottom and sides of the footing excavations should be wetted following excavation and maintained in a moist condition until concrete is placed. If the foundation soil dries during construction, the foundation will heave when exposed to moisture, which may result in cracking and distress.

We should observe the footing subgrade prior to placement of reinforcing steel. The excavation for the footings should be free of standing water, debris, and disturbed materials prior to placing concrete.

8.3 Floor Slab

The subgrade soil for buildings with basements should be very stiff or dense. The subgrade soil for at-grade buildings should be stiff to hard. Therefore, we conclude the basement slabs can be supported on grade. Where soft or loose soil is present at the basement slab subgrade, the weak soil should be removed and replaced with engineered fill or lean concrete.

Where slab-on-grade floors are to be cast, the soil subgrade should be scarified to a depth of six inches, moisture conditioned to near (or above) optimum moisture content, and rolled to provide a firm, non-yielding surface compacted to at least 90 percent relative compaction. Lime treated soil should be compacted to at least 90 percent relative compaction. If the subgrade is disturbed during excavation for shallow foundations and utilities, it should be re-rolled. Loose, disturbed materials should be excavated, removed, and replaced with engineered fill during final subgrade preparation.

Moisture is likely to condense on the underside of the slabs, even though they will be above the design groundwater table. Consequently, a moisture barrier should be installed beneath the slabs if movement of water vapor through the slabs would be detrimental to its intended use. A moisture barrier is generally not required beneath parking garage slabs, except for areas beneath mechanical, electrical, and storage rooms. A typical moisture barrier consists of a capillary moisture break and a water vapor retarder.

The capillary moisture break should consist of at least four inches of clean, free-draining gravel or crushed rock. The vapor retarder should meet the requirements for Class C vapor retarders stated in the latest edition of ASTM E1745. The vapor retarder should be placed in accordance with the requirements of the latest edition of ASTM E1643. These requirements include overlapping seams by six inches, taping seams, and sealing penetrations in the vapor retarder. The particle size of the gravel/crushed rock should meet the gradation requirements presented in Table 8.

Sieve Size	Percentage Passing Sieve	
	Gravel or Crushed Rock	
1 inch	$90 - 100$	
$3/4$ inch	$30 - 100$	
$1/2$ inch	$5 - 25$	
3/8 inch	$0 - 6$	

TABLE 8 Gradation Requirements for Capillary Moisture Break

Concrete mixes with high water/cement (w/c) ratios result in excess water in the concrete, which increases the cure time and results in excessive vapor transmission through the slab. Therefore, concrete for the floor slab should have a low w/c ratio - less than 0.45. Water should not be added in the field. If necessary, workability should be increased by adding plasticizers. In addition, the slab should be properly cured. Before the floor covering is placed, the contractor should check that the concrete surface and the moisture emission levels (if emission testing is required) meet the manufacturer's requirements.

8.4 Permanent Below-Grade Wall Design

To construct the basement walls, the site may be open cut and/or temporarily shored. It is the responsibility of the contractor to determine the safe excavation slopes; however, we recommend cuts greater than four feet be no steeper than 1.5:1 (horizontal:vertical).

Because the on-site soil is expansive, we recommend designing below grade walls, such as the permanent shoring wall, for at-rest lateral pressures corresponding to equivalent fluid unit weights of 70 pcf and 90 pcf for drained and undrained conditions, respectively. Because the site is in a seismically active area, the design should also be checked for seismic conditions. Under seismic loading conditions, there will be an added seismic increment that should be added to active earth pressures (Sitar et al. 2012). We used the procedures outlined in Sitar et al. (2012)

and the peak ground acceleration based on the DE ground motion level (see Section 8.6) to compute the seismic pressure increment. Basement walls should be designed for the equivalent fluid weights and pressures presented in Table 9A.

TABLE 9A

Basement Wall Design Earth Pressures Backfilled with Native Soil (Drained Conditions above Design Groundwater Level)

	Static Conditions	Seismic Conditions ¹	
	Unrestrained Walls - Active (pcf ³)	Restrained Walls - At-rest (pcf)	Total Pressure - Active Plus Seismic Pressure Increment (pcf)
Drained Condition ²	45	70	80
Undrained Condition	80	90	100

Notes:

1. The more critical condition of either at-rest pressure for static conditions or active pressure plus a seismic pressure increment for seismic conditions should be checked.

2. Applicable to walls that are backdrained to prevent the buildup of hydrostatic pressure.

3. pcf = pounds per cubic foot

If open cuts are made for the basement walls and select fill is used as backfill, then the walls may be designed with the earth pressures presented in Table 9B.

TABLE 9B

Basement Wall Design Earth Pressures with Select Fill Backfill (Drained Conditions above Design Groundwater Level)

	Static Conditions	Seismic Conditions ¹	
	Unrestrained Walls - Active (pcf ³)	Restrained Walls - At-rest (pcf)	Total Pressure - Active Plus Seismic Pressure Increment (pcf)
Drained Condition ²	35	55	
Undrained Condition	80	90	100

Notes:

1. The more critical condition of either at-rest pressure for static conditions or active pressure plus a seismic pressure increment for seismic conditions should be checked.

2. Applicable to walls that are backdrained to prevent the buildup of hydrostatic pressure.

3. pcf = pounds per cubic foot

Non-expansive wall backfill should consist of select fill, as described in Section 8.1. For cantilever walls retaining level backfill (i.e., landscape walls), the pressures presented on Table 9A or Table 9B may be used and will depend if the wall retains native soil (expansive) or select fill.

If surcharge loads occur above an imaginary 45-degree line projected up from the bottom of a retaining wall, a surcharge pressure should be included in the wall design. If this condition exists, we should be consulted to estimate the added pressure on a case-by-case basis. Where truck traffic will pass within 10 feet of retaining walls, temporary traffic loads should be considered in the design of the walls. Traffic loads may be modeled by a uniform pressure of 100 pounds per square foot applied in the upper 10 feet of the walls.

The lateral earth pressures recommended for the sections above the water table are applicable to walls that are backdrained to prevent the buildup of hydrostatic pressure. One acceptable method for backdraining the wall is to place a prefabricated drainage panel against the back of the wall. The drainage panel should extend down to a four-inch-diameter perforated PVC collector pipe at the base of the walls. The pipe should be surrounded on all sides by at least four inches of Caltrans Class 2 permeable material (see Caltrans Standard Specifications Section 68-1.025) or wrapped in filter fabric (Mirafi 140N or equivalent). We should check the manufacturer's specifications regarding the proposed prefabricated drainage panel material to verify it is appropriate for its intended use. The pipe should be connected to a suitable discharge point. As an alternative to using prefabricated drainage panel, the wall may be drained using Caltrans Class 2 permeable material (Caltrans Standard Specifications Section 68-1.025) or clean drain rock wrapped in a geotextile filter fabric (Mirafi 140N or equivalent). The gravel drain should be at least 12 inches wide and should extend up the back of the wall to about 2 feet below the ground surface; the upper 2 feet should be covered with a clay cap to reduce infiltration of surface water. A four-inch-diameter perforated PVC collector pipe should be placed within the gravel blanket near the base of the wall to drain the water to a suitable discharge. The pipe should be surrounded on all sides by at least four inches of Caltrans Class 2 permeable material or drain rock and should be connected to a suitable discharge point.

Wall backfill should be compacted to at least 90 percent relative compaction using light compaction equipment. Wall backfill with less than 10 percent fines, or deeper than five feet, should be compacted to at least 95 percent relative compaction for its entirety. If heavy equipment is used, the wall should be appropriately designed to withstand loads exerted by the equipment and/or temporarily braced.

8.5 Concrete Pavement and Exterior Slabs

Differential ground movement due to expansive soil and settlement will tend to distort and crack the pavements and exterior improvements such as courtyards and sidewalks. Periodic repairs and replacement of exterior improvements should be expected during the life of the project. Mastic joints or other positive separations should be provided to permit any differential movements between exterior slabs and the buildings.

To reduce the potential for cracking related to expansive soil, we recommend exterior concrete flatwork be underlain by at least 12-inches of select fill, of which the upper four inches should consist of aggregate base compacted to at least 95 percent relative compaction. The subgrade should be compacted to at least 90 percent relative compaction and should provide a smooth, non-yielding surface for support of the concrete slabs.

Where rigid pavement is required for loading and service areas, we recommend a minimum of six inches of concrete for medium traffic and a minimum of eight inches of concrete for heavy traffic. The upper six inches of subgrade should be compacted to at least 95 percent relative compaction and should provide a smooth, non-yielding surface. The concrete should be underlain by at least 6 inches of Class 2 Aggregate base. Aggregate base material should conform to the current State of California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) Standard Specifications.

8.6 Seismic Design

The following subsections present the recommended site-specific response spectra performed for the previous development scheme under CBC 2016/ASCE 7-10 (Section 8.6.1) and the code based mapped values per 2019 CBC/ASCE 7-16 (Section 8.6.2).

8.6.1 Site-Specific Response Spectra

We expect this site will experience strong ground shaking during a major earthquake on any of the nearby faults. To estimate ground shaking at the site, we developed site-specific response spectra. We performed a Probabilistic Seismic Hazard Analysis (PSHA) and deterministic analysis to develop site-specific horizontal response spectra for two levels of shaking corresponding to the Risk-targeted Maximum Considered Earthquake (MCE_R) and the Design Earthquake (DE) per the 2016 CBC. The MCE_R is defined in the 2016 CBC as the lesser of the probabilistic spectrum having 2 percent probability of exceedance in 50 years or the 84th percentile deterministic event on the governing fault, both in the maximum direction; the DE is defined as $2/3$ of the MCE_R.

The probabilistic seismic hazard analysis (PSHA) was performed using the computer code EZFRISK 8.06 (Risk Engineering 2019). This approach is based on the probabilistic seismic hazard model developed by Cornell (1973) and McGuire (1976). Our analysis modeled the faults in the Bay Area as linear sources and earthquake activities were assigned to the faults based on historical and geologic data.

Details of our analyses are presented in Appendix G. The recommended horizontal ground surface spectra are shown on Figure 8. Digitized values of the recommended MCE_R and DE spectra for the site and a damping ratio of 5 percent are presented in Table 10.

TABLE 10 Digitized Values of the Recommended MCER and DE Spectra

Because site-specific procedure was used to determine the recommended MCE_R and DE response spectra, the corresponding values of S_{MS} , S_{M1} , S_{DS} and S_{D1} per Section 21.4 of ASCE 7-10 should be used as shown in Table 11. We recommend that the site-specific values be used for design.

TABLE 11

Design Spectral Acceleration Value

 $*$ S_{M1} and S_{D1} are based on the site-specific response spectra and are governed by the spectral acceleration at a period of two seconds.

8.6.2 Code Based Mapped Values

For seismic design in accordance with the provisions of 2019 CBC/ASCE 7-16, we recommend the following:

- Risk Targeted Maximum Considered Earthquake (MCE_R) S_s and S₁ of 1.768g and 0.626g, respectively.
- Site Class C
- Site Coefficients F_A and F_V of 1.2 and 1.4
- Maximum Considered Earthquake (MCE) spectral response acceleration parameters at short periods, S_{MS} , and at one-second period, S_{M1} , of 2.122g and 0.876g, respectively.
- Design Earthquake (DE) spectral response acceleration parameters at short period, S_{DS} , and at one-second period, S_{D1} , of 1.415g and 0.584g, respectively.
- PGA $_{M}$ is 0.873g

8.7 Shoring Design

As discussed in the Section 7.4, a soldier-pile-and-wood-lagging system or soil-cement-mixed columns between soldier piles are acceptable methods to retain the excavation where open cuts are not feasible. A cantilever soldier-pile-and-lagging shoring system can be designed to resist an active earth pressure of 45 pounds per cubic foot (pcf). The lateral pressures recommended for designing tied-back or braced shoring systems are presented on Figures 9 and 10 for temporary soldier pile with wood lagging and soldier pile with soil-cement columns, respectively.

The passive pressures presented on Figures 9 and 10 include a safety factor of 1.5 and may be used for the design of both cantilever and tieback shoring.

Recommendations for computing penetration depth of soldier piles to resist vertical loads are presented in Section 8.7.1.

Shoring that will support remaining buildings should be designed for additional surcharge pressures from the nearby footings. Estimated surcharge pressures from shallow foundations are provided in Figures 11 through 13.

If traffic occurs within 10 feet of the shoring, a uniform surcharge load of 100 psf should be added to the upper 10 feet for the design. An increase in lateral design pressure for the shoring may be required where heavy construction equipment or stockpiled materials are within a distance equal to the shoring depth. Construction equipment should not be allowed within five feet from the edge of the excavation unless the shoring is specifically designed for the appropriate surcharge. The increase in pressure should be computed after the surcharge loads are known. The anticipated deflections of the shoring system should be estimated to check if they are acceptable.

The shoring system should be designed by a licensed civil engineer experienced in the design of retaining systems and installed by an experienced shoring specialty contractor. The shoring engineer should be responsible for the design of temporary shoring in accordance with applicable regulatory requirements. Control of ground movement will depend as much on the timeliness of installation of lateral restraint as on the design. We should review the shoring plans and a representative from our office should observe the installation of the shoring.

8.7.1 Penetration Depth of Soldier Piles

Although the shoring designer should evaluate the required penetration depth of the soldier piles, we recommend that the soldier piles should extend below the excavation bottom a minimum of five feet. The soldier piles should have sufficient axial capacity to support the vertical load component of the tiebacks and the vertical load acting on the piles, if any. To compute the axial capacity of the piles, we recommend using an allowable friction of 1,000 psf on the perimeter of the piles below the excavation level.

8.7.2 Tieback Design Criteria and Installation Procedure

Tiebacks may be used to restrain the shoring. The vertical load from the tiebacks should be accounted for in the design. Design criteria for tiebacks are presented on Figures 9 and 10.

Tiebacks should derive their load-carrying capacity from the soil behind an imaginary line sloping upward from a point 0.2H feet away from the bottom of the excavation and sloping upwards at

60 degrees from the horizontal, where H is the wall height in feet. Tiebacks with bar and strand tendons should have a minimum unbonded lengths of 10 and 15 feet, respectively. All tiebacks should have a minimum bonded length of 15 feet and should be spaced at least four feet on center. The bottom of the excavation should not extend more than two feet below a row of unsecured tiebacks.

Tieback allowable capacity will depend upon the drilling method, hole diameter, grout pressure, and workmanship. The existing sandy soil may cave; therefore, solid flight augers should not be used for tieback installation. We recommend a smooth cased tieback installation method (such as a Klemm type rig) be used. For estimating purposes, we recommend using the skin friction values presented on Figures 9 and 10. These values include a factor of safety of about 1.5. Higher skin friction values may be used, if confirmed with pre-production performance tests.

The contractor should be responsible for determining the actual length of tiebacks required to resist the lateral earth pressures imposed on the temporary retaining systems. Determination of the tieback length should be based on the contractor's familiarity with their installation method. The computed bond length should be confirmed by a performance- and proof-testing program under the observation of an engineer experienced in this type of work. Replacement tiebacks should be installed for tiebacks that fail the load test. Recommendations for tieback testing are presented in Section 8.7.3.

8.7.3 Tieback Testing

The first two production tiebacks and two percent of the remaining tiebacks should be performance-tested to at least 1.25 times the design load. All other tiebacks should be proof-tested to at least 1.25 times the design load. The performance tests will be used to determine the load carrying capacity of the tiebacks and the residual movement. The performance-tested tiebacks should be checked 24 hours after initial lock off to confirm stress relaxation has not occurred. The geotechnical engineer should evaluate the results of the performance tests and determine if creep testing is required and select the tiebacks that should be creep tested. If any tiebacks fail to meet the proof-testing requirements, additional tiebacks should be added to compensate for the deficiency, as determined by the shoring designer.

The movement of each tieback should be monitored with a free-standing, tripod-mounted dial gauge during performance and proof testing. The performance test is used to verify the capacity and the load-deformation behavior of the tiebacks. It is also used to separate and identify the causes of tieback movement, and to check that the designed unbonded length has been established. In the performance test, the load is applied to the tieback in several cycles of

incremental loading and unloading. During the test, the tieback load and movement are measured. The maximum test load should be held for a minimum of 10 minutes, with readings taken at 0, 1, 3, 6, and 10 minutes. If the difference between the 1- and 10-minute reading is less than 0.04 inch during the loading, the test is discontinued. If the difference is more than 0.04 inch, the holding period is extended by 50 minutes to 60 minutes, and the movements should be recorded at 15, 20, 25, 30, 45, and 60 minutes.

A proof test is a simple test used to measure the total movement of the tieback during one cycle of incremental loading. The maximum test load should be held for a minimum of 10 minutes, with readings taken at 0, 1, 2, 3, 6, and 10 minutes. If the difference between the 1- and 10-minute reading is less than 0.04 inch, the test is discontinued. If the difference is more than 0.04 inch, the holding period is extended by 50 minutes to 60 minutes, and the movements should be recorded at 15, 20, 25, 30, 45, and 60 minutes.

We should evaluate the tieback test results and determine whether the tiebacks are acceptable. A performance- or proof-tested tieback with a ten-minute hold is acceptable if the tieback carries the maximum test load with less than 0.04 inches of movement between one and 10 minutes, and total movement at the maximum test load exceeds 80 percent of the theoretical elastic elongation of the unbonded length.

A performance- or proof-tested tieback with a 60-minute hold is acceptable if the tieback carries the maximum test load with less than 0.08 inches of movement between six and 60 minutes and the total movement at the maximum test load exceeds 80 percent of the theoretical elastic elongation of the unbonded length. Tiebacks that fail to meet the first criterion will be assigned a reduced capacity.

If the total movement of the tiebacks at the maximum test load does not exceed 80 percent of the theoretical elastic elongation of the unbonded length, the contractor should replace the tiebacks.

8.7.4 Internal Bracing

Where internal bracing is selected for lateral support of the shoring instead of, or in addition to tiebacks, rakers or struts (diagonal or cross-lot) may be used.

If struts are used as internal bracing, temporary pin piles can be installed within the excavation to support the vertical load from the bracing system. The axial capacity for piles should be determined using an allowable skin friction value of 1,000 psf, which includes a factor of safety of at least 2.0. End bearing should be neglected. Because the piles are temporary and are being

designed for a factor of safety of at least 2.0, load testing is not required. Alternatively, new footings or mats can be used to provide lateral and vertical support for internal bracing elements.

If rakers are used as internal bracing, raker installation should be sequenced in such a manner as to avoid excessive deflection of the shoring system. The initial excavation, prior to raker installation, can be a cantilever excavation that should be designed such that shoring deflection does not exceed the design criteria for the shoring system. The maximum cantilever height will be a function of the stiffness of the soldier piles and lagging system.

A soil berm should be maintained from the bottom of the cantilever section of the shoring to the bottom excavation until the rakers are installed and the concrete for the pin piles has reached the required strength. The soil berm should have a five-foot-wide bench at the top and a slope no steeper than 1.5:1 (horizontal to vertical). At a 1.5:1 (horizontal to vertical) slope, the soil berm can provide a passive resistance of 75 pcf. The passive resistance value includes a factor of safety of about 1.5. The berm can be slot cut if required to facilitate installation of the rakers, however the maximum slot width cut should not exceed two feet. Depending on final spacing of the rakers, raker installation may need to be sequenced such that one raker and pin pile are installed prior to slot cutting of the berm and installation of an adjacent raker. The soil berm in front of the excavation should remain in place until the rakers and the supporting pin pile are installed, and the concrete has reached the minimum strength required by the shoring design engineer.

The rakers should remain in place until the below grade walls and floor slabs up to the top of the raker have been installed and the concrete has reached sufficient strength to support the soil and surcharge pressures.

8.8 Asphalt and Resin Pavements

The State of California flexible pavement design method was used to develop the recommended asphalt concrete pavement sections. We expect the final soil subgrade in asphalt-paved areas will generally consist of stiff to hard clay or engineered fill. On the basis of the laboratory test results on this soil, we selected an R-value of 9 for design. Subgrade soils in paved areas, whether at-grade or on the roof, should have an R-value of 9 or higher. Therefore, additional tests should be performed on the proposed subgrade soil to measure its R-value prior to use in pavement areas. Depending on the results of the tests, the pavement design may need to be revised.

For pavements subjected to vehicle loads, we assumed a Traffic Index (TI) of 4 for automobile parking areas with occasional trucks, and 5 and 6 for driveways and truck-use areas; these TIs

should be confirmed by the project civil engineer. Table 12 presents our recommendations for asphalt or resin pavement sections.

TABLE 12 Pavement Section Design

For pavements not subjected to vehicle loads, we recommend a minimum of 2.5 inches of asphalt or resin pavement over 4 inches of Class 2 aggregate base. These sections should be checked against City of Cupertino minimum standards.

Pavement components should conform to the current Caltrans Standard Specifications. The upper six inches of the soil subgrade in pavement areas should be moisture-conditioned to above optimum and compacted to at least 95 percent relative compaction and rolled to provide a smooth non-yielding surface. Aggregate base should be compacted to at least 95 percent relative compaction.

8.9 Utilities

The corrosivity report provided in Appendix F of this report should be reviewed and corrosion protection measures used if needed. A corrosion engineer should be retained if detailed recommendations are needed.

Utility trenches should be excavated a minimum of four inches below the bottom of pipes or conduits and have clearances of at least four inches on both sides. Where necessary, trench excavations should be shored and braced, in accordance with all safety regulations, to prevent cave-ins. If sheet piling is used as shoring, and is to be removed after backfilling, it should be placed a minimum of two feet away from the pipes or conduits to prevent disturbance to them as the sheet piles are extracted. It may be difficult to drive sheet piles if cobbles, coarse grained gravel layers or buried obstructions are encountered.

Backfill for utility trenches should be compacted according to the recommendations presented for the general site fill. Jetting of trench backfill should not be permitted. To provide uniform

support, pipes or conduits should be bedded on a minimum of four inches of sand or fine gravel. After pipes and conduits are tested, inspected (if required), and approved, they should be covered to a depth of six inches with sand or fine gravel, which should then be mechanically tamped or compacted with a vibratory plate. Backfill should be placed in lifts of eight inches or less, moisture-conditioned, and compacted to at least 90 percent relative compaction. If sand or gravel with less than 10 percent fines (particles passing the No. 200 sieve) is used, it should be compacted to 95 percent relative compaction.

Special care should be taken in controlling utility backfilling in pavement areas. Poor compaction may cause excessive settlements, resulting in damage to exterior improvements.

Where utility trenches backfilled with sand or gravel enter the building pads, an impermeable plug consisting of low-expansion potential clay or lean concrete, at least five feet in length, should be installed at the building line. Further, where sand- or gravel-backfilled trenches cross planter areas and pass below asphalt or concrete pavements, a similar plug should be placed at the edge of the pavement. The purpose of these plugs is to reduce the potential for water to become trapped in trenches beneath the building or pavements. This trapped water can cause heaving of soils beneath slabs and softening of subgrade soil beneath pavements.

8.10 Site Drainage

Positive surface drainage should be provided around the buildings to direct surface water away from the existing building foundations. To reduce the potential for water ponding adjacent to the buildings, we recommend the ground surface within a horizontal distance of five feet from the buildings be designed to slope down and away from the buildings with a surface gradient of at least two percent in unpaved areas and one percent in paved areas. In addition, roof downspouts should be discharged into controlled drainage facilities to keep the water away from the foundations.

8.11 Bioretention Systems

Bioretention areas are landscaping features used to treat stormwater runoff within a development site. They are commonly located in parking lot islands and landscape areas. Surface runoff is directed into shallow, landscaped depressions, which usually include mulch and a prepared soil mix. Typically, the filtered runoff is collected in a perforated underdrain beneath the bioretention system and returned to the storm drain system. For larger storms, runoff is generally diverted past the bioretention areas to the storm drain system.

The soil within a bioretention system should typically have an infiltration rate sufficient to draw down any pooled water within 48 hours after a storm event. Based on the "C.3 Stormwater Handbook" prepared by Santa Clara Valley Urban Runoff Pollution Prevention Program (SCVURPPP, 2016), the infiltration rate of the soil should allow standing water to drain within 72 hours; cohesionless soils like sand meet this criterion. Cohesive soils like clay and silts do not meet the infiltration rate requirement and are considered unsuitable in a bioretention system, particularly when they are expansive. For areas where there are unsuitable in-situ soils, the bioretention system can be created by importing a suitable soil mix and providing an underdrain. Based on our observation of the soil at the site, the in-situ clays are relatively impervious will likely not meet the infiltration rate requirements. The bioretention systems will need to be constructed with suitable imported soil and include an underdrain system.

Underdrains are typically at the invert of the bioretention system to intercept water that does not infiltrate into the surrounding soils. Underdrains consist of a perforated PVC pipe surrounded by two to three inches of Class 2 Permeable material (Caltrans Standard Specifications Section 68-2.02F(3)). The perforated PVC pipe cross-section area should be determined based on the desired hydraulic conductivity of the underdrain. Underdrains should be installed in accordance with the Santa Clara County's C.3 stormwater technical guidelines.

Because of the presence of near surface expansive soil, unlined bioretention systems should be set back a minimum of five feet from building foundations, slabs, concrete flatwork, or pavements. If bioretention systems are closer than five feet, passive resistance of foundation elements should be neglected. Overflow from bioretention areas should be directed to the storm drain system away from building foundations and slabs.

In Santa Clara County, the bottom of the bioretention system is recommended to be a minimum of five feet or more above the groundwater table (SCVURPPP, 2016).

8.12 Construction Monitoring

The conditions of existing buildings and other improvements within 100 feet of the site should be photographed and surveyed prior to the start of construction and monitored periodically during construction.

To monitor ground movements, groundwater levels, and shoring movements, we recommend installing survey points on the adjacent buildings and streets that are within 100 feet of the site. In addition, survey points should be installed at the tops of the shoring walls at 20-foot-spacing.

The survey points should be read regularly, and the results should be submitted to us in a timely manner for review.

Where critical structures or improvements will be supported behind the temporary shoring, periodic monitoring of survey points should be based on the minimum recommendations provided in Table 13.

Stage	Critical Structure or Improvement	Non-Critical Structure or Improvement
Prior to Construction	Once (baseline)	Once (baseline)
During Installation of Shoring System	Weekly	
During Excavation	Weekly	Weekly
Throughout Construction Until Structure is Above Street Level and Basement Walls are in Place	Monthly	Monthly

TABLE 13 Recommended Minimum Frequency of Survey Point Monitoring

9.0 ADDITIONAL GEOTECHNICAL SERVICES

During final design we should be retained to consult with the design team as geotechnical questions arise. Prior to construction, we should review the project plans and specifications to check their conformance with the intent of our recommendations. We should also review shoring design and installation submittals. During construction, we should observe site preparation, excavation, shoring installation, tieback testing, compaction of fill and backfill, preparation of mat subgrade and subgrade of footing excavations. These observations will allow us to compare the actual with the anticipated soil conditions and to check that the contractors' work conforms to the geotechnical aspects of the plans and specifications.

10.0 LIMITATIONS

The conclusions and recommendations provided in this report result from our interpretation of the geotechnical conditions existing at the site inferred from a limited number of borings as well as architectural information provided by KPF. Actual subsurface conditions could vary. Recommendations provided are dependent upon one another and no recommendation should be followed independent of the others. Any proposed changes in structures, depths of excavation, or their locations should be brought to Langan's attention as soon as possible so that we can determine whether such changes affect our recommendations. Information on subsurface strata and groundwater levels shown on the logs represent conditions encountered only at the locations indicated and at the time of investigation. If different conditions are

encountered during construction, they should immediately be brought to Langan's attention for evaluation, as they may affect our recommendations.

This report has been prepared to assist the Owner, architect, and structural engineer in the design process and is only applicable to the design of the specific project identified. The information in this report cannot be utilized or depended on by engineers or contractors who are involved in evaluations or designs of facilities on adjacent properties which are beyond the limits of that which is the specific subject of this report.

Environmental issues (such as permitting or potentially contaminated soil and groundwater) are outside the scope of this study and should be addressed in a separate evaluation.

LANGAN

REFERENCES

2014 Working Group on California Earthquake Probabilities. (2015). "UCERF3: A new Earthquake Forecast for California's Complex Fault System", U.S. Geological Survey 2015–3009. http://dx.doi.org/10.3133/fs20153009.

Aagaard, B. T., Blair, J. L., Boatwright, J., Garcia, S. H., Harris, R. A., Michael, A. J., Schwartz, D. P., and DiLeo, J.S . (2016). "Earthquake Outlook for the San Francisco Bay Region 2014–2043 (ver. 1.1, August 2016), U.S. Geological Survey Fact Sheet 2016–3020, 6 p. http://dx.doi.org/10.3133/fs20163020

Abrahamson, N.A., Silva, W.J., and Kamai, R. (2014). Summary of the ASK14 ground-motion relation for active crustal regions: Earthquake Spectra, v. 30, n. 3, p. 1025-1055.

Abrahamson, N. A. (2000). "Effect of rupture directivity on probabilistic seismic hazard analysis." Proceedings of Sixth International Conference on Seismic Zonation, Palm Springs, California, November.

ASCE/SEI 7-10 (2010). Minimum Design Loads for Buildings and Other Structures.

ASCE/SEI 7-16 (2016). Minimum Design Loads for Buildings and Other Structures.

Bozorgnia, Y. and Campbell, K. W. (2004). "The vertical-to-horizontal response spectra ratio and tentative procedures for developing simplified V/H and vertical design spectra" Journal of Earthquake Engineering, 8(2), 175-207.

Boore, D.M., Stewart, J.P., Seyhan, E., and Atkinson, G.M. (2014). NGA-West 2 equations for predicting PGA, PGV, and 5%-damped PSA for shallow crustal earthquakes, Earthquake Spectra, v. 30, n. 3, p. 1057-1085.

California Building Standards Commission (2016). California Building Code.

California Building Standards Commission (2019). California Building Code.

California Department of Conservation Division of Mines and Geology (1997). *Guidelines for Evaluating and Mitigating Seismic Hazards in California*. Special Publication 117.

California Division of Mines and Geology (1996). *Probabilistic Seismic Hazard Assessment for the State of California*, CDMG Open-File Report 96-08.

California Division of Mines and Geology (1974). "State of California Special Studies Zones, Cupertino Quadrangle," prepared by the California Geologic Survey.

California Division of Mines and Geology (2002a). "Seismic Hazard Zone Report for the Cupertino 7.5-Minute Quadrangle, Santa Clara County, California, prepared by the California Geologic Survey," Seismic Hazard Zone Report 068.

REFERENCES (Continued)

California Division of Mines and Geology (2002b). "State of California Seismic Hazard Zones, Cupertino Quadrangle," prepared by the California Geologic Survey.

Campbell, K.W., and Bozorgnia, Y. (2014). NGA-West2 ground motion model for the average horizontal components of PGA, PGV, and 5%-damped linear acceleration response spectra: Earthquake Spectra, v. 30, n. 3, p. 1087-1115.

Chiou, B.S.-J. and Youngs, R.R. (2014). Update of the Chiou and Youngs NGA model for the average horizontal component of peak ground motion and response spectra, Earthquake Spectra, v. 30, n. 3, p. 1117-1153.

Cao, T., Bryant, W. A., Rowshandel, B., Branum D. and Wills, C. J. (2003). "The Revised 2002 California Probabilistic Seismic Hazard Maps."

Chiou, B. S.-J., and Youngs, R. R. (2008). "An NGA Model for the Average Horizontal Component of Peak Ground Motion and Response Spectra." Earthquake Spectra, 24(1), 173-215.

Cornell, C. A. (1968). "Engineering Seismic Risk Analysis." Bulletin of the Seismological Society of America, 58(5).

County of Santa Clara (2015). "Geologic Hazard Zones" Maps. Scale 1:24,000.

DCI Engineers (2020). "Vallco Town Center, Shoring and Mass Excavation Documents," dated 15 January 2020

Fugro Consultants (2019). "EZFRISK computer program." Version 8.06.

Hanks, T. C., and W. H. Bakun (2008). "M-log A observations of recent large earthquakes." Bulletin of Seismological Society of America, Vol. 98, No. 1, pp 490-503.

Holzer, T.L. et al. (2008). "Liquefaction Hazard Maps for Three Earthquake Scenarios for the Communities of San Jose, Campbell, Cupertino, Los Altos, Los Gatos, Milpitas, Mountain View, Palo Alto, Santa Clara, Saratoga and Sunnyvale, Northern Santa Clara County." USGS Open File Report 2008-1270.

Idriss, I.M. and Boulanger, R.W. (2008). "Soil Liquefaction During Earthquakes." Earthquake Engineering Research Institute. Monograph MNO-12.

Idriss, I. M. (1993). "Procedures for Selecting Earthquake Ground Motions at Rock Sites." National Institute of Standards and Technology, NIST GCR 93-625, 12 p. plus appendix.

Lazarte, C.A., Robinson, H., Gomez, J.E., Baxter, A., Cadden, A., and Berg, R., 2015, "Geotechnical Engineering Circular No. 7, Soil Nail Walls – Reference Manual," U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration, Publication No. FHWA-NHI-14-017, March.

REFERENCES (Continued)

Lienkaemper, J. J. (1992). "Map of recently active traces of the Hayward Fault, Alameda and Contra Costa counties, California." Miscellaneous Field Studies Map MG-2196.

McGuire, R. K. (1976). "FORTRAN computer program for seismic risk analysis." U.S. Geological Survey, Open-File Report 76-67.

Pradel, Daniel (1998). "Procedure to Evaluate Earthquake-Induced Settlements in Dry Sand," Journal of Geotechnical and Geoenvironmental Engineering, April, and errata October 1998, pp1048.

Nichols, D.R., and N.A. Wright (1971). "Preliminary map of historic margins of marshland, San Francisco Bay, California: USGS Open-File-Report.

Santa Clara Valley Urban Runoff Pollution Prevention Program (SCVURPPP) (2016). Guidance for Implementing Stormwater Requirements for New Development and Redevelopment Projects, June.

Sandis (2016). "The Hills at Vallco, Demolition Package, Cupertino, CA, Topography Survey," Sheets CD.00.01.00, CD.02.01.01, CD.02.01.02, CD.01.01.03 through CD.01.01.07, dated 9/20/16.

Seed, H.B. and Idriss, I.M. (1971). "Simplified Procedure for Evaluating Soil Liquefaction during Earthquakes," Journal of Geotechnical Engineering Division, ASCE, 97 (9), 1249-1273.

Seed, H.B., R.B. Seed, L.F. Harder and H.L. Jong, 1988, "Re-evaluation of the Slide in the Lower San Fernando Dam in the Earthquake of February 9, 1971." Report No. UCB/EERC-88/04, University of California, Berkeley, April.

Shahi, S. K. and Baker J. W. (2014). "NGA-West 2 Models for Ground Motion Directionality." *Earthquake Spectra*. Volume 30. No. 3. Pages 1285-1300.

Sitar, N., E.G. Cahill and J.R. Cahill (2012). "Seismically Induced Lateral Earth Pressures on Retaining Structures and Basement Walls."

Treadwell & Rollo (2013). "Geotechnical Data Report, Pruneridge Theatre Site, Cupertino, California."

Tokimatsu, K. and Seed, H.B. (1987). "Evaluation of Settlements in Sand due to Earthquake Shaking." Journal of Geotechnical Engineering, Vol. 113, No. 8, pp. 861-878.

Toppozada, T. R. and Borchardt G. (1998). "Re-Evaluation of the 1836 "Hayward Fault" and the 1838 San Andreas Fault earthquakes." Bulletin of Seismological Society of America, 88(1), 140 159.

REFERENCES (Continued)

Townley, S. D. and Allen, M. W. (1939). "Descriptive catalog of earthquakes of the Pacific coast of the United States 1769 to 1928." Bulletin of the Seismological Society of America, 29(1).

TRC (2015). "Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation, The Hills at Vallco, Cupertino, California." Report Number 228550.

Wells, D. L. and Coppersmith, K. J. (1994). "New Empirical Relationships among Magnitude, Rupture Length, Rupture Width, Rupture Area, and Surface Displacement." Bulletin of the Seismological Society of America, 84(4), 974-1002.

Wesnousky, S. G. (1986). "Earthquakes, Quaternary Faults, and Seismic Hazards in California." Journal of Geophysical Research, 91(1312).

Youd, T.L., and Idriss, I.M. (2001). "Liquefaction Resistance of Soils: Summary Report from the 1996 NCEER and 1998 NCEER/NSF Workshops on Evaluation of Liquefaction Resistance of Soils," Journal of Geotechnical and Geoenvironmental Engineering, Vol. 127, No. 4.

Youd, T.L., and Garris, C.T. (1995). "Liquefaction-induced ground-surface disruption." Journal of Geotechnical Engineering, American Society of Civil Engineers, Vol. 121, 805-809.

Youngs, R. R., and Coppersmith, K. J. (1985). "Implications of fault slip rates and earthquake recurrence models to probabilistic seismic hazard estimates." Bulletin of the Seismological Society of America, 75(), 939-964.

FIGURES

LANGAN

Filename: \\langan.com\data\SJO\data1\770633101\Cadd Data - 770633101\2D-DesignFiles\Geotechnical\770633101-B-GI0101_SiteLocMap.dwg Date: 12/1/2023 Time: 12:15 User: agekas Style Table: Langan.stb Layout: Figure 1 Site Loc

© 2023 Langan

EXPLANATION

LANGAN

LANGAN

-
-
-

Filename: \\langan.com\data\SJO\data1\770633101\Cadd Data - 770633101\D-DesignFiles\Geotechnical\770633101-B-GI0101_SiteLocMap.dwg Date: 11/15/2023 Time: 09:02 User: agekas Style Table: Langan.stb Layout: Figure 6 FaultMap

© 2023 Langan

I Not felt by people, except under especially favorable circumstances. However, dizziness or nausea may be experienced. Sometimes birds and animals are uneasy or disturbed. Trees, structures, liquids, bodies of water may sway gently, and doors may swing very slowly.

II Felt indoors by a few people, especially on upper floors of multi-story buildings, and by sensitive or nervous persons. As in Grade I, birds and animals are disturbed, and trees, structures, liquids and bodies of water may sway. Hanging objects swing,

especially if they are delicately suspended.

III Felt indoors by several people, usually as a rapid vibration that may not be recognized as an earthquake at first. Vibration is similar to that of a light, or lightly loaded trucks, or heavy trucks some distance away. Duration may be estimated in some cases. Movements may be appreciable on upper levels of tall structures. Standing motor cars may rock slightly.

IV Felt indoors by many, outdoors by a few. Awakens a few individuals, particularly light sleepers, but frightens no one except those apprehensive from previous experience. Vibration like that due to passing of heavy, or heavily loaded trucks. Sensation like a heavy body striking building, or the falling of heavy objects inside.

 Dishes, windows and doors rattle; glassware and crockery clink and clash. Walls and house frames creak, especially if intensity is in the upper range of this grade. Hanging objects often swing. Liquids in open vessels are disturbed slightly. Stationary automobiles rock noticeably.

V Felt indoors by practically everyone, outdoors by most people. Direction can often be estimated by those outdoors. Awakens many, or most sleepers. Frightens a few people, with slight excitement; some persons run outdoors.

 Buildings tremble throughout. Dishes and glassware break to some extent. Windows crack in some cases, but not generally. Vases and small or unstable objects overturn in many instances, and a few fall. Hanging objects and doors swing generally or considerably. Pictures knock against walls, or swing out of place. Doors and shutters open or close abruptly. Pendulum clocks stop, or run fast or slow. Small objects move, and furnishings may shift to a slight extent. Small amounts of liquids spill from well-filled open containers. Trees and bushes shake slightly.

VI Felt by everyone, indoors and outdoors. Awakens all sleepers. Frightens many people; general excitement, and some persons run outdoors.

Persons move unsteadily. Trees and bushes shake slightly to moderately. Liguids are set in strong motion. Small bells in churches and schools ring. Poorly built buildings may be damaged. Plaster falls in small amounts. Other plaster cracks somewhat. Many dishes and glasses, and a few windows break. Knickknacks, books and pictures fall. Furniture overturns in many instances. Heavy furnishings move.

VII Frightens everyone. General alarm, and everyone runs outdoors.

 People find it difficult to stand. Persons driving cars notice shaking. Trees and bushes shake moderately to strongly. Waves form on ponds, lakes and streams. Water is muddied. Gravel or sand stream banks cave in. Large church bells ring. Suspended objects quiver. Damage is negligible in buildings of good design and construction; slight to moderate in well-built ordinary buildings; considerable in poorly built or badly designed buildings, adobe houses, old walls (especially where laid up without mortar), spires, etc. Plaster and some stucco fall. Many windows and some furniture break. Loosened brickwork and tiles shake down. Weak chimneys break at the roofline. Cornices fall from towers and high buildings. Bricks and stones are dislodged. Heavy furniture overturns. Concrete irrigation ditches are considerably damaged.

VIII General fright, and alarm approaches panic.

 Persons driving cars are disturbed. Trees shake strongly, and branches and trunks break off (especially palm trees). Sand and mud erupts in small amounts. Flow of springs and wells is temporarily and sometimes permanently changed. Dry wells renew flow. Temperatures of spring and well waters varies. Damage slight in brick structures built especially to withstand earthquakes; considerable in ordinary substantial buildings, with some partial collapse; heavy in some wooden houses, with some tumbling down. Panel walls break away in frame structures. Decayed pilings break off. Walls fall. Solid stone walls crack and break seriously. Wet grounds and steep slopes crack to some extent. Chimneys, columns, monuments and factory stacks and towers twist and fall. Very heavy furniture moves conspicuously or overturns.

IX Panic is general.

 Ground cracks conspicuously. Damage is considerable in masonry structures built especially to withstand earthquakes; great in other masonry buildings - some collapse in large part. Some wood frame houses built especially to withstand earthquakes are thrown out of plumb, others are shifted wholly off foundations. Reservoirs are seriously damaged and underground pipes sometimes break.

X Panic is general.

 Ground, especially when loose and wet, cracks up to widths of several inches; fissures up to a yard in width run parallel to canal and stream banks. Landsliding is considerable from river banks and steep coasts. Sand and mud shifts horizontally on beaches and flat land. Water level changes in wells. Water is thrown on banks of canals, lakes, rivers, etc. Dams, dikes, embankments are seriously damaged. Well-built wooden structures and bridges are severely damaged, and some collapse. Dangerous cracks develop in excellent brick walls. Most masonry and frame structures, and their foundations are destroyed. Railroad rails bend slightly. Pipe lines buried in earth tear apart or are crushed endwise. Open cracks and broad wavy folds open in cement pavements and asphalt road surfaces.

XI Panic is general.

 Disturbances in ground are many and widespread, varying with the ground material. Broad fissures, earth slumps, and land slips develop in soft, wet ground. Water charged with sand and mud is ejected in large amounts. Sea waves of significant magnitude may develop. Damage is severe to wood frame structures, especially near shock centers, great to dams, dikes and embankments, even at long distances. Few if any masonry structures remain standing. Supporting piers or pillars of large, well-built bridges are wrecked. Wooden bridges that "give" are less affected. Railroad rails bend greatly and some thrust endwise. Pipe lines buried in earth are put completely out of service.

XII Panic is general.

 Damage is total, and practically all works of construction are damaged greatly or destroyed. Disturbances in the ground are great and varied, and numerous shearing cracks develop. Landslides, rock falls, and slumps in river banks are numerous and extensive. Large rock masses are wrenched loose and torn off. Fault slips develop in firm rock, and horizontal and vertical offset displacements are notable. Water channels, both surface and underground, are disturbed and modified greatly. Lakes are dammed, new waterfalls are produced, rivers are deflected, etc. Surface waves are seen on ground surfaces. Lines of sight and level are distorted. Objects are thrown upward into the air.

-
-
-
-

Filename: Wangan.com/data/SJO/data1/770633101/Cadd Data - 770633101/2D-DesignFiles/Geotechnical/770633101-B-RW01011_R1.dwg Date: 11/10/2023 Time: 14:55 User: agekas Style Table: Apple LaserWriter 8500.ctb Layout: FIGURE 9

-
-
-
-

Filename: Wangan.com\data\SJO\data1\770633101\Cadd Data - 770633101\2D-DesignFiles\Geotechnical\770633101-B-RW01011_R1.dwg Date: 11/7/2023 Time: 16:51 User: agekas Style Table: Apple LaserWriter 8500.ctb Layout: FIGURE 11

Note:

- .
1. Horizontal pressures calculated based on 1 ksf uniform bearing pressure
1. Horizontal pressures calculated based on 1 ksf uniform bearing pressure 1. Horizontal pr
.from footing. 2. Apply surcharge pressures over a distance of 14 feet from either side of Note:
1. Horizontal pressures calculated based on 1 ksf uniform bearing pressure
1. Horizontal pressures calculated based on 1 ksf uniform bearing pressure
1. Horizontal pressures over a distance of 14 feet from either sid
-

APPENDIX A

BORING LOGS AND LABORATORY TEST RESULTS FROM PREVIOUS INVESTIGATIONS

LANGAN

DEFINITION OF TERMS

RELATIVE DENSITY

*Number of blows of 140 pound hammer falling 30 inches to drive a 2—inch O.D. (1—3/8 inch I.D.) split spoon (ASTM D—1586).
+Unconfined compressive strength in tons/sq.ft. as determined by laboratory testing or approximated

CONSISTENCY

KEY TO EXPLORATORY BORING LOGS Unified Soil Classification System (ASTM D-2487)

 $LB-5$

 $LB-6$

L

 \sim

 $\frac{1}{2}$ $\ddot{}$

 \bar{z}

LB-7

 $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$ ł, $\overline{}$

 \mathbb{L}

l,

 $\bar{\mathbf{r}}$

 \sim

YASS⁽ IE Environmental/Geotechnical/Engineering Services LB-9

 $\bar{\beta}$

 $\ddot{}$

 \overline{a}

 \bar{z}

 \overline{a}

 $\bar{\mathbf{r}}$

 $\ddot{}$

EB-9 259-5E

LB-9

÷

 $\mathord{\hspace{1pt}\text{--}\hspace{1pt}}$ L.

 $\frac{1}{2}$

 $\bar{}$

l,

l,

ä,

 $\ddot{}$

l,

 $\overline{}$

i,

L

 $\ddot{}$

 \mathbb{L}

÷

j,

 $\tilde{\mathbb{C}}$

Ļ

ł.

 \overline{a}

L,

i,

 $\overline{}$ $\overline{}$

 $\frac{1}{2}$

 \sim

J.

 $\frac{1}{2}$.

 $\ddot{}$

Ť,

 $\frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2}$

EB-10

 $\ddot{\cdot}$ $\ddot{}$ $\ddot{}$

EB-11

 $\frac{1}{2}$, $\frac{1}{2}$

 $\frac{1}{2}$

EB-14

 $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$

 ϵ

 $EB-15$

 $\ddot{}$

EB-21

 $\frac{1}{2}$

LA_CORP.GDT_8/20/04 MV* FLI

PLASTICITY CHART AND DATA

LOWNEYASSO® ATES Environmental/Geotechnical/Engineering Services Project: VALLCO Location: CUPERTINO, CA Project No.: 259-5E

2004 Geotechnical Investigation **FIGURE B-1**

PLASTICITY CHART AND DATA

1999 Geotechnical Investigation

FIGURE B-1 $259 - 50$

 \bar{z}

COMPACTION CURVE

VALLCO EXPANSION Cupertino, California

1999 Geotechnical Investigation FIGURE B-2 $259 - 5D$

APPENDIX B - LABORATORY INVESTIGATION

The laboratory testing program was directed toward a quantitative and qualitative evaluation of the physical and mechanical properties of the soils underlying the site.

The natural water content was determined on 83 samples of the materials recovered from the borings; these water contents are recorded on the boring logs at the appropriate sample depths.

Atterberg Limits determinations were performed on three samples of the surface soils at the site to determine the range of water content over which these materials exhibit plasticity. The Atterberg Limits are used to classify the soil in accordance with the Unified Soil Classification System and to indicate the soil's expansion potential. The results of these tests, as well as the results of three tests performed during the previous investigation, are presented on Figure B-1 and on the logs of borings at the appropriate sample depths.

The percent passing the No. 200 sieve was determined on three samples of the surface soils to aid in the classification of these soils, the results of these tests, as well as the results of three tests performed during the previous investigation are presented on Figure B-1 and on the boring logs at the appropriate sample depths.

Dry density determinations were performed on 21 samples of the subsurface soils to evaluate their physical properties. The results of these tests as well as the result of three tests performed during the previous investigation are presented on the boring logs at the appropriate sample depths.

Unconfined compression tests were performed on 18 undisturbed samples of the clayey subsurface soils to evaluate the undrained shear strengths of these materials. The unconfined tests were performed on samples having a diameter of 2.8 inches and a height-to-diameter ratio of at least 2. Failure was taken as the peak normal stress. The results of these tests are presented on the boring logs at the appropriate sample depths.

Resistance "R" value tests were performed on two representative samples of the surface soils at the site to provide data for pavement design. The tests indicated that the expansion pressure controls the design of pavement sections with the "R" values by expansion equal to 4, 12 and 23 for traffic indices of 3.5, 4.5 and 6.0, respectively.

RESULTS OF "R" VALUE TESTS

investigation

Lowney-Haldyeer Rssociates

APPENDIX B

LOGS OF TEST BORINGS

LANGAN

Unstabilized groundwater level
Stabilized groundwater level Stabilized groundwater level Samp
PP = Pocket Penetrometer $\begin{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 0 \end{bmatrix} & 0 \end{bmatrix} & 0 \end{bmatrix}$ Samp

Stabilized groundwa
PP = Pocket Penetr
TV = Torvane
SAMPLER TYPE

C Core barrel

**SAMPLER TYPE
California split-barrel sampler with 2.5-inch outside
diameter and a 1.93-inch inside diameter** CA California split-barrel sampler with 2.5-inch outside
diameter and a 1.93-inch inside diameter
D&M Dames & Moore piston sampler using 2.5-inch outside

alliornia split-barrel sample
diameter and a 1.93-inch
ames & Moore piston sam
diameter, thin-walled tube M Dames & Moore piston sampler using 2.5-inch c
diameter, thin-walled tube
O Osterberg piston sampler using 3.0-inch outside

nes & Moore piston sampler using
iameter, thin-walled tube
erberg piston sampler using 3.0-ir
diameter, thin-walled Shelby tube

Core sample
Analytical laboratory sample

Sample taken with Direct Push or Drive sampler

- PT Pitcher tube sampler using 3.0-inch outside diameter, thin-walled Shelby tube PT Pitcher tube sampler using 3.0-inch outside diameter,
thin-walled Shelby tube
S&H Sprague & Henwood split-barrel sampler with a 3.0-inch
- ر
Trague & Henwood split-barrel sampler with a 3.0
Transide diameter and a 2.43-inch inside diameter S&H Sprague & Henwood split-barrel sampler with a 3.0-inch

outside diameter and a 2.43-inch inside diameter

SPT Standard Penetration Test (SPT) split-barrel sampler with a

2.0-inch outside diameter and a 1.38- or 1.5-in
- 2.0-inch outside diameter and a 1.38- or 1.5-inch inside diameter see report text
- ST Shelby Tube (3.0-inch outside diameter, thin-walled tube) advanced with hydraulic pressure

APPENDIX C

DOWNHOLE SUSPENSION LOGGING

LANGAN

November 3, 2016

Mr. Wilson Wong, Project Engineer **LANGAN** 4030 Moorpark Ave., Suite 210 San Jose, 19117-1845

- Subject: P- and S-Wave Borehole Geophysical Logging Investigation The Hills at Vallco Project 10333 N. Wolf Rd. Cupertino, California NORCAL Job No. NS165088
- Attention: Mr. Wilson Wong

This report summarizes the findings of a borehole geophysical investigation performed by NORCAL Geophysical Consultants, Inc. at the subject site for LANGAN. The investigation was conducted on September 8, 2016 by NORCAL Professional Geophysicist William J. Henrich (PGp No. 893). Mr. Daniel Wagstaffe, Field Engineer of LANGAN provided background information, coordination and on-site logistical support.

The purpose of the borehole geophysical investigation was to measure P- and S-wave velocities within unconsolidated alluvium to a depth of 120 feet below ground surface (bgs). These data will be used by others to help characterize subsurface conditions for a proposed building foundation.

1.0 SCOPE

Geophysical borehole logging was conducted in one borehole labeled as Borehole B-1. The borehole was situated in a parking lot northwest of the intersection of Wolf Road and Stevens Creek Boulevard in Cupertino, California. Geophysical logging methods consisted of Suspension P- and S-wave velocity profiling and caliper logging.

NORCAL Geophysical Consultants, A Terracon Company . 321 Blodgett Street . Cotati, CA 94931 P (707) 796 7170 • F (707) 796 7175 • norcalgeophysical.com • terracon.com

LANGAN November 3, 2016 Page 2

2.0 BOREHOLE CONDITIONS

The borehole was advanced with a 5-inch diameter rotary wash drilling method. The borehole penetrated Recent and Quaternary unsaturated and saturated, unconsolidated clay, silt, sand and gravel deposits. Total depth of the borehole was 140-ft bgs. Borehole stability was good with minor sloughing. A 5-inch diameter steel conductor casing was set to 5-ft bgs to prevent caving from loose, unconsolidated fill.

3.0 GEOPHYSICAL LOGGING DESCRIPTIONS

The borehole geophysical investigation was conducted using a digital Robertson Geologging, Ltd. Model MICROLOGGER2 System. This system consisted of a control console, computer logging tools, and winch. The borehole logging tools consisted of a Suspension P- and S-wave velocity and a mechanical three-arm caliper. Complete descriptions of the methodology, data acquisition, data analysis procedures and results for the Suspension P- and S-wave logging are presented in Appendix A.

Caliper logs are a measure of the borehole diameter versus depth. The tool was used both as a survey technique to assess borehole stability and quantify the relative consolidation of alluvium. The caliper tool consists of three interconnected mechanical arms that are spring loaded against the borehole wall. The horizontal deflections of the arms gauge the borehole diameter in units of inches with depth. The logging measurement was made in the uphole direction at a speed of approximately 18-ft per minute. The data sampling rate for this instrument was every 0.2-ft.

4.0 INTERPRETATION and DISCUSSION

The results of our Suspension P- and S-wave velocity and caliper logging are presented on Plate 1. The caliper log shows that the upper 78 feet of the borehole to be highly eroded. This means the diameter of the borehole has expanded beyond the drill bit diameter. Geologically, this may be a zone that contains layers of loose, poorly consolidated sand and gravel.

The average P-wave velocity (Vp) of the majority of the logged borehole section (36-ft down to 120-bgs) has an average of about 6000 fps. The Vp profile shows a sharp velocity reduction beginning at 34-ft up to 10-ft bgs. This low Vp velocity averages about 4000 fps. We interpreted this reduction to be related to alluvial sediments being unsaturated.

The S-wave profile shows that from 10-ft to 26-ft bgs, the alluvium has an S-wave velocity (Vs) that averages 1000 fps. From 26-ft to 72-ft bgs, the Vs ranges from 1000 to 2000 fps. These Vs variations in profile show distinctive peaks (high velocity) and troughs (low velocities). These

LANGAN November 3, 2016 Page 3

peaks and troughs are probably related to sedimentary layers with the high Vs related to sand and gravel mixtures: the low Vs related to silt and clays. Below 72-ft bgs, the Vs velocities oscillated around an average Vs of 2000 fps. These oscillations probably relate to relatively thin alternating layers of sand/gravel and silty sand.

5.0 STANDARD CARE

The scope of NORCAL's services for this project consisted of using geophysical logging techniques to measure P- and S-wave velocities. The accuracy of our findings is subject to specific site conditions and limitations inherent to the techniques used. We performed our services in a manner consistent with the level of skill ordinarily exercised by members of the profession currently employing similar methods. No warranty, with respect to the performance of services or products delivered under this agreement, expressed or implied, is made by NORCAL.

We appreciate the opportunity to provide our services to LANGAN for this project. If you have any questions, or require additional geophysical services, please do not hesitate to call on us.

Sincerely,

NORCAL Geophysical Consultants, Inc.

William J. Henrich PGp Professional Geophysicist-893

Enclosures: Plate 1: Suspension P- and S-wave Velocity Profile, Borehole B-1 Appendix A: P- and S-Wave Suspension Velocity Survey

NORCAL SUSPENSION VELOCITY TABLE FOR BOREHOLE B-1 at Hills at Vallco Project, Wolfe Road, Cupertino, CA

Vs & Vp Interval Velocities

see red triangle & blue squares

on Plate 1

COLUMN HEADER LEGEND

 $\bar{\chi} \bar{\chi}$

DIRECT TRAVEL VELOCITIES:

 \sim

OFF SET DEPTH MEASUREMENT POINT:
Near Detector Depth reference for source to near detector velocity value; mid-point Far Detector Depth reference for source to far detector velocity value, mid-point

Appendix A:

P- and S-WAVE SUSPENSION VELOCITY SURVEY

APPENDIX A

P and S-WAVE SUSPENSION VELOCITY SURVEY

The Suspension logger is a highly specialized downhole tool that measures P- and S-wave velocities at discrete depths. The following presents a narrative on its operation and the data reduction procedures we use in analyzing the data. Also presented are the velocity profiles and tabulated velocity data acquired in Borehole B-1.

METHODOLOGY

We measured downhole compressional (P-) and shear (S-) wave velocities using a Robertson Geologging, Ltd. digital suspension logging system. A schematic diagram depicting the probe configuration and equipment attachment is shown in Figure 1. The suspension logging tool is equipped with a dipole seismic energy source located near the base of the probe and a pair of geophones (detectors R-1 and R-2) located within the middle to the upper sections of the probe. The distance from the energy source to the first (near detector) geophone was 7.04, feet (2.14 meters) when assembled with a detachable 1-meter isolation tube. The in-line distance between the geophone pair was 3.28-feet (1.0 meter). Each geophone contains one horizontal and one vertical oriented element. The horizontal geophone elements preferentially record shear wave motion. The vertical geophone elements record first arriving P-wave energy.

Suspension seismic data are collected at discrete depths in the fluid-filled portion of the borehole. At each measurement depth, the energy source is activated via commands from the surface control console. This activation causes a metal solenoid to strike a plate (anvil) mounted inside the probe housing. This energy transmits through the fluid to the borehole wall which produces a seismic wave ("flexure") in the adjacent formation. As this wave propagates radially into the formation a physical interaction between the seismic wave and the borehole wall creates tube waves together with a refracted compressional P-wave that travels up the borehole to the two recording geophones.

When assembled with a 1-meter isolation tube, the suspension logging tool measures approximately 20-ft in length (Figure 1). The measuring point of the tool is taken at the center of the pair of receiver geophones. This measuring point is approximately 12-ft from the probe tip. Therefore, the maximum depth of a suspension logging survey given a non-sloughing borehole will always be reported as 12 feet less than the total depth of the borehole.

Drawing not to scale

SURVEY CONDITIONS AND DATA ACQUISITION PROCEDURES

We measured seismic suspension velocities at stationary 1.0 to 2.0-ft measurement intervals. The finer interval spacing being taken across alluvial layers in some cases. The survey began near the bottom of the borehole (PS- measuring point at approximately 120-ft bgs and proceeded upward to 10-ft bgs. At each measurement station, we cycled the energy source to fire 2 times in succession into each of the geophone elements. This cycling stacks the seismic energy resulting in an improved signal-to-noise ratio. We also recorded S-wave data using a 600 KHz low pass filter. This filtering reduces high frequency interference from the onset of earlier arriving P-wave energy on the S-wave channels. We recorded P-wave waveforms using a 20 KHz low pass filter.

DATA ANALYSIS

Suspension P- and S-wave velocities were calculated with the interpretation computer software programs PSLogger Application Version 1.121 and PSLOG Analysis Version 1.0.001 both published by Robertson Geologging, Ltd. (2009). Example suspension waveform records from Borehole B-1 at a depth of 79.88-ft below ground is presented in Figure 2. This suspension waveform records show six detector (geophone) traces. The upper four waveform traces are related to S-wave velocity arrival time measurements determined at the "far" (srf and slf) and "near" (srn and sln) horizontal detectors; the lower two waveform traces are related to P-wave velocity arrival time measurements determined at the far and near vertical detectors. The far and near detector labels refer to the relative in-line distances of the geophone detectors to the energy source.

Referring to the P- and S-wave suspension record in Figure 2, the red traces (cycle 1) are created by a right strikes or impacts of the dipole source (anvil) to the probe housing (srf and srn); the green traces (cycle 2) are created from left strikes (slf and sln) of the dipole source. By superimposing and pairing the respective left and right strike waveform traces, phase reversals associated with the arrival times of the S-wave energy can be identified. These arrival times are presented as open dots on the waveform plot. P-wave records are associated with the lower two waveform traces (blue color). With P-wave energy, the direction of the dipole strike can be in either direction but requires another recording cycle. P-wave arrival times are determined by noting the first breaks on the set of near and far detector traces. Interpreted arrival times are shown as open dots on the waveforms at a position corresponding to the onset of the first break (either up or down). Note that at a minimum, a complete suspension waveform record requires at least three recording cycles.

A**lerracon** COMPANY

Figure 2 Example Waveform Record from B-1, Depth 79.88-ft bgs

All suspension waveform records were analyzed for P- and S-wave arrival times in this manner

P- and S-WAVE VELOCITY TABLE

The suspension interpretation program (PSLOG Analysis) computes interval seismic P- and Swave velocities in meters per second. Interval velocities are calculated by dividing the detector spacing (Far distance minus the near detector distance $= 1$ meter) by the difference in interpreted arrival times in microseconds at the two detectors. Note, that two separate interval S-wave velocities (created from the dipole source striking left then right) are calculated at each measurement depth. In the attached table at the end of this appendix, these are tabulated as Vs left and Vs right. These two interval Vs velocities are then averaged (Vs Ave) in a separate column for each measurement station. We export these velocity data and arrival times to **EXCEL** (Microsoft Corporation) computer program to create a spreadsheet that lists the various interval velocities and measurement depths.

Within the spreadsheet we converted P- and S-wave interval velocities in meters/sec to feet per second. These two columns, *VsAve (fps)* and *Vp (fps)* appear shaded on the following spread sheet. For comparison purposes we also computed what we refer to as Direct Velocities for each wave type at the near and far detectors. These are calculated as the in-line distance between the dipole source and respective detectors divided by interpreted arrival times. The Direct Velocities and are labeled as Vs Ave Near, Vs Ave Far, Vp Near and Vp Far in the column headers. Note, these direct velocities have measuring points that are midway between the source and two respective detectors. The direct velocities are actually a few feet lower than the interval velocity measurement depth though these are presented along the same row as the interval velocity measurement depth.

The purpose of deriving direct velocities is to generally compare these to the interval velocities. If there were significant differences we would have reexamined interpretation of arrival times and produced different results. In this survey the Interval and Direct Velocities are comparable in general. Variations in Interval versus Direct velocity measurements are due to averaging direct velocities over a larger cross-section than the interval velocities, thin layer effects within the alluvial sediments and borehole diameter variations (see Borehole Diameter on Plate 1). The two latter effects are geometric as these can slightly alter the phase or scatter seismic signals causing differences observed in direct versus interval velocities along some sections within this borehole.

APPENDIX D

LABORATORY DATA

LANGAN

[©] 2023 Langan 2023 Langar

© 2023 Langan

2023 Langan

© 2023 Langan 3 Langan 023

Filename: \\langan.com\data-X**OOUNTY**
SJO\data1\770633101\Cadd Data - 770633101\2D-DesignFiles\Geotechnical\770633101-B--GI0101_Lab.dwg Date: 11/15/2023 Time: 11:18 User: agekas Style Table: Langan.stb Layout: R-VALUE_1
SJ

T: 408.283.3600 F: 408.283.3601 www.langan.com

APPENDIX E

CONE PENETRATION TESTS

Filename: \\langan.com\data\SJO\data1\770633101\Cadd Data - 770633101\2D-DesignFiles\Geotechnical\770633101-B--GI0101_Lab.dwg Date: 11/15/2023 Time: 11:39 User: agekas Style Table: Langan.stb Layout: CPT-1

Filename: \\langan.com\data\SJO\data1\770633101\Cadd Data - 770633101\2D-DesignFiles\Geotechnical\770633101-B--GI0101_Lab.dwg Date: 11/15/2023 Time: 11:43 User: agekas Style Table: Langan.stb Layout: CPT-2

© 2023 Langan

Filename: \\langan.com\data\SJO\data1\770633101\Cadd Data - 770633101\2D-DesignFiles\Geotechnical\770633101-B--GI0101_Lab.dwg Date: 11/15/2023 Time: 11:48 User: agekas Style Table: Langan.stb Layout: CPT-3

Filename: \\langan.com\data\SJO\data1\770633101\Cadd Data - 770633101\2D-DesignFiles\Geotechnical\770633101-B--GI0101_Lab.dwg Date: 11/15/2023 Time: 11:58 User: agekas Style Table: Langan.stb Layout: CPT-4

Filename: \\langan.com\data\SJO\data1\770633101\Cadd Data - 770633101\2D-DesignFiles\Geotechnical\770633101-B--GI0101_Lab.dwg Date: 11/15/2023 Time: 12:04 User: agekas Style Table: Langan.stb Layout: CPT-5

© 2023 Langan

© 2023 Langan

Langan 2023 **APPENDIX F**

SOIL CORROSIVITY EVALUATION AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CORROSION CONTROL

2 May, 2018

Revised Job No. 1609167 Cust. No. 12242

1100 Willow Pass Court, Suite A Concord, CA 94520-1006 925 462 2771 Fax. 925 462 2775 www.cercoanalytical.com

Mr. Wilson Wong Langan Treadwell Rollo 4030 Moorpark Avenue, Suite 210 San Jose, CA 95117

Subject: Project No.: 770633101.700.340 Project Name: Vallco Town Center Corrosivity Analysis - ASTM Test Methods

Dear Mr. Wong:

Pursuant to your request, CERCO Analytical has analyzed the soil samples submitted on September 21, 2016. Based on the analytical results, a brief evaluation is enclosed for your consideration.

Based upon the resistivity measurements, samples 001 & 003 are classified as "corrosive" and sample 002 is classified as "moderately corrosive". All buried iron, steel, cast iron, ductile iron, galvanized steel and dielectric coated steel or iron should be properly protected against corrosion depending upon the critical nature of the structure. All buried metallic pressure piping such as ductile iron firewater pipelines should be protected against corrosion.

The chloride ion concentrations range from none detected to 32 mg/kg. Because the chloride ion concentrations are less than 300 mg/kg, they are determined to be insufficient to attack steel embedded in a concrete mortar coating.

The sulfate ion concentrations range from none detected to 210 mg/kg and are determined to be sufficient to potentially be detrimental to reinforced concrete structures and cement mortar-coated steel at these locations. Therefore, concrete that comes into contact with this soil should use sulfate resistant cement such as Type II, with a maximum water-to-cement ratio of 0.55.

The pH of the soils range from 7.56 to 7.95, which does not present corrosion problems for buried iron, steel, mortar-coated steel and reinforced concrete structures.

The redox potentials are 350-mV which is indicative of potentially "slightly corrosive" soils resulting from anaerobic soil conditions.

This corrosivity evaluation is based on general corrosion engineering standards and is non-specific in nature. For specific long-term corrosion control design recommendations or consultation, please call JDH Corrosion Consultants, Inc. at (925) 927-6630.

Very truly yours, CÉRCO ANALYTICAL. J. Darby Howard, J., P.E.

President

JDH/jdl Enclosure.

Client: Langan Treadwell Rollo Client's Project No.: 770633101.700.340 Client's Project Name: Vallco Town Center Date Sampled: 14-Sep-16 Date Received: 21-Sep-16 Soil Matrix: Signed Chain of Custody Authorization:

Canalytical 1100 Willow Pass Court, Suite A Concord, CA 94520-1006 925 462 2771 Fax. 925 462 2775 www.cercoanalytical.com

2-May-2018

Revised

Date of Report:

Marlinh /8.

* Results Reported on "As Received" Basis

N.D. - None Detected

Cheryl McMillen/

Laboratory Director

Quality Control Summary - All laboratory quality control parameters were found to be within established limits

APPENDIX G

SITE-SPECIFIC GROUND MOTIONS FOR PREVIOUS DEVELOPMENT SCHEME

APPENDIX G SITE-SPECIFIC RESPONSE SPECTRA FOR PREVIOUS DEVELOPMENT SCHEME

This appendix presents the details of our estimation of the level of ground shaking at the site during future earthquakes. To develop site-specific response spectra in accordance with 2016 California Building Code (CBC) criteria, and by reference ASCE 7-10, we performed probabilistic seismic hazard analysis (PSHA) and deterministic seismic hazard analysis to develop smooth, site-specific horizontal spectra for two levels of shaking, namely:

- Risk Targeted Maximum Considered Earthquake (MCE_R), which corresponds to the lesser of two percent probability of exceedance in 50 years (2,475-year return period) or $84th$ percentile of the controlling deterministic event both considering the maximum direction as described in ASCE 7-10.
- Design Earthquake (DE) which corresponds to $2/3$ of the MCE_R.

G1.0 PROBABILISTIC SEISMIC HAZARD ANALYSIS

Because the location, recurrence interval, and magnitude of future earthquakes are uncertain, we performed a PSHA, which systematically accounts for these uncertainties. The results of a PSHA define a uniform hazard for a site in terms of a probability that a particular level of shaking will be exceeded during the given life of the structure.

To perform a PSHA, information regarding the seismicity, location, and geometry of each source, along with empirical relationships that describe the rate of attenuation of strong ground motion with increasing distance from the source, are needed. The assumptions necessary to perform the PSHA are that:

- the geology and seismic tectonic history of the region are sufficiently known, such that the rate of occurrence of earthquakes can be modeled by historic or geologic data;
- the level of ground motion at a particular site can be expressed by an attenuation relationship that is primarily dependent upon earthquake magnitude and distance from the source of the earthquake;
- the earthquake occurrence can be modeled as a Poisson process with a constant mean occurrence rate.

As part of the development of the site-specific spectra, we performed a PSHA to develop a sitespecific response spectrum for 2 percent probability of exceedance in 50 years. The spectrum for this hazard level was developed using the computer code EZFRISK 8.06 (Risk Engineering 2019). The approach used in EZFRISK is based on the probabilistic seismic hazard model developed by Cornell (1968) and McGuire (1976). Our analysis modeled the faults in the Bay Area as linear sources, and earthquake activities were assigned to the faults based on historical and geologic data. The levels of shaking were estimated using Next Generation Attenuation West 2 (NGA – West2) relationships that are primarily dependent upon the magnitude of the earthquake and the distance from the site to the fault.

G1.1 Probabilistic Model

In probabilistic models, the occurrence of earthquake epicenters on a given fault is assumed to be uniformly distributed along the fault. This model considers ground motions arising from the portion of the fault rupture closest to the site rather than from the epicenter. Fault rupture lengths were modeled using fault rupture length-magnitude relationships given by Wells and Coppersmith (1994).

The probability of exceedance, $P_e(Z)$, at a given ground-motion, Z, at the site within a specified time period, T, is given as:

$$
\mathsf{P}_{\mathrm{e}}(Z)\,=\,1\,\text{-}\,\mathrm{e}^{\text{-V(z)}\mathsf{T}}
$$

where V(z) is the mean annual rate of exceedance of ground motion level Z. V(z) can be calculated using the total-probability theorem.

$$
V(z) = \sum_i v_i \iint P[Z > z \mid m, r] f_{M_i}(m) f_{R_i|M_i}(r; m) dr dm
$$

where:

 v_i = the annual rate of earthquakes with magnitudes greater than a threshold M_{oi} in source i

 P [Z > z | m,r] = probability that an earthquake of magnitude m at distance r produces ground motion amplitude Z higher than z

 f_{Mi} (m) and f_{RiMi} (r;m) = probability density functions for magnitude and distance

Z represents peak ground acceleration, or spectral acceleration values for a given frequency of vibration. The peak accelerations are assumed to be log-normally distributed about the mean with a standard error that is dependent upon the magnitude and attenuation relationship used.

G1.2 Source Modeling and Characterization

The segmentation of faults, mean characteristic magnitudes, and recurrence rates were modeled using the data presented in the WGCEP (2008) and Cao et al. (2003) reports. We also included the combination of fault segments and their associated magnitudes and recurrence rates as described in the WGCEP (2008) in our seismic hazard model. Table G-1 presents the distance and direction from the site to the fault, mean characteristic magnitude, mean slip rate, and fault length for individual fault segments. We used the California fault database identified as "USGS 2014 Lower 48 v0.1" in EZFRISK 8.06. Each segment is characterized with multiple magnitudes, occurrence or slip rates and weights. This approach takes into account the epistemic uncertainty associated with the various seismic sources in our model.

	Approx. Distance from fault	Direction	Mean Characteristic Moment	Mean Slip Rate	Approx. Fault Length
Fault Segment	(km)	from Site	Magnitude	(mm/yr)	(km)
Monte Vista-Shannon	4.8	Southwest	6.50	0.4	45
N. San Andreas; SAN+SAP	10.6	Southwest	7.73	22	274
N. San Andreas; SAN+SAP+SAS	10.6	Southwest	7.87	21	336
N. San Andreas; SAO+SAN+SAP	10.6	Southwest	7.95	22	410
N. San Andreas; SAO+SAN+SAP+SAS	10.6	Southwest	8.05	22	472
N. San Andreas; SAP	10.6	Southwest	7.23	17	85
N. San Andreas; SAP+SAS	10.6	Southwest	7.48	17	147
N. San Andreas; SAS	17	South	7.12	17	62
Hayward-Rodgers Creek; HN+HS	20	Northeast	7.00	$\overline{9}$	87
Hayward-Rodgers Creek; HS	20	Northeast	6.78	9	52
Hayward-Rodgers Creek; RC+HN+HS	20	Northeast	7.33	9	150
Calaveras; CC	22	Northeast	6.39	15	59
Calaveras; CC+CS	22	Northeast	6.50	15	78
Calaveras; CN	22	Northeast	6.87	6	45
Calaveras; CN+CC	22	Northeast	7.00	11	104
Calaveras; CN+CC+CS	22	Northeast	7.03	12	123
Zayante-Vergeles	27	South	7.00	0.1	58
San Gregorio Connected	33	West	7.50	5.5	176
Greenville Connected	46	East	7.00	$\overline{2}$	50
Monterey Bay-Tularcitos	46	South	7.30	0.5	83
Mount Diablo Thrust	48	Northeast	6.70	$\overline{2}$	25
Hayward-Rodgers Creek; HN	58	North	6.60	9	35
Hayward-Rodgers Creek; RC+HN	58	North	7.19	$\overline{9}$	97
Calaveras; CS	61	Southeast	5.83	15	19
Great Valley 7	63	Northeast	6.90	1.5	45

TABLE G-1 Source Zone Parameters

G1.3 Attenuation Relationships

Pacific Earthquake Engineering Research Center (PEER) embarked on a project to enhance the Next Generation Attenuation for the Western United States, the NGA-West 2 project. We used the relationships by Abrahamson et al. (2014), Boore et al. (2014), Campbell and Bozorgnia (2014) and Chiou and Youngs (2014). These attenuation relationships include the average shear wave velocity in the upper 100 feet. Furthermore, these relationships were developed using the same database and each relationship is considered equally credible. Therefore, the average of the relationships was used to develop the recommended spectra.

The NGA-West 2 relationships were developed for the orientation-independent geometric mean of the data. Geometric mean is defined as the square root of the product of the two recorded components.

As part of our field exploration, we performed down hole suspension logging to estimate the shear wave velocity of the soil beneath the proposed basement. On the basis of the shear wave velocity measurements, we estimate an average shear wave velocity of the upper 30 meters (100 ft), V_{s30} , of approximately 1,670 feet per second (510 meters per second) as such, the site is classified as a very dense profile, site class C. The NGA-West 2 flat files indicate $Z_{1.0}$ and $Z_{2.5}$ are 530 meters and 2.6 kilometers, respectively.

G2.0 PSHA RESULTS

Figures G-1 presents results of the PSHA for 2 percent probability of exceedance in 50 years, 2,475 return period, using the four relationships discussed above. The average of these relationships is also presented.

ASCE 7-10 specifies the development of MCE_R site-specific response spectra in the maximum direction. Shahi and Baker (2014) provide scaling factors that modify the geometric mean spectra to provide spectral values for the maximum response (maximum direction). We used the scaling factors presented in Table 1 of Shahi and Baker (2014) ratios $Sa_{RotD100}/Sa_{RotD50}$ to modify the average of the PSHA results. The maximum direction spectrum is also shown on Figure G-1.

Figure G-2 presents the deaggregation plots of the PSHA results for the 2 percent probability of exceedance in 50 years hazard level. From the examination of these results, it can be seen that the Monte Vista Shannon and San Andreas faults dominate the hazard at the project site at different periods of interest.

G3.0 DETERMINISTIC ANALYSIS

We performed a deterministic analysis to develop the MCE_R spectrum at the site. In a deterministic analysis, a given magnitude earthquake occurring at a certain distance from the source is considered as input into an appropriate ground motion attenuation relationship. On the basis of the deaggregation results we developed deterministic spectra for both scenarios earthquakes:

- a moment magnitude 6.5 earthquake on the Monte Vista Shannon fault occurring 4.8 km from the site;
- a moment magnitude 8.0 earthquake on the San Andreas fault occurring 10.6 km from the site.

The deterministic MCE spectrum was defined as an envelope of both scenario earthquakes. This is consistent with the deaggregation results discussed in Section G2.0.

The same attenuation relationships as discussed in Section G1.3 were used in our deterministic analysis. Figures G-3 and G-4 presents the 84th percentile deterministic results for the San Andreas and Monte Vista scenarios, respectively. The average of the four relationships is also presented on those figures. Similarly, to the PSHA results, we developed the 84th percentile deterministic spectrum in the maximum direction using the Shahi and Baker (2014) ratios.

Figure G-5 presents the average of the $84th$ percentile deterministic results in the maximum direction for both scenarios as well as the recommended envelop of both scenarios.

G4.0 RECOMMENDED SPECTRA

The MCE_R as defined in ASCE 7-10 is the lesser of the maximum direction PSHA spectrum having a two percent probability of exceedance in 50 years (2,475-year return period) or the maximum direction 84th percentile deterministic spectrum of the governing earthquake scenario and the DE spectrum is defined as $2/3$ times the MCE_R spectrum. Furthermore, the MCE_R spectrum is defined as risk targeted response spectrum which corresponds to a targeted collapse probability of one percent in 50 years. According to USGS website the risk coefficients vary from 0.88 to 0.96. We used these risk coefficients to develop the Risk-Targeted PSHA response spectrum.

Furthermore, we followed the procedures outlined in Chapter 21 of ASCE 7-10 to develop the site-specific spectra for MCE_R and DE. Chapter 21 of ASCE 7-10 requires the following checks:

- the deterministic spectrum used to develop the MCE_R shall not fall below the Deterministic Lower Limit spectrum as shown on Figure 21.2-1 of ASCE 7-10 for site class C;
- the DE spectrum shall not fall below 80 percent of general design spectrum (Section 21.3) of Chapter 21 ASCE 7-10).

Figure G-6 and Table G-2 present a comparison of the site-specific spectra for the PSHA 2,475-year return period (max. dir.), the 84th percentile deterministic (max. dir.), and the Deterministic Lower Limit spectra for Site Class C per ASCE 7-10. We included the risk coefficients as discussed above in the Risk-Targeted PSHA spectrum. The deterministic 84th percentile spectrum is greater than the Deterministic Lower Limit spectrum; hence the MCE_R is defined as the lesser of the 84th percentile deterministic and the PSHA 2,475-year return spectra. The recommended MCE_R spectrum is presented on Figure G-4 and in Table G-2.

TABLE G-2

Comparison of Site-specific and Code Spectra for Development of MCE^R Spectrum per ASCE 7-10 S^a (g) for 5 percent damping

Table G-3 presents the development of recommended DE spectrum following the procedures outlined in Chapter 21 of ASCE 7-10. The DE is defined as $2/3$ of the MCE_R per ASCE 7-10; however, the recommended DE may not be below 80 percent of the general spectrum at any period (ASCE 7-10 Section 21.3). Figure G-6 and Table G-3 presents a comparison of 2/3 of the MCE_R spectrum and 80 percent of the general spectrum for Site Class C. As shown in Table G-3 and Figure G-6, 80 percent of the general spectrum is lower than $2/3$ of the MCE_R spectrum. Therefore, we recommend that $2/3$ of the MCE_R spectrum be used to develop the DE spectrum. The recommended DE spectrum is shown on Figure G-6.

TABLE G-3

Comparison of Site-specific and Code Spectra for Development of DE Spectrum per ASCE 7-10 S^a (g) for 5 percent damping

The recommended MCE_R and DE spectra in the maximum direction are presented on Figure G-7 along with a comparison of the general spectrum for site class C and digitized values of the recommended spectra are presented in Table G-4 for a damping ratio of 5 percent.

TABLE G-4 Recommended Spectra S^a (g) for 5 percent Damping

Because site-specific procedure was used to determine the recommended MCE_R and DE response spectra, the corresponding values of S_{MS} , S_{M1} , S_{DS} and S_{D1} per Section 21.4 of ASCE 7-10 should be used as shown in Table G-5.

TABLE G-5

 $*$ S_{M1} and S_{D1} are based on the site-specific response spectra and are governed by the spectral acceleration at a period of two seconds.

DISTRIBUTION

2 copies: Mr. Nandy Kumar Vallco Property Owner, LLC 10123 North Wolfe Road Cupertino, California 95014

QUALITY CONTROL REVIEWER

Wilson Wong, GE #3103 Senior Project Engineer