



August 25, 2023

G-4638

Mr. Farzad Ghazvinian  
Millad Homes  
7683 SE 27<sup>th</sup> St, #178  
Mercer Island, WA 98040  
Also via email: newhomes@millad.net

**Subject:       ADDENDUM LETTER 14  
                  PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT – UPPER BUILDING  
                  4276 EAST MERCER WAY  
                  MERCER ISLAND, WA**

References: See End of Letter

Dear Mr. Ghazvinian:

We were asked in an email from August 23, 2023 to opine on the use of geofoam at slab support areas within the backfill zone for the upper building foundation/stem retaining walls at the subject site. It is understood that the intention is to limit the amount of fill needed for import and potentially also minimize the need for temporary bracing at the slab-restrained concrete retaining walls. We have prepared the following letter to provide an addendum to the referenced geotechnical report and addenda.

### **Introduction**

From review of the approved building plans, we understand relatively large slab-restrained conventional retaining walls are proposed at the downhill sides of the building, including at the pipe pile supported garage foundation/stem walls. Current planning is for these walls to be temporarily restrained with bracing until the slab can provide restraint at the top of the retaining walls. These walls are to have drainage mat at the backside of the walls and footing drains at the base.

In an email dated August 23, 2023 your structural engineer, Mr. Javid Abdi, suggested the use of EPS15 geofoam having a unit weight of 0.9 pcf and compressive strength of 10.2 psi for the backfill behind the retaining walls and support below the slab-on-grade floors.

Based upon discussion with you we understand that the wall geofoam backfill will extend from the back side of the wall beyond a 1H:1V plane projected upward from the base of the wall footing.

### Conclusions and Recommendations

Geofoam is acceptable for use as structural fill below the slabs and behind retaining walls provided that the drainage mat and footing drain remains. At any location, such as the garage, where there is a potential for fuel spills, we recommend that the geofoam is properly protected via the use of a PVC liner.

For the proposed configuration noted above we anticipate that the designer may assume a uniform lateral load equal to 5 psf imparted to the wall from the geofoam backfill. Accordingly, there is expected to be savings related to reinforcement and concrete wall width, if the walls are re-designed. And of course, the need for temporary bracing is not likely to be necessary, subject to the structural engineer's design.

Pea gravel or free-draining sand filler may be placed at minor (< 1-inch wide) gaps between geofoam blocks.

We appreciate the opportunity to provide geotechnical consulting regarding the proposed development. Please contact us if there are any questions or concerns.

Sincerely,  
GEO GROUP NORTHWEST, INC.



Adam Gaston  
Project Engineer



William Chang, P.E.  
Principal

8-25-2023

## REFERENCES

- “Addendum Letter 13, Proposed Development – Upper Building, 4276 East Mercer way, Mercer Island, WA”, GEO Group Northwest, November 22, 2021.
- “Addendum Letter 12, Proposed Development – Lower Building, 4270 East Mercer way, Mercer Island, WA”, GEO Group Northwest, November 8, 2021.
- “Addendum Letter 11, Proposed Development – Upper Building, 4276 East Mercer Way, Mercer Island, WA”, GEO Group Northwest, November 3, 2021.
- “Addendum Letter #10 With Plan Review Statement, Proposed Development – Upper Building, 4276 East Mercer Way, Mercer Island, WA”, GEO Group Northwest, Sept. 2, 2021.
- “Addendum Letter 9, Proposed Development – Upper Building, 4276 East Mercer Way, Mercer Island, WA”, GEO Group Northwest, July 22, 2021.
- “Addendum Letter 8, Proposed Development – Lower Building, 4270 East Mercer Way, Mercer Island, WA”, GEO Group Northwest, May 21, 2021.
- “Addendum Letter 7, Proposed Development – Upper Building, 4270 East Mercer Way, Mercer Island, WA”, GEO Group Northwest, Mar. 3, 2021.
- “Addendum Letter 6 – Response to Plan Review Comments, Proposed Development – Lower Building, 4270 East Mercer Way, Mercer Island, WA”, GEO Group Northwest, Nov. 13, 2020.
- “Addendum Letter 5 - Response to Plan Review Comments, Proposed Development - Lower Building, 4270 East Mercer Way, Mercer Island, WA”, GEO Group Northwest, June 9, 2020.
- “Addendum Letter #4, Lower Building Development, 4270 East Mercer Way, Mercer Island, WA”, GEO Group Northwest, Nov. 4, 2019.
- “Addendum Letter – Response to Sept. 4, 2019 Review, Proposed Development, 4270 East Mercer Way, Mercer Island, WA”, GEO Group Northwest, Oct. 18, 2019.
- “Addendum Letter – Response to 3<sup>rd</sup> Party Review, Proposed Development, 4270 East Mercer Way, Mercer Island, WA”, GEO Group Northwest, Aug. 16, 2019.
- “Addendum Letter, Proposed Development, 4270 East Mercer Way, Mercer Island, WA”, GEO Group Northwest, December 27, 2018.
- “Geotechnical Report, Proposed Development, 4270 East Mercer Way, Mercer Island, Washington”, GEO Group Northwest, July 13, 2018.

## Typical Tested Physical Properties of InsulFoam Geofoam\*

| Type - ASTM D6817                                     | Units                                   | EPS12       | EPS15       | EPS19       | EPS22       | EPS29       | EPS39        | EPS46        |
|---|---|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|
| <b>Density</b> (nomical pcf)                          | lb/ft <sup>3</sup> (kg/m <sup>3</sup> ) | 0.70 (11.2) | 0.90 (14.4) | 1.14 (18.4) | 1.35 (21.6) | 1.80 (28.8) | 2.40 (38.4)  | 2.85 (45.7)  |
| Compressive Resistance **<br>min. @ 1% deformation    | psi (kPa)                               | 2.2 (15)    | 3.6 (25)    | 5.8 (40)    | 7.3 (50)    | 10.9 (75)   | 15.0 (103)   | 18.6 (128)   |
| Compressive Resistance **<br>min. @ 5% deformation    | psi (kPa)                               | 5.1 (35)    | 8.0 (55)    | 13.1 (90)   | 16.7 (115)  | 24.7 (170)  | 35.0 (241)   | 43.5 (300)   |
| <b>Compressive Strength</b><br>(psi, 10% deformation) | psi (kPa)                               | 5.8 (40)    | 10.2 (70)   | 16.0 (110)  | 19.6 (135)  | 29.0 (200)  | 40.0 (276)   | 50.0 (345)   |
| <b>Flexural Strength</b> (min. psi)                   | psi (kPa)                               | 10.0 (69)   | 25.0 (172)  | 30.0 (207)  | 40.0 (276)  | 50.0 (345)  | 60.0 (414)   | 75.0 (517)   |
| <b>Oxygen Index, min.</b>                             | Volume %                                | 24.0        | 24.0        | 24.0        | 24.0        | 24.0        | 24.0         | 24.0         |
| <b>Dimensional Stability</b>                          | max. %                                  | < 2%        | < 2%        | < 2%        | < 2%        | < 2%        | < 2%         | < 2%         |
| <b>Buoyancy Force</b>                                 | lb/ft <sup>3</sup> (kg/m <sup>3</sup> ) | 61.7 (990)  | 61.5 (980)  | 61.3 (980)  | 61.1 (980)  | 60.6 (970)  | 60.0 (960)   | 59.5 (950)   |
| <b>Poisson's Ratio</b>                                | --                                      | .05         | .05         | .05         | .05         | .05         | .05          | .05          |
| <b>Coefficient of Friction</b>                        | --                                      | .6          | .6          | .6          | .6          | .6          | .6           | .6           |
| <b>Absorption</b>                                     | Volume %                                | < 4.0       | < 4.0       | < 4.0       | < 4.0       | < 4.0       | < 4.0        | < 4.0        |
| <b>Elastic Modulus, min.</b>                          | psi (kPa)                               | 220 (1500)  | 360 (2500)  | 580 (4000)  | 730 (5000)  | 1090 (7500) | 1500 (10300) | 1860 (12800) |

\*Properties are based on data provided by resin manufacturers, independent test agencies and Insulfoam.

\*\* For InsulFoam GF applications the design load stresses should not exceed 1% strain for combined live and dead loads.