

August 1, 2019 File No. 07-073-100

Mr. Edward Knopf 9507 SE 43rd Street Mercer Island, WA 98040

Subject: Slope Stabilization 9507 SE 43rd Street Mercer Island WA

Dear Mr. Knopf,

Attached is our calculation package for the proposed TECCO G65/3 slope stabilization system which will be used to stabilize a section of the hillside above your house that was involved in debris flow landslides in 1982 and most recently in 2017 resulting from excessive rainfall during winter storms saturating the steep uphill slopes of adjacent property owners which resulted in debris flows which descended onto your property. This report discusses stabilizing the easternmost landslide with Tecco mesh and soil anchors. In our opinion, the flatter slopes below the westernmost slide can be stabilized with plantings of native shrubs and trees. The following discusses the basis of design for the Tecco stabilization system, the stability of the hillside in areas that did not slide, and rehabilitation of the debris chute area below the westernmost slide

We appreciate the opportunity to work on this project. Please call if there are any questions.

Sincerely,

Wir and Car

W. Paul Grant, P.E. Principal Geotechnical Engineer

Encl.: Calculation Package Design Plans

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	1
2.0	SUBSURFACE CONDITIONS	1
3.0	STABILIZATION SYSTEM RECOMMENDATIONS	2
3.	1 TECCO MESH SLOPE STABILIZATION	2
	3.1.1 Subsurface Design Parameters	
	3.1.2 Wire Mesh and Spike Plates	
	3.1.3 Ground Anchors	
	3.1.4 Design Method	
	3.1.5 Results	
3.2	2 SLOPE STABILITY ANALYSES	
3.3	3 Slope Plantings	
4.0	LIMITATIONS	4
4.0 F	REFERENCES	6

LIST OF FIGURES

- Figure 1 Vicinity Map
- Figure 2 Site Plan
- Figure 3 Geologic Map
- Figure 4 Stabilization Plan
- Figure 5 Static Stability Analysis Slope outside of stabilized area
- Figure 6 West Chute Stabilization Area

LIST OF APPENDIXES

- Appendix A Subsurface Explorations
- Appendix B TECCO System Analysis for slopes of about 45 degrees

1.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The Knopf property at 9507 SE 43rd Street is located on a southeasterly facing slope overlooking Lake Washington (see Figure 1). The purpose of the engineering studies was to develop plans for slope stabilization to address the 2017 landslides originating on two adjoining uphill parcels (9409 SE 43rd Street and 43o4 94th Avenue SE) that descended as debris flows onto your parcel and the adjacent property below. Similar slope movement also occurred in 1982 in the same area (see Figure 2). Our study specifically addresses slope repairs on your parcel at the approximate locations shown on Figure 2.

Repairs on the steeper slope to the east will consist of Tecco mesh surfacing restrained with soil anchors. The flatter slope within the debris chute on the west may be remediated with native plantings. We understand that the owners of the neighboring uphill parcels will be responsible for the remaining repairs. Tecco mesh and soil nail will also be used on the adjacent uphill properties.

2.0 SUBSURFACE CONDITIONS

Geologic maps (Troost and Wisher, 2006) indicate that the property is underlain by several different geologic units as shown on Figure 3. Specifically, the northeast corner, which experienced landslides in 1982 and 2017, has been mapped as being underlain by advance glacial outwash deposits that typically consist of very dense, sands and gravels with silt interbeds. The advance outwash is mapped as being underlain by lacustrine deposits of stiff silt and clayey silt of the Lawton Clay formation. Finally, the southeast corner of the site is shown to be underlain by dense till, which is an unsorted mixture of sand, silt, and clay, and other non-glacial deposits such as silts.

The generalized geologic conditions are confirmed with the results of borings drilled at the top of the slope in the spring of 2017. Specifically, Boring B-3 was drilled by Matvey behind the crest of the slope at the location shown on Figure 4. The boring was drilled to a depth of 81.5 feet below the ground surface and the results of the log of the boring is presented in Appendix A. Boring B-3 encountered about 6 feet of surficial fill overlying about 5 feet of medium dense (weathered?) glacial till. The till was underlain by outwash deposits and till to a depth of 81.5 feet.

Perched groundwater was encountered between depths of 29 and 35 feet and between depths of 62 to 70 feet. The lower groundwater depth is consistent with our observations of seepage at the face of the slope between elevations 260 and 270 feet as shown on Figure 4.

3.0 STABILIZATION SYSTEM RECOMMENDATIONS

To improve the stability of the exposed soils in the landslide head scarp, we developed a design for soil anchors restraining a TECCO (G65/3) mesh at the face of the slope consistent with the restraining methods that will be used by the uphill property owners to stabilize the near vertical slope face on their parcels.

The process involves clearing the slope, drilling ground anchors (soil nails) which will secure the TECCO high-tensile strength steel wire mesh to the face of the slope. The mesh is attached to the ground anchors by a system of spike plates. By tightening the nuts, the slope stabilization system is pretensioned to a defined force. Additionally, the edges of the TECCO mesh are restrained with boundary ropes (steel cables).

3.1 TECCO MESH SLOPE STABILIZATION

The soil anchor system was designed using propriety GEOBRUGG software using the soil parameters discussed below

3.1.1 Subsurface Design Parameters

The following parameters were used for the TECCO G65/3 slope stabilization system:

<u>Unit</u>	<u>Soil Parameter</u>	<u>Design Values</u>
Outwash	Friction Angle:	36 degrees
	Apparent Cohesion:	100 psf
	Soil Unit Weight:	130 pcf
	Ultimate Load Transfer:	3 kips per foot

The ultimate load transfer value will be affected by many factors including soil conditions, drilling methods and grouting pressures. Therefore, the recommended ultimate value must be verified in the field by conducting proof tests up to 1.33x the design load.

3.1.2 Wire Mesh and Spike Plates

Design assumes TECCO steel wire mesh G65/3 and P33 spike plates.

3.1.3 Ground Anchors

Design assumes:

- Anchor spacing should not exceed 10 feet in either the horizontal or vertical directions and installed declined 20 degrees below the horizontal;
- Anchors have a minimum pullout capacity (design load) of 30 kips and a minimum yield strength of 16 kips; and
- Anchors are locked-off at a load of 4.5 kips.

3.1.4 Design Method

- 1. Determine by inspection, slope section for analysis runs based on ground topography and soils present.
- 2. Input cross-section geometry, soil properties, and partial factors of safety into ROVOLUM (by GEOBRUGG).
- 3. Based on results of initial runs, adjust mesh, bar size or spacing until a factor of safety of at least 1.5 is achieved for long term static conditions

3.1.5 Results

Design calculations are presented in Appendix B

3.2 SLOPE STABILITY ANALYSES

At the request of the City of Mercer Island, we also conducted stability analyses on the adjacent section of the slope that did not fail in the 1982 or 2017 landslides. Global slope stability analyses were conducted using the computer program SLIDE v.6, by RocScience. The stability analysis was conducted for the soil strength parameter recommended for the design of the soil nails (see Section 3.1.2). The results of the analyses, which are presented in Figure 5, indicate that the intact, material underlying the slope would have a static factor of safety of at lease 1.5.

3.3 SLOPE PLANTINGS

The narrow landslide runout chute on the west (see Fig. 6) is inclined at a relatively modest slope (approximately 2(H):1(V)) and is underlain by relatively competent material. In our opinion, this area does not require Tecco mesh and ground anchor stabilization. Consequently, we recommend stabilizing this area (~500 s.f.) with native plants (trees and shrubs).

4.0 LIMITATIONS

We have prepared this report for use Mr. Ed Knopf and the project design team. Recommendations contained in this report are based on a site reconnaissance, review of pertinent subsurface information, and our understanding of the City's requirements for slope stabilization. The study was performed using a mutually agreed-upon scope of work.

Variations in soil conditions may exist between the explorations and the actual conditions underlying the site. The nature and extent of soil variations may not be evident until construction occurs. If any soil conditions are encountered at the site that are different from those described in this report, we should be notified immediately to review the applicability of our recommendations. Additionally, we should also be notified to review the applicability of our recommendations if there are any changes in the project scope.

The scope of our work does not include services related to construction safety precautions. Our recommendations are not intended to direct the contractors' methods, techniques, sequences or procedures, except as specifically described in our report for consideration in design. Additionally, the scope of our work specifically excludes the assessment of environmental characteristics, particularly those involving hazardous substances. We are not mold consultants nor are our recommendations to be interpreted as being preventative of mold development. A mold specialist should be consulted for all mold-related issues.

This report may be used only by the client and for the purposes stated, within a reasonable time from its issuance. Land use, site conditions (both off and on-site), or other factors including advances in our understanding of applied science, may change over time and could materially affect our findings. Therefore, this report should not be relied upon after 24 months from its issuance. PanGEO should be notified if the project is delayed by more than 24 months from the date of this report so that we may review the applicability of our conclusions considering the time lapse.

It is the client's responsibility to see that all parties to this project, including the designer, contractor, subcontractors, etc., are made aware of this report in its entirety. The use of information contained in this report for bidding purposes should be done at the contractor's option and risk. Any party other than the client who wishes to use this report shall notify PanGEO of such intended use and for permission to copy this report. Based on the intended use of the report, PanGEO may require that additional work be performed and that an updated report

Slope Stabilization Design 9507 SE 43rd Street, Mercer Island August 1, 2019

be reissued. Noncompliance with any of these requirements will release PanGEO from any liability resulting from the use this report.

Within the limitation of scope, schedule and budget, PanGEO engages in the practice of geotechnical engineering and endeavors to perform its services in accordance with generally accepted professional principles and practices at the time the Report or its contents were prepared. No warranty, express or implied, is made.

We appreciate the opportunity to be of service to you on this project. Please feel free to contact our office with any questions you have regarding our study, this report, or any geotechnical engineering related project issues.



W. Paul Grant, P.E. Principal Geotechnical Engineer

Encl.

4.0 REFERENCES

- GEOBRUGG (2018). "RUVOLUM Slope Stabilization Software Manual," Geobrugg AG, CH-8590 Romanshorn
- GEOBRUGG (2019). "TECCO System Slope Stabilization Manual," Geobrugg AG, CH-8590 Romanshorn
- Troost, K.G., and Wisher, A.P., 2006, Geologic Map of Mercer Island, Washington, City of Mercer Island, Scale 1:12,000.









anchor count may be 40% greater than that shown above



Geotechnical Evaluation 9507 SE 43rd Street Mercer Island, Washington

Project No.

Figure No. 4







Geotechnical Evaluation 9507 SE 43rd Street Mercer Island, Washington

West Chute Stabilization Area

Project No. 07-073 Figure No.

6

APPENDIX A

BORING LOGS

Borii	ng Location: See Figure 2, Site and Exploration Plan	Drilling Cor	mpany	BoreTec Bor	e Hole Dia.: 8 Inch		
<u>Top</u>	Elevation: 341'	Drilling Met	thod:	Hollow Stem Auger Ha	<u>mmer Type:</u> Cathead	B	-3
Date	Drilled: 5/17/2017	Drill Rig:		Acker Log	<u>iged by:</u> JPG		
	SOIL DESCRIPTION	T	e	PENETRATION RES	(blows/foot)	S	
(#)		umber LES ery	Wat	Standard Penetration	on Test	ount	bu
epth	The stratification lines represent the approximate boundaries between soil types. The transition may be gradual. Refer to	n ple N MP	, pur	Δ Hammer Weight an	d Drop:	Ŭ ≈	esti
ă	report text and appendices for additional information.	Sarr SA F	Grot		-	Blov	н
- 0 -					40 t	i0	
	2.5 inches of pavers over 1/4 inch of sand over 6 inches of	~					
			21 K	5			
	Medium dense wet dark grav silty SAND some gravel (Fill)	Т	88	3			
	inequality dense, wet, dark gray, sity OAND, some graver. (Fill)	S-1 12"	8 R			14	
		1 -	X	}			
- 5 -		_ T					
	Loose to medium dense, wet, gray-brown with iron oxide	S-2 16"	X X	} ♠		10	
				}			
	Medium dense, moist, gray-brown, silty SAND, some gravel.	S-3 18"		<u> </u>		26	
	(Glacial Till)			}_		20	
- 10 -		_	8 R	8			
	Medium dense moist grav fine to medium SAND some silt	S-4 18"		≷▲_		27	
	(Glacial Outwash)	_ ⊥	88	8			
		T	X X				
	Dense, moist, gray SAND, trace to some silt and gravel.	S-5 14"				37	
	(Glacial Outwash)	<u> </u>	8 R				
·15-	Dense moist gray SAND trace to some silt and gravel	T					
	(Glacial Outwash)	S-6 14"	8 k			37	
		_		}			
		-	88	8			
	(Smoother drilling action)		88	}			
-20-		-	8 R	<u>}</u>			
	Dense, moist, gray, fine to medium SAND, trace to some silt.	S-7 16"	X	<u>}</u>		36	
	(Glacial Outwash)	⊥					
			8 R	\$			
		-		8			
			8 R	8			
-25 -	SAMPLE LEGEND GROUNDWATER LEGEND		<u>ка к</u>	≫ Sines	(<0.075 mm)		
	2-inch O.D. split spoon sample Clean Sand			O % Water	(Moisture) Content		
Ī	S-inch I.D. Shelby tube sample 🔯 Bentonite			Plastic Limit	C Liquid Lim	it	
				Natural W	/ater Content		
		1204 04th Ave SE					
	CSA - Grain Size Analysis ▼ Groundwater level at			Hercer	Island WA		
	time of drilling (ATD) of an data of	r	Date	• May 2017	Project No ·	1797	7 09
	Consol = Consolidation Test		Date	. May 2017		1131	
	Att. = Atterberg Limits		Z	ipper Geo Associat		B	-3
1			19	9023 36th Ave. W, Suite I vnnwood WA	LOG:	_	-
			1		Page	1 of 4	

Borir	g Location: See Figure 2, Site and Exploration Plan	Drilling Co	mpany:	BoreTec	Bore Hole	Dia.: 8 Inch		
Тор	Elevation: 341'	Drilling Me	thod:	Hollow Stem Auger	<u>Hammer T</u>	<u>ype:</u> Cathead	B	-3
Date	<u>Drilled:</u> 5/17/2017	Drill Rig:		Acker	Logged by	<u>r:</u> JPG		
	SOIL DESCRIPTION		e	PENETRATION	RESISTAN	ICE (blows/foot)	s	
(Ħ		LES LES ery	Wat	Standard Pene	tration Test		ount	bu
∋pth	The stratification lines represent the approximate boundaries between soil types. The transition may be gradual. Refer to	Ple N MP	, pur	Δ Hammer Weig	ht and Drop:		Ŭ ×	esti
ă	report text and appendices for additional information.	Sam SA F	Brou				Blov	F
-25-		<u> </u>		0 20	4	0 6	0	
20	Very dense, moist, gray SAND, some gravel, trace silt.	S-8 18"	8 8				51	
	(Glačlai Outwash)	⊥	X X					
			XX					
\square								
Н	Medium dense saturated drav SAND trace to some silt and			3				
- 30 -	gravel. (Glacial Outwash)	ΙT		ᢤ <u>╶╶╴╴</u>				
\square	Medium dense, wet to saturated, gray, interbedded fine to	S-9 18"	8 5	3	▲		27	
Щ	medium SAND, some silt and fine sandy SILT. (Glacial Outwash)	-	XX	3				
			X K					
		-		3				
25	Very stiff moist to wet gray, finely laminated to massive SILT.		R K					
-35-	with some fine sand and trace clay.		8 8				26	
\vdash	Verv stiff. moist to wet. gray SILT with some clay, interbedded		R K	╡┼┼┼┼┼┼┼┼	┡		20	
\vdash	with medium dense, saturated, gray SAND with trace to some		X X					
Щ	silt. (Giaciai Outwasn)		8 K					
Ц			88					
-40-		Ţ	88					
	Hard, moist to wet, gray SILT, with some clay and 1- to 3-inch thick interbeds of dense, saturated, gray SAND with trace to	S-11 16"	8 8				41	
	some silt. (Glacial Outwash)		RK	$\left\{ \left[$	TIIII			
\square			8					
H		_						
\vdash	(Rougher drilling action)							
45 -	Very dense, maint to wat arow SAND, with gravel, trace to	ΙŢ						
Щ	some silt. (Glacial Outwash)	S-12 16"	8	3			51	
Ц		-	8 K	3				
			88	3				
			8 R	\$				
		1	88	3				
- 50 -	SAMPLE LEGEND GROUNDWATER LEGEND			♦ % F	ines (<0.07	5 mm)		
1	- 2-inch O.D. split spoon sample 🔛 Clean Sand			Ο %ν	Vater (Moist	ure) Content		
Īī	- 3-inch I D. Shelbv tube sample 🔯 Bentonite			Plastic Limit			it	
L 1				Natu	ral Water Co	ontent		
	Groundwater level at			400 Mor				
	time of drilling (ATD) o	r					470	7 00
	200W = 200 Wash Analysis ^N measurement		Date:	: May 2017		Project No.:	179	7.09
	Consol. = Consolidation Test		z	ipper Geo Asso	ciates	BORING	R	_2
	Att. = Atterberg Limits		19	9023 36th Ave. W, S	Suite D	LOG:	D	-3
			Lynnwood, WA				2 of 4	

Drilling Cor	mpany:	BoreTe	с	Bore Hole	Dia.: 8 Inch		
Drilling Me	Drilling Method: Hollow Stem Auger Hammer Type: Cathead		<u>[ype:</u> Cathead	ad B-			
Drill Rig:		Acker		Logged by	<u>r:</u> JPG		
	J.	PEN	ETRATION	RESISTAN	ICE (blows/foot)	6	
Sample Number SAMPLES Recovery	round Wate	▲ s ∆ н	tandard Pene lammer Weig	etration Test ht and Drop:		low Counts	Testing
.,	Ū,	0	20	4	0 6	0	
S-13 16"						64	
S-14] 16"						54	
S-15 [16"						63	
S -16 16"						50/6"	
-S-17] 10"						50/4"	
	ψ <u></u>		♦ % F	ines (<0.07	5 mm)		
			Ο %ν	Vater (Moist	ure) Content		
		Plas	stic Limit ⊢		Liquid Lim	it	
Natural Water Content							
Screened Casing Panteleakos Residence							
4304 94th Ave SE							
			Mer	cer Islan	d, WA		
	Date:	May 2	017		Project No.:	1797	7.09
	Zi 19	pper (023 36 Lyr	Geo Asso th Ave. W, S nnwood, WA	ciates Suite D	BORING LOG:	B	-3
	Drilling Col Drilling Me Drill Rig: S-13 I 16" S-14 I 16" S-14 I 16" S-15 I 16" S-17 I 10"	Drilling Company: Drilling Method: Drill Rig:	Drilling Method: Drill Rig: Acker PEN Acker PEN Acker PEN Acker PEN Acker PEN Acker PEN Acker PEN Acker Acher	Drilling Company: BoreTec Drilling Method: Hollow Stem Auger Drill Rig: Acker PENETRATION A Standard Pene A Standard Pene A Hammer Weig B-13 16" A Hammer Weig S-14 16" A Hammer Weig S-14 16" A Hammer Weig S-16 16" A Hammer Weig A Hammer Weig A Hammer Weig S-16 16" A Hammer Weig A Hammer Weig A Hammer Weig A Hammer Weig	Dilling Company: Bore Tec Bore Hole Drilling Method: Hollow Stem Auger Hammer Drill Rig: Acker Logaed by PENETRATION RESISTAN Acker Logaed by Image: Signed by the standard Penetration Test A Hammer Weight and Drop Image: Signed by the standard Penetration Test A Hammer Weight and Drop Image: Signed by the standard Penetration Test A Hammer Weight and Drop Image: Signed by the standard Penetration Test A Hammer Weight and Drop Image: Signed by the standard Penetration Test A Hammer Weight and Drop Image: Signed by the standard Penetration Test A Hammer Weight and Drop Image: Signed by the standard Penetration Test A Hammer Weight and Drop Image: Signed by the standard Penetration Test A Hammer Weight and Drop Image: Signed by the standard Penetration Test A Hammer Weight and Drop Image: Signed by the standard Penetration Test A Hammer Weight and Drop Image: Signed by the standard Penetration Test A Hammer Meight and Test Image: Signed by the standard Penetration Test A Hammer Meight and Test Image: Signed by the standard Penetration Test A Mater Penetration Test Image: Signed by the standard Penetration Te	Drilling Company: Bore Tec Bore Hole Dia:: 8 Inch Drilling Method: Hollow Stem Auger Hammer Type: Cathead Drill Rig: Acker Logged by: JPG Image: Acker Logged by: JPG PENETRATION RESISTANCE (blows/foot) Acker Standard Penetration Test Attack Hammer Weight and Drop: Acker Hammer Weight and Drop: S-14 10° 0 20 40 6 S-14 10° 0 20 40 6 S-14 10° 0 0 0 0 0 S-14 10° 0 0 0 0 0 0 S-14 10° 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 S-16 10° 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 S-16 10° 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 S-16 10° 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	Drilling Company: Bore Tec Bore Hole Dia: 8 Inch Drilling Method: Hollow Stem Auger Hammer Type: Cathead Drilling Method: Hollow Stem Auger Hammer Type: Cathead Drilling Method: Hollow Stem Auger JPG JPG PENETRATION RESISTANCE (blows/loot) A standard Penetration Test Bore Hole Dia: Bore Hole Dia: Market Barber Acker 20 40 60 S-13 10° 20 40 60 S-14 10° 20 40 60 S-14 10° 40 63 S-14 10° 54 S-15 10° 506° S-16 10° 506° S-17 10° 506°

Borir	ng Location: See Figure 2, Site and Exploration Plan	Drilling Co	mpany:	Bore	eTec	;			Bo	ore I	Hole	e Dia	1. <u>:</u> 8	Inc	h			
<u>Top</u>	Elevation: 341'		ethod: Hollow Stem Auger <u>Hammer Type:</u> Cathead					B	-3									
Date	Drilled: 5/17/2017	<u>Drill Rig:</u>		Acke	ər				Lo	ogge	ed by	<u>y:</u>	J	PG				
	SOIL DESCRIPTION	N 10	Ē	PE	ENE	TR	ATI	ON	RE	SIS	TAI	NCE	E (b	lows	/foot)	s	
(ft)		umber LES ery	Wat		St	anda	ard	Pen	etrat	ion ⁻	Test	t					ount	bu
epth	The stratification lines represent the approximate boundaries between soil types. The transition may be gradual. Refer to	M P Recover	pur	Δ Hammer Weight :			ght a	nd E	Drop	:					ŭ	esti		
ă	report text and appendices for additional information.	Sar SA F	Grot	ļ													Blo∖	Т
-75-		0.40 T or					2	20			2	10 				60	0/6"	
	Very dense, moist, gray, silty SAND, some gravel. (Glacial Ti	I) S-18 L 6"														P °	0/6"	
	Hard, moist, gray, massive SILT, some clay.																	
- 80 -																	70	
		S-19 14															76	
	Boring completed at about 81.5 feet.																	
	feet and from about 66 to 70.5 feet at time of drilling.																	
	Groundwater measured at 62.15 feet on 5/24/2017. Well Tag # BIT-739																	
- 85 -	-										_		_					
00																		
-90-																		
- 95 -			-															
100																		
	GROUNDWATER LEGEN	<u>D</u>					\diamond	% I	Fines	s (<(0.07	5 m	m)					
ļļ	2-inch O.D. split spoon sample 🔛 Clean Sand						0	% ۱	Wate	er (N	loist	ture) Co	onte	nt			
	3-inch I.D. Shelby tube sample 🔯 Bentonite			F	Plas	tic L	.imit			-0			1 1	_iqu	id Li	mit		
	Grout/Concrete		Natural Water Content															
	Screened Casing	Panteleakos Residence																
	TESTING KEY Blank Casing 4304 94th Ave SE																	
	GSA = Grain Size Analysis → Groundwater level at → time of drilling (ATD)	or					ľ	Vlei	rcei	r Is	lan	d, '	W/	4				
	200W = 200 Wash Analysis		Date:	Ma	y 20)17						F	^o ro	ject	No	.:	179	7.09
	Consol. = Consolidation Test		Zi	рре	er G	eo	As	sso	cia	tes	;	B	0	RI	NG	6	P	2
	Au. – Auerberg Limits		19	023	361	h A	ve.	W,	Suit	e D			L	00):		D	-5
					Lyn	nwc	ood,	, W/	4					P	age	e 4 c	of 4	

APPENDIX B

TECCO System Analysis

for slopes < = 45 degrees



RUVOLUM® ONLINE TOOL

RUVOLUM® - The Program to dimension the slope stabilization system TECCO®/SPIDER®

Project No.	07-073.100
Project Name	Knopf Short Plat (Slope <= 45 degrees
Date, Author	2019-07-22, NTW

Input quantities		
(Slope inclination)	<mark>α=</mark>)	45.0 degrees
(Layer thickness)	(t=)	(3.50) (ft)
(Friction angle ground (characteristic value)	Φ _k =	36.0 degrees
Volume weight ground (characteristic value)	<mark>Y</mark> ₅=)	130.0 lb/ft ³
(Nail inclination)	<mark>ψ=</mark>)	20.0 degrees
(Nail distance horizontal)	a=)	(10.00 ft)
Nail distance in line of slope	<mark>b=</mark>)	10.00 ft

Streaming pressure		No
(Earthquake)		No
Coefficient of horizontal acceleration due to earthquake	$\epsilon_{h}=$	0.000 [-]
Coefficient of vertical acceleration due to earthquake	ε _v =	0.000 [-]

Defaults and Safety Factors		
(Cohesion ground (characteristic value))	C _k =	100.0 lb/ft ²
Radius of pressure cone, top	ζ=	0.49 ft
Inclination of pressure cone to horizontal	δ=	45.0 degrees
Slope-parallel force	$Z_d =$	3.4 kips
Pretensioning force of the system	V=	6.7 kips
Partial safety correction value for friction angle	Y _₽	<mark>1.25 [-]</mark>
(Partial safety correction value for cohesion	Y _c	<mark>1.60 [-]</mark>
Partial safety correction value for volume weight	(<mark>Y</mark> γ	<mark>1.20 [-]</mark>
(Model uncertainty correction value)	(Y _{mod})	<mark>1.50 [-]</mark>
Dimensioning quantities	$\Phi_d =$	30.2 degrees
	C _d =	62.7 lb/ft ²

155.8 lb/ft3

 $Y_d =$



Safety is our nature

1483 in²

 $A_{\text{red}}\text{=}$

Elements of the system		
Applied mesh type	TECCO G65/3)
(Applied spike plate)	system spike plate P33)
Bearing resistance of mesh to selective, slope parallel tensile stress	Z _R = 7	kips
Bearing resistance of mesh to pressure stress in nail direction	D _R = 41	kips
Bearing resistance of mesh against shearing-off in nail direction	P _R = 20	kips
(Applied nail type)	GEWI D = 28 mm)
Taking into account rusting away	Yes)
Bearing resistance of nail to tensile stress	T _{Rred} = 51	kips
Bearing resistance of nail to shear stress	S _{Rred} = 25	kips

Cross-section surface of the applied nail with / without rusting away

Proof of the mesh against shearing-off at the upslope edge of the spike plate	Fulfilled
Proof of the mesh to selective transmission of the force Z onto the nail	Fulfilled
Proof of the nail against sliding-off of a superficial layer parallel to the slope	Fulfilled
Proof of the mesh against puncturing	Fulfilled
Proof of the nail to combined stress	Fulfilled

The given proofs concern the investigation of superficial instabilities. Additional investigations are required if there is a risk regarding global stability of the slope. If necessary the nail type and nail pattern have to be adapted.

Proof of the mesh against shearing-off at the upslope edge of the spike plate

Maximum stress on the mesh for shearing-off in nail direction at the upslope edge of the spike plate (dimensioning level).	P _d =	5.8	kips
Thickness of decisive sliding mechanism	t _{rel} =	3.33	ft
Bearing resistance of the mesh against shearing-off in nail direction at the upslope edge of the spike plate (characteristic value).	P _R =	20.2	kips
Resistance correction value for shearing-off of the mesh	$\gamma_{PR} =$	1.5	[-]
Dimensioning value of the bearing resistance of the mesh against shearing-off	$P_R/\gamma_{PR}=$	13.5	kips
Proof of bearing safety	$P_d \le P_R / \gamma_{PR}$	Fulfilled	
Proof of the mesh to selective transmission of the force Z onto the nail			
Slope parallel force taken into account in the equilibrium considerations	Z _d =	3.4	kips
Bearing resistance of the mesh to selective, slope-parallel tensile stress	Z _R =	6.7	kips
Resistance correction value for selective, slope-parallel transmission of the force Z	y _{zr} =	1.5	[-]
Dimensioning value of the bearing resistance of the mesh to tensile stress	$Z_R/\gamma_{ZR}=$	4.5	kips
Proof of bearing safety	$Z_d {<}= Z_R / \gamma_{ZR}$	Fulfilled	



kips [-] kips kips [-] kips

6.7 kips

0.8 [-]

5.4 kips

10.0 kips 15.4 kips

5.8 kips 50.8 kips

29.4 kips

1.5 [-]

1.5 [-]

Fulfilled

Investigation of slop-parallel instabilitie

Proof of the nail against sliding-off of a superficial layer parallel to the slope

Pretensioning force effectively applied on nail	V=	6.7
Load factor for positive influence of pretension V	y _{vi} =	0.8
Dimensioning value of the applied pretensioning force by positive influence of V	V _{dl} =	5.4
Calculatorily required shear force at dimensioning level in function of $V_{\scriptscriptstyle dl}$	S _d =	15.4
Bearing resistance of the nail to shear stress	S _{Rred} =	29.4
Resistance correction value for shearing-off of the nail	y _{sr} =	1.5
Dimensioning value of the bearing resistance of the nail to shear stress	$S_{\rm Rred}/\gamma_{\rm SR} =$	19.6
Proof of bearing safety	$S_d{<=}S_{\rm Rred}/\gamma_{\rm SR}$	Fulfilled
Proof of the mesh against puncturing		

Pretensioning force effectively applied on nail	V=	6.7 kips
Load factor for positive influence of pretension V	Y _{vii} =	1.5 [-]
Dimensioning value of the applied pretensioning force by positive influence of V	V_{dii} =	10.0 kips
Bearing resistance of the mesh to pressure stress in nail direction	D _R =	40.5 kips
Resistance correction value for puncturing	Y _{DR} =	1.5 [-]
Dimensioning value of the bearing resistance of the mesh to pressure stress	$D_R/Y_{DR} =$	27.0 kips
Proof of bearing safety	$V_{dII} \leq D_R/Y_{DR}$	Fulfilled

Proof of the nail to combined stress

Pretensioning force effectively applied on nail
Load factor for positive influence of pretension V
Dimensioning value of the applied pretensioning force by positive influence of V
Load factor for negative influence of pretension V
Dimensioning value of the applied pretensioning force by negative influence of V
Calculatorily required shear force at dimensioning level in function of $V_{\mbox{\tiny dl}}$
Maximum stress on the mesh for shearing-off
Bearing resistance of the nail to tensile stress
Bearing resistance of the nail to shear stress
Resistance correction value for tensile stress
Resistance correction value for shear stress
Proof of bearing safety {[$V_{dll}/(T_{Reed}/\gamma_{TR})$] ² + [$S_{dl}/(S_{Reed}/\gamma_{SR})$] ² } ^{0.5} <= 1.0
Proof of bearing safety $\{[P_d/(T_{sred}/\gamma_{TR})]^2 + [S_d/(S_{sred}/\gamma_{SR})]^2\}^{0.5} \le 1.0$
Minimal tensile strength in the nail for superficial instabilities

Dimensioning value of the static equivalent tensile force in the nail for determination of the nail length



V=

γ_{v1}=

 $V_{dI} =$

γ_{vii}= V_{dii}=

 $S_d = P_d =$

T_{Rred}=

S_{Rred}=

 $\gamma_{\text{TR}} =$

 $\gamma_{\text{SR}} =$

0.84



Cross-section:		
(Layer thickness)	(t=)	<mark>3.50 ft</mark>
(Nail inclination)	<mark>ψ=</mark>	20.0 degrees
(Slope inclination)	α=	45.0 degrees



View nail arrangement:

