

PREPARED FOR: CEMEX CONSTRUCTION MATERIALS PACIFIC, LLC 2365 IRON POINT ROAD, SUITE 120 FOLSOM, CALIFORNIA 95630

PREPARED BY: GEOCON CONSULTANTS, INC. 3160 GOLD VALLEY DRIVE, SUITE 800 RANCHO CORDOVA, CALIFORNIA 95742

CONSULTANTS, INC.

GEOTECHNICAL BENVIRONMENTAL BMATERIAL

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

Debbie Haldeman Regional Natural Resources Manager, Northern California/Nevada Cemex Construction Materials Pacific, LLC 2365 Iron Point Road, Suite 120 Folsom, California 95630 deborahg.haldeman@cemex.com

Subject: SLOPE STABILITY EVALUATION CEMEX CACHE CREEK MINE MINING PERMIT AND RECLAMATION PLAN AMENDMENT PROJECT YOLO COUNTY, CALIFORNIA

Dear Ms. Haldeman:

In accordance with your authorization of our proposal (Geocon proposal No. S1294-05-01P, dated September 27, 2017), we have performed a geotechnical evaluation of the slopes associated with the Cemex Cache Creek Mine in Yolo County, California. Our study will be used to support the *Mining Permit* and *Reclamation Plan Amendment* Project.

The accompanying report presents our findings, conclusions, and recommendations regarding geotechnical aspects of mining and reclamation slope configurations as presently proposed. Based on the results of our study, the proposed perimeter mining and reclamation slopes are anticipated to meet the performance standards set forth in the *Yolo County Off-Channel Surface Mining Ordinance, Yolo County Surface Mining Reclamation Ordinance* and the California *Surface Mining and Reclamation Act*. In our opinion, the proposed project is feasible from a geotechnical viewpoint provided the recommendations of this report are followed.

Please contact us if you have any questions regarding this report or if we may be of further service.

Sincerely,

GEOCON CONSULTANTS, INC.

John C. Pfeiffer, PG, CEG Senior Geologist

 t m K/L

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SLOPE STABILITY EVALUATION

PHOTOGRAPHS

Photos 1 through 4

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

APPENDIX A

 FIELD EXPLORATION Figure A1, Key to Logs Figures A2 through A12, Log of Boring (B1 through B4) Previous Boring Logs (Kleinfelder, 1994)

APPENDIX B

LABORATORY TESTING PROGRAM

Figure B1, Summary of Laboratory Results

Figure B2, Atterberg Limits

Figure B3, Grain Size Distribution

Figure B4, Moisture-Density Relationship

Figure B5, Direct Shear Test Report

Figures B6 and B7, Unconfined Compressive Strength

Figures B8 through B13, Triaxial Shear Strength – CU Test with pore pressure measurements

Figures B14 and B15, Compaction Test Reports

Previous Kleinfelder Lab (1994)

APPENDIX C

SLOPE STABILITY AND SEEPAGE ANALYSIS

Figure C1, Seepage Analysis – Section 1 – Cache Creek 100-year Water Level

Figure C2, Slope Stability, Section 1, Mining, ALG, Low Water Cache Creek (Static)

Figure C3, Slope Stability, Section 1, Mining, ALG, Low Water Cache Creek (Seismic)

Figure C4, Slope Stability, Section 1, Mining, AHG/100-Year Water Cache Creek (Static)

Figure C5, Slope Stability, Section 1, Mining, AHG/100-Year Water Cache Creek (Seismic)

Figure C6, Slope Stability, Section 1, Reclamation, AHG/100-Year Water Cache Creek (Static)

Figure C7, Slope Stability, Section 1, Reclamation, AHG/100-Year Water Cache Creek (Seismic)

Figure C8, Slope Stability, Section 2, Mining, ALG (Static)

Figure C9, Slope Stability, Section 2, Mining, ALG (Seismic)

Figure C10, Slope Stability, Section 2, Reclamation, AHG (Static)

Figure C11, Slope Stability, Section 2, Reclamation, AHG (Seismic)

Figure C12, Slope Stability, Section 3, Mining, ALG, No Tower Present (Static)

Figure C13, Slope Stability, Section 3, Mining, ALG, No Tower Present (Seismic)

Figure C14, Slope Stability, Section 3, Mining, ALG –Tower with 25' Setback (Static)

Figure C15, Slope Stability, Section 3, Mining, ALG –Tower with 25' Setback (Seismic)

Figure C16, Slope Stability, Section 4, Alluvial Separator, ALG, Backfilled One Side (Static)

Figure C17, Slope Stability, Section 4, Alluvial Separator, ALG, Backfilled One Side (Seismic)

APPENDIX D LIQUEFACTION ANALYSIS

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Geocon Consultants, Inc. has prepared this slope stability evaluation in support of the CEMEX Construction Materials Pacific, LLC. (CEMEX) Cache Creek Mining Permit and Reclamation Plan Amendment Project (Project). Specifically, CEMEX proposes to modify Long-Term Off-Channel Mining Permit No. ZF #95-093, Reclamation Plan No. ZF #95-093 and Development Agreement No. 96-287 (as subsequently amended, "Existing Entitlements") with revised mining and reclamation plans and a 20 year time extension. This report presents results of our geotechnical investigation for evaluation of slopes associated with the Cemex Cache Creek Mine (Mine) in Yolo County, California. The approximate site location is shown on the Vicinity Map, Figure 1.

The following geotechnical report was previously prepared for the site: *Slope Stability Analysis, Solano Concrete Madison Plant, Highway 505 and Highway 16, Yolo County, California*, prepared by Kleinfelder, Inc. (File No. 40-2695-01), dated August 1, 1994. The Kleinfelder report was based on 13 exploratory borings performed throughout the site to depths ranging from approximately 45 to 90 feet. The Kleinfelder study also included laboratory testing and numerical slope stability analyses for the proposed mining and reclamation slopes. As part of our study, we have reviewed and incorporated pertinent subsurface and laboratory testing information from the 1994 Kleinfelder report.

The purpose of our study was to further evaluate subsurface conditions, determine pertinent geotechnical parameters, and evaluate slope stability for proposed mining and reclamation slopes under static and dynamic (seismic) conditions with respect to the performance standards outlined in the Yolo County *Off-Channel Surface Mining Ordinance* (OCSMO), Yolo County *Surface Mining Reclamation Ordinance* (SMRO) and California *Surface Mining and Reclamation Act* (SMARA).

To prepare this report, we performed the following scope of services:

- Reviewed published geologic maps, geotechnical reports, and other literature pertaining to the site. A list of referenced material is included in Section 11.0 of this report.
- Reviewed available plans for the project to select areas of exploration.
- Performed a site reconnaissance to review project limits, determine access and mark out exploratory excavation locations for subsequent utility clearance.
- Paid required fees and obtained a soil boring permit from Yolo County Environmental Health Department (YCEHD).
- Notified subscribing utility companies via Underground Service Alert (USA) a minimum of 2 business days prior to performing exploratory excavations at the site.
- Retained the services of a California C57-licensed drilling subcontractor to perform exploratory borings using truck-mounted drilling equipment.
- Performed four exploratory borings (B1 through B4) using a truck-mounted drill rig equipped with hollow-stem auger drilling equipment to depths ranging from approximately 5 to 86 feet.
- Logged the borings in accordance with the Unified Soil Classification System (USCS).
- Obtained soil samples from the borings.
- Performed laboratory tests on selected soil samples to evaluate pertinent geotechnical parameters.
- Performed slope stability and seepage analyses for the proposed mining and reclamation slopes considering both static and seismic conditions.
- Prepared this report summarizing our findings, conclusions and recommendations regarding the geotechnical aspects of the proposed project.

Approximate locations of current and previous subsurface explorations are shown on the Site Plan, Figure 2. Details of our field exploration program including exploratory boring logs (current and previous) are presented in Appendix A. Details of our laboratory testing program and test results are summarized in Appendix B. Details of our slope stability and seepage analyses are summarized in Appendix C. Details of our liquefaction analyses are summarized in Appendix D.

2.0 SITE AND PROJECT INFORMATION

The CEMEX property occupies approximately 1,900 acres south of Cache Creek, and north of State Route 16 both on the west and east sides of Interstate 505 (I-505).

2.1 Existing Entitlements

Under Existing Entitlements, mining is allowed on ± 586 acres in seven phases. Mining is currently taking place in Phases 3 and 4, while Phase 1 is in various stages of reclamation. Dewatering for mining purposes is not currently permitted, but may be permitted in the future subject to compliance with OCSMO requirements. The site is currently mined dry and "wet-mined" using a dredge (Photo 1). A typical undisturbed portion of the site (currently used for agriculture) is shown in Photo 2.

Existing Entitlements and the supporting 1994 Kleinfelder Report generally conform to the following plans:

- 1. *Off-Channel Mining Plans, Madison Plant, Yolo County, California* (21 Sheets) prepared by Cunningham Engineering, dated November 1995.
- 2. *Off-Channel Reclamation Plans, Madison Plant, Yolo County, California* (22 Sheets) prepared by Cunningham Engineering, dated November 1995.

The 1995 mining plans (Ref. 1) generally show that excavated mining slopes are to be inclined at 1.5H:1V (horizontal to vertical) 5 feet below the Average Low Groundwater (ALG) level and 2H:1V above this level. The 1995 reclamation plans (Ref. 2) show the various pit backfill (reclamation) surfaces within each pit, including "alluvial separators" (or berms) between pits.

We understand that mining activities at the site have differed from the 1995 mining plans in limited areas and that the Project will address these deviations through a set of revised mining and reclamation plans. More specifically, one or more of the intended alluvial separators has been removed by mining.

2.2 Proposed Project

The Project proposes to continue to mine on $489\pm$ acres in seven phases and reclamation is proposed to occur on $838\pm$ acres of the 1,902 \pm acre property. The maximum mining depth is 70 feet. Reclamation will consist of returning the mined areas to agriculture, permanent lakes and wildlife habitat as detailed in a *Revised Reclamation Plan* prepared by Compass Land Group. The Project includes revised mining plans and a reclamation plan that will include a "constructed" alluvial separator between Phases 3 and 4 and the development of a "natural" alluvial separator between an existing and future mining pit (i.e., between Phases 4 and 5). The "constructed" alluvial separator will be comprised of cobble and gravel mixed with clay (Photos 3 and 4) and the "natural" alluvial separator will consist undisturbed, natural ground between existing and future mining pits. The purpose of the constructed alluvial separator is to re-purpose proposed Phase 3 as a silt pond (to accept and settle process wash fines). The purpose of the future developed natural alluvial separator between proposed Phases 4 and 5 is to facilitate backfilling of Phase 4 for a return to agriculture while maintaining a stable separation for the future open water lake in future Phase 5.

Based on the preliminary revised mining plans (Cunningham Engineering, January 2018), the Project includes seven phases as described in Table 2.2.

MINING DETAILS					
Phase	Proposed Mining	Maximum Pit	Groundwater Elevation (feet MSL)		
	Areas (acres)	Depth (feet)	Avg. High	Avg. Low	
Phase 1	Reclaimed Agricultural Land in Progress - No Additional Mining				
Phase 2	No Additional Mining $-$ Area to be used for product stockpiling				
Phase 3	67	70	114	107	
Phase 4	137	70	112	107	
Phase 5	135	70	111	105	
Phase 6	135	70	108	100	
Phase 7	15	35	121	116	

TABLE 2.2 MINING DETAILS

Under existing conditions, Phases 1, 3 and 4 encompass the area of the current and previous mining pits, immediate south of Cache Creek. Phase 2 was partially mined (pursuant to allowances under Existing Entitlements) and currently supports existing aggregate product stockpiles. Phases 3 and 4 are in various stages of mining and reclamation. Phases 5, 6, and 7 have not been mined.

Under the proposed Project, no further mining is planned in proposed Phases 1 and 2. The revised mining plan focuses primarily on future mining in Phases 3 through 7. The proposed site configuration and phasing are shown on the Site Plan, Figure 2.

Similar to Existing Entitlements, the proposed Project's mining will create slopes of varying height and inclinations. Some of these mining and reclamation slopes will intercept the groundwater potentiometric surface. The OCSMO Section 10-4.431 stipulates that:

"Except where benches are used, all banks above groundwater level shall be sloped no steeper than 2:1 (horizontal:vertical). Proposed steeper slopes shall be evaluated by a slope stability study, prepared by a Registered Civil Engineer. Slopes below the groundwater level shall be no steeper than 1:1 (horizontal:vertical). Slopes located five (5) feet or less below the summer low groundwater level shall not be steeper than 2:1 (horizontal:vertical)."

The slope inclinations stipulated by the SMRO Section 10-5.530 are generally consistent with these requirements. However, the SMRO Section 10-5.530 also stipulates that:

 "…the minimum factor of safety for all design reclamation slopes located adjacent to levees or below existing structures shall not be less than 1.5 for static and 1.1 for pseudostatic (seismic) conditions. Other reclamation slopes shall meet a minimum factor of safety that is consistent with the post-reclamation use proposed for the mining area."

Consistent with the OCSMO and SMRO, the Project proposes typical slope mining configurations of 2H:1V to 5 feet below the ALG level and up to 1:1 below this level. Typical mining slope configurations are shown on Figures 3-1 through 3-4.

As mining is completed in each phase, reclamation will generally include filling Phase 3 with mostly pond fines (silt) resultant from onsite aggregate processing as well and filling Phase 4 with excavated/stockpiled overburden and topsoil. In general, Phases 1 through 4 will be reclaimed to agriculture whereas Phases 5 and 6 will be reclaimed as "lakes." Phase 7 will also be reclaimed to agriculture. Phases 1 and 2 are generally already at their finish reclamation design elevation. Phases 3 and 4 are planned to be filled to at least 5 feet above the *Average High Groundwater* (AHG) level.

Reclamation will occur in phases and will require the "constructed" alluvial separator between Phases 3 and 4. The "constructed" alluvial separator will be comprised of cobble (generally 3½ to 7 inches) and gravel mixed with clay (Photos 3 and 4) with side slopes of 4H:1V or flatter. Per Cemex, this material will be placed by dumping and pushing out/contouring using a dozer. A typical "constructed" alluvial separator detail is shown on Figure 3-4. No backfill will be required for the developed natural alluvial separator between Phases 4 and 5. Phase 7 will also be reclaimed to an elevation at least 5 feet above the AHG level.

3.0 SOIL AND GEOLOGIC CONDITIONS

We identified soil and geologic conditions by performing exploratory borings, reviewing the boring logs contained in the 1994 Kleinfelder report, and reviewing the referenced geologic literature (Section 11.0). Soil descriptions provided below include the USCS symbol where applicable.

Based on the *Geologic Map of the Late Cenozoic Deposits of the Sacramento Valley and Northern Sierran Foothills* (Helley and Harwood, 1985), the site is underlain by Holocene-aged stream channel deposits. These depositional and erosional deposits are associated with open, active stream channels and generally consist of unweathered gravel, sand, silt, and clay.

The overburden soil at the site consists of an approximate 5- to 15-foot-thick layer of interbedded silty sand (SM), silt (ML), silty clay (CL-ML), sandy clay (CL), clay (CL), and clayey sand (SC). The gravelly soil below the overburden generally consists of loose to very dense poorly graded sand (SP), poorly graded sand with gravel (SP), poorly graded gravel with sand (GP), and silty gravel with sand (GM), with thin (up to 5 feet) interbedded layers of clay (CL) and poorly graded sand with silt (SP-SM) and scattered small cobbles up to 4 inches. The gravel and cobbles include slightly weathered to fresh metavolcanic and metasedimentary rock with some quartz and chert. The strata proposed for mining overlays a very stiff to hard clay layer.

Based on the available subsurface information, top and bottom elevations of the soil layers are relatively consistent suggesting relatively flat stratigraphy with no significant dip, which is consistent with the erosional/depositional geology of the area. The general subsurface profile at the site is shown on Figures 3-1 through 3-4.

Subsurface conditions described in the previous paragraphs are generalized. The boring logs included in Appendix A contain soil type, color, moisture, consistency/relative density, and USCS classification of the materials encountered at specific locations and elevations.

4.0 GROUNDWATER

We encountered groundwater in Borings B1 and B2 at depths of 25 and 35 feet, respectively, on October 12 and 13, 2017. These depths correspond to approximate groundwater elevations of 105 and 108 feet, which are near the predicted AHG near the boring locations.

Table 4.0 presents the estimated AHG and ALG levels at the site (Luhdorff and Scalmanini, April 2017):

Groundwater Condition	Groundwater Elevation (Feet, MSL)			
	West	East		
Average High				
Average Low	08	α		

TABLE 4.0 ESTIMATED AVERAGE HIGH AND LOW GROUNDWATER ELEVATIONS

5.0 SEISMICITY AND GEOLOGIC HAZARDS

5.1 Mapped Geologic Hazard Zones

The site is not located in any currently established official geologic hazard zones (e.g. liquefaction, active faulting, landslides) established by the California Geologic Survey (CGS) or the local agency specific plan element.

5.2 Surface Fault Rupture

The numerous faults in Northern California include active, potentially active, and inactive faults. The criteria for these major groups were developed by the CGS for the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone (APEFZ) Program (Bryant and Hart, 2007). By definition, an active fault is one that has had surface displacement within the last 11,000 years. A potentially active fault has demonstrated surface displacement during Quaternary time (approximately the last 1.6 million years) but has had no known movement within the past 11,000 years. Faults that have not moved in the last 1.6 million years are considered inactive.

The site is not located within a currently established APEFZ. Based on our reconnaissance, evidence obtained in exploratory borings, and our review of geologic maps and reports, no active or potentially active faults with the potential for surface fault rupture are known to pass directly beneath the site. Therefore, the potential for surface rupture due to faulting occurring beneath the site is considered low. The site, however, is located in a seismically active area and could be subjected to ground shaking in the event of an earthquake on one of the many active Northern California faults.

5.3 Seismicity

In order to evaluate the distance of closest known active faults to the site, we reviewed geologic maps and used the computer program *EQFAULT*, (Version 3, Blake, 2000). Principal references used within *EQFAULT* are Jennings (1975), Anderson (1984) and Wesnousky (1986). The results of the query indicate the Great Valley Fault System and a segment of the Dunnigan Hills Fault, located approximately 6 miles to the west and northwest, respectively, are the closest known active faults to the site.

We used the United States Geological Survey (USGS) *Unified Hazard Tool* (https://earthquake.usgs.gov/hazards/interactive/) to determine the deaggregated seismic source parameters including controlling magnitude and fault distance. The USGS estimated modal magnitude is 6.5, the estimated Peak Ground Acceleration (PGA) for the Maximum Considered Earthquake (MCE) with a 2,475-year return period is 0.53g, and the modal distance is 15 km.

We used the online USGS application *Seismic Design Maps* to evaluate the site class modified, design-level Peak Ground Acceleration (PGA_M) for the site, for use in liquefaction and seismic slope stability analysis. The PGA_M for the site is 0.49g.

While listing PGA is useful for comparison of potential effects of fault activity in a region, other considerations are important in seismic design, including frequency and duration of motion and soil conditions underlying the site. The site could be subjected to ground shaking in the event of a major earthquake along the faults mentioned above or other area faults. However, the seismic risk at the site is not considered to be significantly greater than that of other sites in the area.

5.4 Liquefaction

Liquefaction is a phenomenon in which saturated cohesionless soils are subject to a temporary loss of shear strength due to pore pressure buildup under the cyclic shear stresses associated with earthquakes. Primary factors that trigger liquefaction are: strong ground shaking (seismic source), relatively clean, loose granular soils (primarily poorly graded sands and silty sands), and saturated soil conditions.

The site is not located in a currently established State of California Seismic Hazard Zone for liquefaction. In addition, we are not aware of any reported historical instances of liquefaction in the project area. However, soil and groundwater conditions exist at the site that may be susceptible to seismic-induced liquefaction.

We evaluated potential for liquefaction in sandy layers located below groundwater using the Standard Penetration Test (SPT)-based approach following the methodology of Youd et al (2001) as outlined in CGS Special Publication 117A, *Guidelines for Evaluating and Mitigating Seismic Hazards in California* (CGS, 2008). We used a site class modified Peak Ground Acceleration, PGA_M of 0.49g, an earthquake moment magnitude (Mw) of 6.5, and the AHG groundwater depth of 30 feet (for Boring B1) and 25 feet (for Boring B2).

Our evaluation indicates that sandy soil below groundwater is sufficiently dense to yield a factor of safety against liquefaction greater than 1.3, which is considered to be sufficient resistance against liquefaction per CGS SP117A. Therefore, no special design measures with respect to liquefaction are necessary for the project. Details of our liquefaction analysis are presented in Appendix D.

6.0 SLOPE STABILITY AND SEEPAGE ANALYSIS

Slope stability analyses evaluate the ratio of the resisting forces (predominantly soil shear strength) to the driving forces that would cause a slope failure (predominantly gravity, soil unit weight, slope/strata geometry). The ratio of the summation of driving forces divided by the summation of resisting forces is termed Factor of Safety (FS). A FS of 1.0 indicates that the driving and resisting forces are equal and the slope is a state of impending failure/movement. A FS greater than 1.0 indicates the presence of reserve strength; however, does not guarantee that failure will not occur. Rather, the probability of failure generally decreases as the FS increases. The minimum required FS for slope stability analyses used in this study, consistent with the requirements of the OCSMO and SMRO, are summarized in Table 6.0.

TABLE 6.0 MINIMUM REQUIRED FACTORS OF SAFETY – SLOPE STABILITY ANALYSES

Analysis Condition	Minimum $FS1$			
Mining/Temporary Conditions ¹				
Permanent (Reclamation) Conditions - Static	ר ו			
Permanent (Reclamation) Conditions - Seismic				
Notes: 1. Minimum FS based on OCSMO Section 10-4.431 and SMRO Section 10-5.530.				

6.1 Stability Analysis Sections

We evaluated slope stability at four locations considered representative of the anticipated mining and reclamation slope conditions for the project. Details of the analytical sections are summarized in Table 6.1.

01ADILI I ANAL I 919 0LUTIVNO				
Section $ID1$	Description			
$S-1$	Typical Slope Adjacent to Cache Creek (Phase 4)			
$S-2$	Typical "Natural" Alluvial Separator (Between Phases 4 and 5)			
$S-3$	Typical "Natural" Alluvial Separator at PG&E Easement (Between Phases 5 and 6)			
$S-4$	Typical "Constructed" Alluvial Separator (Between Phases 3 and 4)			
Notes:				
1. The approximate Section locations are shown on the Site Plan, Figure 2.				

TABLE 6.1 STABILITY ANALYSIS SECTIONS

6.2 Stability Analysis Material Parameters

To select appropriate material parameters for our slope stability analysis, we used the results of current and previous exploratory borings, laboratory testing, published correlations, engineering judgment, and experience with similar soil conditions on nearby sites. The material parameters used in our analyses are summarized in Table 6.2.

- VIIIDILII I INTP VEEI ITVE INTIET VIV						
Material Type	Total Unit Weight (pcf)	Cohesion, C (psf)	Friction Angle, $φ$ (degrees)	Hydraulic Conductivity (ft/sec) Horizontal Vertical		
Overburden Soil	120	250	28	1.5×10^{-7}	1.5×10^{-6}	
Gravel	130	50	38	5.2×10^{-4}	5.2×10^{-3}	
Clay	120	500	15	1.5×10^{-7}	1.5×10^{-6}	
Reclamation $Fill - Silt/Fines$	120	250	10	n/a	n/a	
"Constructed" Alluvial Separator	120	500	15	n/a	n/a	

TABLE 6.2 SOIL PARAMETERS FOR SLOPE STABILITY AND SEEPAGE ANALYSIS

Discussion of the derivation of the parameters shown in Table 6.2 is presented hereinafter.

Overburden Soil. Shear strength parameters for overburden soil were estimated from published correlations based on soil type and our experience with similar soils in the project area. Based on sensitivity analysis, overburden soil parameters (total unit weight, C , ϕ) have a negligible effect on slope stability for this project. Hydraulic conductivity of the overburden soil was estimated using published correlations and laboratory permeability test results previously performed by Geocon on similar soil types.

Gravel. Shear strength parameters for the gravelly soil deposits are based on laboratory direct shear testing and sampling penetration resistance values measured in current and previous borings at the site. The shear strength parameters derived from direct shear test results are considered to be conservative since the materials tested did not include the gravel portion of the samples. To evaluate the appropriate hydraulic conductivity value of the gravelly soil deposits, we compared the hydraulic conductivity values used by Luhdorff and Scalmanini (L&S) in their hydraulic modeling of the site and values based on correlations developed by Alyamani and Sen, *Determination of Hydraulic Conductivity from Complete Grain-Size Distribution Curves*, Groundwater Journal, July-August 1993. Based on the comparison, the L&S hydraulic conductivity values are approximately 2 to 3 times faster than the values estimated using the Alyamani and Sen grain-size correlation method. In a seepage analysis, faster hydraulic conductivity is more likely to result in adverse seepage conditions (e.g. seepage daylighting on a slope above the level of groundwater). Therefore, for consistency with the L&S hydraulic analysis and as a conservative measure, we have used the L&S hydraulic conductivity values for the gravels in our seepage analysis.

Clay. Total and effective shear strength parameters and permeability of the clay are based on the results of our exploratory borings, laboratory triaxial shear strength testing, published index property correlations, comparisons with local data, engineering judgment, and experience. Hydraulic conductivity of the clay soil was estimated using published correlations and laboratory permeability test results previously performed by Geocon on similar soil types.

Reclamation Fill (Silt/Fines). Unit weight of the reclamation fill/pond fines are based on laboratory unit weight and moisture content tests performed on intact samples of these materials located in the Phase 1 area of the site (Boring B4).

"Constructed" Alluvial Separator. Shear strength parameters for the constructed alluvial separator are based on the results of laboratory triaxial shear strength testing on remolded samples of the proposed material provided by Cemex. Given the proposed placement process, we assumed an average relative compaction of approximately 85%.

For the soil layering/stratigraphy, we assumed a generally flat soil layer stratigraphy consistent with the depositional and erosional geology of the site.

6.3 Groundwater/Surface Water Conditions

In limit-equilibrium slope stability analysis, ponded water against a slope tends to increase global slope stability due to the buttressing effect of the mass of water against the slope. As a conservative measure in our analyses of mining slopes, we modeled groundwater conditions using the ALG levels established for the site. For reclamation conditions, we used the AHG levels established for the site. In our seepage analysis of Section 1 (adjacent to Cache Creek), we used the AHG in conjunction with the 200-year water level in Cache Creek. A summary of the groundwater and surface water levels used is presented in Table 6.3.

Section ID	Location	Average High Groundwater Elevation (Feet, MSL)	Average Low Groundwater Elevation (Feet, MSL)	100-Year Water Level in Cache Creek (Feet, MSL)
$S-1$	Between Phase 4 and Cache Creek	110	104	126.5
$S-2$	Between Phases 4 and 5	111	105	---
$S-3$	Between Phases 5 and 6	108	100	
$S-4$	Between Phases 3 and 4	111	108	

TABLE 6.3 GROUNDWATER/SURFACE WATER ELEVATIONS FOR ANALYSIS

6.4 Seismic Forces for Dynamic (Seismic) Slope Stability Analysis

We analyzed dynamic (seismic) slope stability using a pseudo-static approach in which the earthquake load is simulated by an "equivalent" static horizontal acceleration acting on the mass of the slope. This methodology is generally considered to be conservative and is most often used in current practice.

We calculated the seismic coefficient using the procedures presented in *Special Publication 117A, Guidelines for Evaluating and Mitigating Seismic Hazards in California* (CGS 2008). In this procedure, the seismic coefficient is equal to a portion of the design-level PGA_M without the risk coefficient (PGA_M/1.5). Assuming a 15-cm displacement threshold, a PGA_M of 0.49g (PGA_M/1.5 = 0.33), a modal distance of 15 km, and a modal magnitude of 6.5, the calculated seismic coefficient is 0.1.

6.5 High-Voltage Power Transmission Line Towers

The project site is traversed by a high-voltage power transmission line between Phase 5 and 6 (Site Plan, Figure 2). The current mining and reclamation plans show a minimum 25-foot setback from the towers to the mining slopes. Specific information related to the tower structures and/or foundations was not available for our review. The towers consist of typical lattice tower structures and are likely supported on conventional cast-in-drilled-hole (CIDH) concrete foundations. Based on our experience on similar projects, in our stability analyses, we assumed maximum vertical and horizontal foundation reaction loads of 150 kips and 25 kips, respectively.

6.6 Slope Stability Analysis and Results

We analyzed slope stability using the computer program SLOPE/W, Version 7.22 (Geo-Slope International) for static and seismic conditions using the Morgenstern-Price method of limit-equilibrium analysis considering circular and block failure modes. For the mining and reclamation conditions, we analyzed for "global", deep-seated failure surfaces that would extend significantly into the dedicated setback areas. We did not evaluate FS for "surficial" or shallow failure surfaces, generally considered to not impact the dedicated setback areas.

Tabulated results of our slope stability analysis (FS against failure) for each slope configuration under the conditions of analysis are summarized in Table 6.6. Graphical representations of the potential critical failure surfaces and parameters used for each stability analysis are presented on Figures C2 through C17 in Appendix C. Results are summarized in Table 6.6.

Profile	Slope Details	Operational Condition	Calculated FS	
			Static	Seismic
Section $S-1$	Natural Ground/Alluvial Separator \bullet 2H:1V slope to 5 feet below ALG \bullet 1H:1V slope below ALG \bullet Maximum slope height $= 70$ feet \bullet See Figure 3-1 for slope details See Figures C2 through C7 for \bullet stability analysis details	Mining – Average Low Groundwater, Low Water Level in Cache Creek	1.5	1.1
		Mining - Average High Groundwater/100-Year Water Level in Cache Creek	1.5	1.2
		Reclamation - Average High Groundwater/100-Year Water Level in Cache Creek	2.7	2.0
Section $S-2$	Natural Ground/Alluvial Separator \bullet 2H:1V slope to 5 feet below ALG \bullet 1H:1V slope below ALG \bullet Maximum slope height $= 70$ feet \bullet See Figure 3-2 for slope details \bullet See Figures C8 through C11 for \bullet stability analysis details	Mining – Low Groundwater	1.5	1.1
		Reclamation – High Groundwater	2.6	2.0
Section $S-3$	Natural Ground/Alluvial Separator \bullet 2H:1V slope to 5 feet below ALG \bullet 1H:1V slope below ALG Maximum slope height $= 70$ feet \bullet See Figure 3-3 for slope details \bullet See Figures C12 through C15 for \bullet stability analysis details	Mining - Low Groundwater - No Tower Present	1.5	1.1
		Mining – Low Groundwater – Tower with 25-foot setback	1.5	1.1
Section $S-4$	Constructed Alluvial Separator \bullet 4H:1V slope \bullet Maximum slope height $= 70$ feet \bullet See Figure 3-4 for slope details \bullet See Figures C16 and C17 for stability analysis details	"Constructed" Alluvial Separator - Low Groundwater - Backfilled One Side	2.9	1.6

TABLE 6.6 SLOPE STABILITY ANALYSIS RESULTS

6.7 Seepage Analysis and Results

The proposed north mining/reclamation slopes will be separated (set back) from Cache Creek by a minimum of 200 feet. To model seepage conditions in the north mining/reclamation slopes under influence of a potential 100-year flood event in Cache Creek, we used the computer program SEEP/W, Version 7 (Geo-Slope International) using the geometry at Section S-1, the AHG level (Table 6.3), and the soil hydraulic conductivity values listed in Table 6.2. For stratified soil deposits, the horizontal hydraulic conductivity is greater than the vertical hydraulic conductivity. The typical ratio of vertical to horizontal permeability (Ky/kx) may range from 0.5 (2-times) to 0.1 (10-times) or more. For our analyses, we used a Ky/kx ratio of 0.1 (10-times), which is considered conservative. The purpose of our analysis was to determine if the seepage front would daylight on the slope above the AHG, which could adversely impact slope stability due to increased seepage forces in the slope.

We modeled the transient 100-year water surface elevation (126.5 feet MSL, per Cunningham Engineering, 2016) in Cache Creek for steady-state seepage conditions. The results of our analyses indicate that the seepage front does not intercept the proposed north mining slope at an elevation higher than the AHG level, even when sustained indefinitely. Our seepage analysis results are presented graphically on Figure C1 in Appendix C.

7.0 CONCLUSIONS

7.1 Slope Stability

Based on the results of our study, the proposed mining and reclamation slopes are anticipated to meet the performance standards set forth in the Yolo County *Surface Mining and Reclamation Ordinances* and SMARA.

For the temporary mining slope conditions, static FS against failure ranges from 1.5 to 2.9, which is greater than the minimum required FS of 1.0. For the permanent reclamation slope conditions, static FS against failure ranges from 2.6 to 2.7, which is greater than the minimum required FS of 1.5. Seismic FS for both the mining and reclamation conditions ranges from 1.1 to 2.0, which equals or exceeds the minimum required FS of 1.1.

These results indicate that the project slopes should be globally stable under static and seismic conditions for both temporary mining and permanent reclamation slopes.

7.2 Seepage

Seepage analyses indicates that the seepage front does not intercept the proposed north mining slope at an elevation higher than the average seasonal high groundwater condition, even when sustained indefinitely (steady state conditions). Therefore, anticipated subsurface seepage conditions at the proposed north mining slope under a 100-year Cache Creek flood event are not expected to adversely impact slope stability.

7.3 Pit Capture Potential

Cache Creek floodwaters, when present, do not appear to overtop the south bank of the creek adjacent to the site. Hydrologic and hydraulic models developed by the County and summarized by Cunningham Engineering (2016) indicate that floodwaters are below the top of bank elevations on the south side of the creek. These conditions, combined with the 200-foot setback and the lack of adverse seepage and slope stability conditions based on our analyses suggest that the potential for pit capture is low.

8.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

During mining, exposed gravel slopes are subject to erosion and deterioration and shallow surficial failures should be expected. Such surficial failures should be repaired as soon as practicable prior to additional mining in the immediate area. At a minimum, slope conditions should be observed by an engineering professional at least annually.

In addition, the following measures should be considered:

- Reclamation should occur shortly after mining is complete. Slopes exposed to rain and surface runoff are susceptible to erosion and surficial degradation. Appropriate erosion control measures and best management practice (BMP) devices should be installed to reduce long-term slope degradation.
- Cemex should train onsite workers regarding seismic safety issues, including appropriate actions to be taken during a seismic event.
- During mining operations, Cemex should have sufficient materials and equipment available to repair slopes due to surficial sloughing and/or erosion.

9.0 FURTHER GEOTECHNICAL SERVICES

9.1 Plan Review

We should review the final mining and reclamation plans prior to implementation to ensure that our recommendations have been properly incorporated. If changes are made to the plan during the permitting process or at time of permit approval, then geotechnical re-evaluation may be warranted.

9.2 Future Services

If, during the course of mining and reclamation, sloughing or rills greater than 12 inches deep develop, Geocon should be consulted for mitigation recommendations, as appropriate.

10.0 LIMITATIONS AND UNIFORMITY OF CONDITIONS

The recommendations of this report pertain only to the site investigated and are based upon the assumption that the soil conditions do not deviate from those disclosed in the investigation. If any variations or undesirable conditions are encountered during mining and reclamation, or if the proposed mining and reclamation will differ from that anticipated herein, we should be notified so that supplemental recommendations can be given. The evaluation or identification of the potential presence of hazardous materials or environmental contamination was not part of our scope of services.

Our professional services were performed, our findings obtained, and our recommendations prepared in accordance with generally accepted geotechnical engineering and engineering geology principles and practices used in the site area at this time. No warranty is provided, express or implied. This report is subject to review and should not be relied upon after a period of three years.

11.0 REFERENCES

- 1. Alyamani and Sen, *Determination of Hydraulic Conductivity from Complete Grain-Size Distribution Curves,* Groundwater Journal, July-August 1993.
- 2. Blake, T.F., EQFAULT, *A Computer Program for the Deterministic Prediction of Peak Horizontal Acceleration from Digitized California Faults*, Version 2.20, 2000.
- 3. Bryant, W.A., and E.W. Hart, 2007, *Fault-Rupture Hazard Zones in California, Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act with Index to Earthquake Fault Zone Maps,* California Geological, Special Publication 42, Interim Revision 2007, 42 pp.
- 4. California Division of Mines and Geology Wagner, D.L., Jennings, C.W., Bedrossian, T.L. and Bortugno, E.J. (compilers), *Geologic Map of the Sacramento Quadrangle*, 1981.
- 5. California Division of Mines and Geology, *Guidelines for Evaluating and Mitigating Seismic Hazards in California, Special Publication 117A*, revised and re-adopted September 11, 2008.
- 6. Cunningham Engineering, *Off-Channel Mining Plans, Madison Plant, Yolo County, California* (21 Sheets), November 1995.
- 7. Cunningham Engineering, O*ff-Channel Reclamation Plans, Madison Plant, Yolo County, California* (22 Sheets), November 1995.
- 8. Cunningham Engineering, *Conceptual Off-Channel Mining Plan, Cemex Cache Creek, Yolo County, California*, January 2018.
- 9. Cunningham Engineering, *Off- Reclamation Plan, Cemex Cache Creek, Yolo County, California*, January 2018.
- 10. Cunningham Engineering, *Cache Creek: Hydraulic Analysis of the Cemex Reach*, March 2016.
- 11. Geocon Consultants, Inc., Slope Stability Evaluation, Teichert Shifler Mining Project, Yolo County, California, (Geocon Project No. S9534-05-04), May 25, 2016.
- 12. Geocon Consultants, Inc., Slope Stability Evaluation, Teichert Schwarzgruber Mining and Reclamation Project, Yolo County, California, (Geocon Project No. S9534-06-01), May 10, 2011.
- 13. Geo-Slope International, SEEP/W and SLOPE/W, Version 7-22, 2011.
- 14. Helley, E. J. and Harwood, D. S., *Geologic Map of the Late Cenozoic Deposits of the Sacramento Valley and Northern Sierran Foothills, California*, United States Geological Survey Miscellaneous Field Studies map MF-1790, scale 1:62,500, 1985.
- 15. Jennings, C.W., *Fault Activity Map of California and Adjacent Areas with Locations and Ages of Recent Volcanic Eruptions*, California Division of Mines and Geology Map No. 6, 1994.
- 16. Kleinfelder, Inc., *Slope Stability Analysis, Solano Concrete Madison Plant, Highway 505 and Highway 16, Yolo County, California,* (File No. 40-2695-01), August 1, 1994.
- 17. Luhdorff and Scalmanini, *Technical Memorandum Estimation of Average High Groundwater Levels, Cemex Madison Plant, Yolo County*, November 30, 2016.
- 18. Luhdorff and Scalmanini, *Technical Memorandum Estimation of Average Low Groundwater Levels, Cemex Madison Plant, Yolo County*, April 26, 2017.
- 19. United States Geological Survey Seismic Design Maps Web Application, http://geohazards.usgs.gov/designmaps/us/application.php.
- 20. United States Geological Survey (USGS), *Unified Hazard Tool* https://earthquake.usgs.gov/hazards/interactive/
- 21. Unpublished reports, aerial photographs, and maps on file with Geocon.
- 22. Yolo County, *Surface Mining and Reclamation Ordinances*

Photo No. 1 Active Mining Pit

Photo No. 2 High Voltage Transmission Line Easement (between Phases 5 and 6)

PHOTOS NO. 1 & 2 Cemex Cache CreekYolo County, CONSULTANTS, INC. California 3160 GOLD VALLEY DR – SUITE 800 – RANCHO CORDOVA, CA 95742
PHONE 916.852.9118 – FAX 916.852.9132 GEOCON Project No. S1294-05-01 | February 2018

Photo No. 3 Proposed "Alluvial Separator" Material

Photo No. 4 Proposed "Alluvial Separator" Material

PHOTOS NO. 3 & 4

Yolo County, California Cemex Cache Creek

GEOCON Project No. S1294-05-01 | February 2018

APPENDIX A

FIELD EXPLORATION PROGRAM

Our field exploration program was performed on October 12 and 13, 2017, and consisted of drilling four exploratory borings (B1 through B4) at the approximate locations shown on the Site Plan, Figure 2.

Exploratory borings were performed using a truck-mounted, CME 75 drill rig equipped with 6-inch outside diameter (OD) hollow-stem augers. Soil sampling was accomplished using an automatic 140-pound hammer with a 30-inch drop. Samples were obtained with a 3.0-inch OD, split spoon (California Modified) sampler and a 2-inch OD Standard Penetration Test (SPT) sampler. The number of blows required to drive the samplers the last 12 inches (or portion thereof) of the 18-inch sampling interval were recorded on the boring logs.

Subsurface conditions encountered in the exploratory borings were visually examined, classified and logged in general accordance with the American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM) Practice for Description and Identification of Soils (Visual-Manual Procedure D2488-90). This system uses the Unified Soil Classification System (USCS) for soil designations. The logs depict the soil and geologic conditions encountered and the depths at which samples were obtained. The logs also include our interpretation of the conditions between sampling intervals. Therefore, the logs contain both observed and interpreted data. We determined the lines designating the interface between soil materials on the logs using visual observations, drill rig penetration rates, excavation characteristics and other factors. The transition between the materials may be abrupt or gradual. Where applicable, the field logs were revised based on subsequent laboratory testing. Logs of exploratory borings are presented herein.

BORING/TRENCH LOG LEGEND

MOISTURE DESCRIPTIONS

QUANTITY DESCRIPTIONS

GRAVEL/COBBLE/BOULDER DESCRIPTIONS

LABORATORY TEST KEY

- CP COMPACTION CURVE (ASTM D1557)
- CR CORROSION ANALYSIS (CTM 422, 643, 417)
- DS DIRECT SHEAR (ASTM D3080)
- EI EXPANSION INDEX (ASTM D4829)
- GSA GRAIN SIZE ANALYSIS (ASTM D422)
- MC MOISTURE CONTENT (ASTM D2216) PLASTICITY INDEX (ASTM D4318) PI –
- R R-VALUE (CTM 301) SE – SAND EQUIVALENT (CTM 217)
- CONSOLIDATED UNDRAINED TRIAXIAL (ASTM D4767) TXCU –
- UNCONSOLIDATED UNDRAINED TRIAXIAL (ASTM D2850) TXUU –
	- UC UNCONFINED COMPRESSIVE **EXEY TO LOGS** Figure A1

BEDDING SPACING DESCRIPTIONS

STRUCTURE DESCRIPTIONS

CEMENTATION/INDURATION DESCRIPTIONS

IGNEOUS/METAMORPHIC ROCK STRENGTH DESCRIPTIONS

IGNEOUS/METAMORPHIC ROCK WEATHERING DESCRIPTIONS

IGNEOUS/METAMORPHIC ROCK JOINT/FRACTURE DESCRIPTIONS

3160 GOLD VALLEY DR – SUITE 800 – RANCHO CORDOVA, CA 95742
PHONE 916.852.9118 – FAX 916.852.9132

Figure A2, Log of Boring, page 1 of 4

IN PROGRESS S1294-05-01 CEMEX CACHE CREEK PLANT.GPJ 11/06/17

SAMPLE SYMBOLS ... SAMPLING UNSUCCESSFUL ... CHUNK SAMPLE **EXECUTE IN STANDARD PENETRATION TEST** ... DRIVE SAMPLE (UNDISTURBED) \boxtimes ... DISTURBED OR BAG SAMPLE **V** ... WATER TABLE OR SEEPAGE

Figure A3, Log of Boring, page 2 of 4

IN PROGRESS S1294-05-01 CEMEX CACHE CREEK PLANT.GPJ 11/06/17

PROJECT NAME Cemex Cache Creek

Figure A4, Log of Boring, page 3 of 4

IN PROGRESS S1294-05-01 CEMEX CACHE CREEK PLANT.GPJ 11/06/17

Figure A5, Log of Boring, page 4 of 4

IN PROGRESS S1294-05-01 CEMEX CACHE CREEK PLANT.GPJ 11/06/17

SAMPLE SYMBOLS $\hfill\Box$... SAMPLING UNSUCCESSFUL \blacksquare ... CHUNK SAMPLE **EXECUTE: STANDARD PENETRATION TEST** ... DRIVE SAMPLE (UNDISTURBED) \boxtimes ... DISTURBED OR BAG SAMPLE **V** ... WATER TABLE OR SEEPAGE

Figure A6, Log of Boring, page 1 of 4

IN PROGRESS S1294-05-01 CEMEX CACHE CREEK PLANT.GPJ 11/06/17

SAMPLE SYMBOLS ... SAMPLING UNSUCCESSFUL ... CHUNK SAMPLE **EXECUTE IN STANDARD PENETRATION TEST** ... DRIVE SAMPLE (UNDISTURBED) \boxtimes ... DISTURBED OR BAG SAMPLE **V** ... WATER TABLE OR SEEPAGE

Figure A7, Log of Boring, page 2 of 4

IN PROGRESS S1294-05-01 CEMEX CACHE CREEK PLANT.GPJ 11/06/17

PROJECT NAME Cemex Cache Creek

Figure A8, Log of Boring, page 3 of 4

IN PROGRESS S1294-05-01 CEMEX CACHE CREEK PLANT.GPJ 11/06/17

SAMPLE SYMBOLS $\hfill\Box$... SAMPLING UNSUCCESSFUL \blacksquare ... CHUNK SAMPLE **EXECUTE: STANDARD PENETRATION TEST** ... DRIVE SAMPLE (UNDISTURBED) \boxtimes ... DISTURBED OR BAG SAMPLE **V** ... WATER TABLE OR SEEPAGE

Figure A9, Log of Boring, page 4 of 4

IN PROGRESS S1294-05-01 CEMEX CACHE CREEK PLANT.GPJ 11/06/17

SAMPLE SYMBOLS $\hfill\Box$... SAMPLING UNSUCCESSFUL \blacksquare ... CHUNK SAMPLE **EXECUTE:** STANDARD PENETRATION TEST ... DRIVE SAMPLE (UNDISTURBED) \boxtimes ... DISTURBED OR BAG SAMPLE **V** ... WATER TABLE OR SEEPAGE

Figure A10, Log of Boring, page 1 of 1

IN PROGRESS S1294-05-01 CEMEX CACHE CREEK PLANT.GPJ 11/06/17

SAMPLE SYMBOLS ... SAMPLING UNSUCCESSFUL \blacksquare ... CHUNK SAMPLE **EXECUTE:** STANDARD PENETRATION TEST ... DRIVE SAMPLE (UNDISTURBED) \boxtimes ... DISTURBED OR BAG SAMPLE **V** ... WATER TABLE OR SEEPAGE

PROJECT NO. **S1294-05-01**

Figure A11, Log of Boring, page 1 of 1

IN PROGRESS S1294-05-01 CEMEX CACHE CREEK PLANT.GPJ 11/06/17

SAMPLE SYMBOLS ... SAMPLING UNSUCCESSFUL ... CHUNK SAMPLE **EXECUTE: STANDARD PENETRATION TEST** ... DRIVE SAMPLE (UNDISTURBED) \boxtimes ... DISTURBED OR BAG SAMPLE **V** ... WATER TABLE OR SEEPAGE

Figure A12, Log of Boring, page 1 of 1

IN PROGRESS S1294-05-01 CEMEX CACHE CREEK PLANT.GPJ 11/06/17

SAMPLE SYMBOLS ... SAMPLING UNSUCCESSFUL ... CHUNK SAMPLE **EXECUTE IN STANDARD PENETRATION TEST** ... DRIVE SAMPLE (UNDISTURBED) \boxtimes ... DISTURBED OR BAG SAMPLE **V** ... WATER TABLE OR SEEPAGE

UNIFIED SOIL CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM

 $-$

 $\hat{\mathcal{L}}$

APPENDIX B LABORATORY TESTING PROGRAM

Laboratory tests were performed in accordance with generally accepted test methods of the American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM) or other suggested procedures. Selected soil samples were tested for their grain size distribution, plasticity characteristics, maximum dry density/optimum moisture content, and shear strength parameters. Laboratory test results are presented on the following pages.

Summary of Laboratory Results

Project: Cemex Cache Creek Location: Madison, California Number: S1294-05-01 Figure: B1

ATTERBERG LIMITS (ASTM D4318)

Project: Cemex Cache Creek Location: Madison, California Number: S1294-05-01 Figure: B2

 \overline{q} PLANT CREEK CEMEX CACHE S1294-05-01

US_COMPACTION COPY 2.GPJ US_LAB.GDT 1/26/07

DIRECT SHEAR TEST REPORT

CEMEX CACHE CREEK PLANT

G1294-52-01

Sample No.: B1 @ 40.5

Date: Thursday, October 19, 2017 **By:** TG

Description: SW-GRAY (F-C) SAND WITH A TRACE OF FINE

* Degree of saturation calculated with a specific gravity of 2.65

Rate (in/min) 0.0100 0.0100 0.0100

Tested By: MPW **Checked By:** CMW

Tested By: MPW **Checked By:** CMW

Yolo County, California

Yolo County, California

KI KLEINFELDER **DIRECT SHEAR TEST Solano Concrete Madison Plant** **PLATE**

PROJECT NO. 40-2695-01 Yolo County, California

Yolo County, California

Yolo County, California

Solano Concrete Madison Plant

Yolo County, California

Yolo County, California

40-2695-01 PROJECT NO.

Yolo County, California

APPENDIX C SLOPE STABILITY AND SEEPAGE ANALYSIS

The computer programs SLOPE/W and SEEP/W Version 7 distributed by Geo-Slope International were utilized to perform slope stability and seepage analyses. SEEP/W is a finite element analysis software product for analyzing groundwater seepage and excess-pore pressure dissipation problems within porous materials such as soil and rock. SLOPE/W uses conventional slope stability equations and a two-dimensional limit-equilibrium method to calculate the factor of safety against failure. For our analysis, the Morgenstern-Price Method with a circular failure mechanism was used. The Morgenstern-Price Method satisfies both moment and force equilibrium.

The computer program searches for the critical failure surface based on user-provided input parameters. For a circular failure search, a linear search of entry and exit locations is specified and the computer searches for the critical failure slip surface. Tabulated results of the factor of safety (FS) against failure for each slope configuration under the conditions of analysis (e.g. high groundwater, low groundwater, static, seismic, surficial and global) are summarized in Table 6.6. Graphical representations of the seepage analyses, potential critical failure surfaces, and parameters used for each analysis are presented on Figures C1 through C17.

APPENDIX D LIQUEFACTION ANALYSIS

Liquefaction Hazard Analysis
^{Youd, T. L. et al - 2001
Project: Cemex Cache Creek
Location: B1
Location: B1}

Liquefaction Hazard Analysis

Youd, T. L. et al - 2001
Project: Cemex Cache Creek
 Location: B2
 Location: B2

