



August 23, 2007

File: 15-85-68

Alberta Infrastructure and Transportation
2nd Floor, Provincial Building
111 – 54 Street
Edson, Alberta
T7E 1T2

Attention: Mr. Cliff Corner

**NORTH CENTRAL REGION GEOHAZARD ASSESSMENT
HWY 43:16 WHITECOURT EAST HILL (NC1)
2007 ANNUAL INSPECTION REPORT**

Dear Sir:

This letter documents the 2007 annual site inspection of the Hwy 43:16 (km 1.9) Whitecourt East Hill site at legal land description 26-59-12-W5M (Figure NC1-1A, Section F). Thurber Engineering Ltd. (Thurber) undertook this inspection in partial fulfillment of our Geotechnical Services for Geohazard Assessment, Instrumentation Monitoring and Related Work contract (CE046/2004) with Alberta Infrastructure and Transportation (AIT).

Mr. Don Law, P.Eng. and Mr. Ken Froese, P.Eng., of Thurber undertook the inspection on June 11, 2007, in the presence of Mr. Fred Cheng, P. Eng., Dr. Rocky Wang, and Mr. Cliff Corner of AIT.

1. BACKGROUND AND RECENT WORK

Thurber last visited the site in June 2006 and the site conditions at that time are described in our Part B assessment letter provided in the site binder. Additional information for the site is provided in the Geotechnical File Review in Section A of the binder.

2. SITE OBSERVATIONS

The changes in condition since last year are shown on the attached site sketch plan and cross-section, provided for inclusion in Section F of the site binder. Selected photographs taken during the visit are also attached.

2.1 Roadway

The roadway surface was inspected during the reconnaissance for the full length of the hill. The two main cracks (vicinity of Stations 1+850 and 1+900) have had minor changes since the 2006 site visit. A height differential was observed across the west and east cracks and the east crack had a new extension.

The approximate locations of the cracks are shown on the site plan (Figure NC1-1A, Appendix F) with a closer view of the crack patterns given in Figure NC1-2. Photographs of the cracks are attached.

The extension of the west crack into the median first observed in 2006 had not extended further at the time of the 2007 visit. The crack differential in the centre of the driving lanes has re-appeared and was up to 2 mm in the driving lanes, increasing to about 10 mm at the north shoulder.

At the time of the 2007 site visit, a transverse crack was noted extending through the driving lanes toward the centre median near the east end of the east crack. The height differential across the east crack was measured at 8 mm in the shoulder but was negligible within the east traveling lanes.

A gentle dip in the eastbound lanes first observed in the 2003 at about Sta 1+770 was noticed again at the time of the 2007 visit. This dip is located over a culvert and there was a transverse crack observed through the area.

An erosion gully has formed at the pavement edge along the south shoulder of the eastbound lanes, extending over a length of approximately 300 m and with a depth and width of about 40 mm and 100 mm, respectively. This gully likely developed in the spring of 2007 due to accumulation of road sand just beyond the edge of the pavement which has prevented drainage of pavement runoff down the sideslope and into the ditch.

2.2 Toe Berm, Side Slopes and Back Slopes

The toe berm area north of the highway at Stations 1+600 to 1+800 exhibited no signs of slope movement (such as cracking, slumping, or seepage). In addition,

no visual evidence of slope movement was noted in the back and side slope areas on either side of the highway.

As noted in previous years, some leaning trees were observed within a treed area located downslope of the highway and southeast of the toe berm (see Figure NC1-1A). However, no tension cracks or seepage were observed in this area and no significant changes were noted from previous site visits. Clearing had been undertaken to allow installation of new instrumentation in this location. During the 2007 visit, a sinkhole was noted in the Town of Whitecourt right-of-way east of SP06-3 located approximately as shown on Figure NC1-1A. This sinkhole was 0.5 m in diameter and about 0.3 m in depth. There is concern that it may be the result of a break in the storm sewer line causing piping of soil into the sewer.

The ground movements measured by the slope inclinometers installed at the site are summarized as follows:

- Movement has been recorded at a depth of about 13 m in SI #5 located on the southwestern corner of the toe berm as shown on the site plan. There has been no discernable movement since 2005 when the rate was 5 mm per year rate (Spring to Fall 2005 interval) and is significantly less than the maximum movement rate previously recorded (12.9 mm per year between May to September, 2001).
- Minor movement had been noted in SI01-1A and also at SI01-2A, located as shown on the site plan, at depths of about 13 m and 8 m, respectively. The current rate of movement at SI01-2A is about 4 mm per year compared to the maximum movement rate of 13.1 mm/year in 2001 and 3 mm per year noted in the 2006 report. The water level in the pneumatic piezometer installed at SI01-2A was 10.5 m below ground surface. Both SI01-1A and the associated piezometer were damaged and have not been read since Fall 2005.
- The joint separation at SI12 was repaired in March 2006 and a new baseline reading was established at that time. Previous movement patterns (at 4 m depth) have not been observed since the repair.
- Minor ongoing movement was recorded in the two operational instruments located in the back slope in the vicinity of the bin wall near the bottom of the hill (SI#30 and SI#31, located approximately as shown on Drawing No. NC1-1 included in Section D of the binder). Movement rates of 2 mm per year were recorded at SI#30 and 12.5 mm per year at SI#31, which is an increase over last year.

- The readings taken in Fall 2006 and Spring 2007 showed the first signs of movement in the series of slope inclinometers installed in March 2006. Rates of movement (per year) measured in Spring 2007 were 5.5 mm for SI06-1 (at 2.8 m below ground), 2.4 mm for SI06-3 (at 11.6 m below ground), and 8.8 mm for SI06-4 (at 2.1 m below ground). These slope inclinometers are located north (downslope) of the highway in and adjacent to the area of leaning trees. SI06-2 located upslope of the highway has not shown any movement.

2.3 Culverts at Station 1+650

Inspection was undertaken of the two culverts at this location; an upper culvert directing surface water from above the walking path to the ditch on the south side of the highway, and a lower centerline culvert which transmits the water across the highway right of way to the base of the toe berm fill located north of the highway. A half-round culvert connects the outlet of the upper culvert to the inlet of the lower culvert. The outlets of two subdrain pipes discharge into the half-round culvert, and the ditch flow from upslope areas flows onto a concrete spillway and over the lip of the half-round culvert.

Maintenance of the concrete spillway was undertaken in 2001. Based on the results of the 2007 inspection, the subdrain and ditch water appear to be entering the centreline culvert in a controlled manner and the asphalt patch between the spillway and half-round culvert is in good shape. The two small sinkholes repaired in 2006 have not re-appeared. Flow from the east subdrain was estimated at 3.5 l/min (increased from 1.5 l/min in 2006) and the west subdrain was dry (as per previous observations). Flow at the culvert outlet (north of the highway) was estimated at 9.5 l/min (increased from 8.5 l/min).

Other sinkholes were observed beside the asphalt path at some of the small diameter culvert crossings below the path. It is understood that maintenance of the path and associated culvert crossings is the responsibility of the Town of Whitecourt.

2.4 Bin Wall Area (Station 1+200)

The bin wall and backslope area above the bin wall near the bottom of the east hill were inspected. The bin wall is located between the access road to the McConnell property and the highway, near Station 1+200 at the bottom of the hill. The trail above the bin wall was paved with asphaltic concrete in 2003.

The three tension cracks first noted during the 2004 site visit in the trail above the east end of the bin wall had not widened nor extended noticeably as of the

June 2007 visit and there was no differential height across the cracks. Crack sealing had been undertaken since the June 2006 visit including the two new cracks observed at that time. An additional crack was noted on the south side of the existing cracks and a second extending between two of the 2004 cracks (see photos).

The slight bulging noted in the east wing of the bin wall has not changed since first observed by Thurber.

Photographs of the tension cracks in the asphalt pavement and of the bin wall are attached.

3. ASSESSMENT

The observations made during the site reconnaissance and the recent slope inclinometer readings from the pre-2006 instrumentation indicate that slope movements at this site remain relatively minor with a modest increase in the rate of movement noted in some of the instrumentation. The 2006 instrumentation readings showed some movement from baseline readings taken at the time of installation.

Some differential height was noted within the east and west cracks indicating some movement is still occurring which is consistent with the continued creep observed in the slope inclinometers. The reason for continued slope movements at this location may be a result of not extending the toe berm far enough to the east during twinning operations to stabilize the area east of Station 1+780. The remainder of the roadway side slope, where the toe berm exists, appears to be stable at the present time. Unfavourable groundwater conditions may also be a significant contributing factor to the instability at the location of the highway distress.

The crack development is not significantly affecting the trafficability of the roadway surface at present. Ongoing movements in this area may be expected, and an increased rate of movement may follow shortly after heavy or prolonged precipitation events. The ongoing movement may result in a reduction in the ride quality in this section of the roadway in the future, possibly to the extent where trafficability and safety are compromised.

Minor additional cracking was noted in the trail located on the back slope above the bin wall in 2007; however, the pre-existing cracks have not developed further. Although there are no visible signs of distress in the slope or binwall, there has been an increase in the rate of movement measured at the slope inclinometers.

The gentle dip observed in the roadway surface (approximate Sta. 1+770) may be a result of settlement of the culvert backfill. No sinkhole development was noted.

It is anticipated that the observed sinkholes in the trail on the backslope above the highway are a result of piping of soil around the culvert outlets. The source of water may be from infiltration of water from above or leakage from the culverts.

4. RISK LEVEL

The risk level for this site has been assessed as follows:

$$PF(6) * CF(3) = 18$$

This risk level is considered applicable to the area of distress on the roadway in the upper portion of the hill (Stations 1+800 to 1+900). A Probability Factor of 6 is considered appropriate since the slide is active but with a slow, indeterminate movement pattern. A Consequence Factor of 3 is applicable since the embankment is relatively high and a partial closure of the road may be required as a result of slide movement. This risk level is the same as that applied in previous years. Other areas of the site are considered to have a lower risk rating.

5. RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Short Term

It is recommended that the Town of Whitecourt be informed of the sinkhole along the right-of-way as it may be a result of piping of soil into a break in the storm sewer traversing the area.

5.2 Long Term

The following remedial measures are considered feasible, based on the current information available.

- A possible long term measure is the extension of the toe berm to the east to buttress the slope at the location of the slope movement, potentially in conjunction with subsurface drainage.
- A potential additional remedial measure is the installation of horizontal subdrains below the roadway to drain subsurface water away from the area and lower piezometric levels. This measure would be undertaken in conjunction with a toe berm to improve the long term performance;

however, it is not considered a long term remedial measure on its own due to the potential for plugging with time.

Based on previous similar projects the cost for the construction of the remedial measures is expected to be in the order of \$500,000 to \$700,000.

5.3 Investigation

No additional investigation is recommended at this time.

5.4 Maintenance and Future Monitoring

As noted in previous annual reports, it is expected that frost action will continue to have a negative effect on the concrete and half-round culvert in the vicinity of Station 1+650. Although the asphalt patch is currently maintaining the flow, maintenance of this facility will likely be required in future years.

As per previous reports, it is recommended that crack sealing be continued regularly to reduce water flow into the slide area through the pavement surface. The cracked section should be monitored routinely in case the differential across the cracks noticeably reduces ride quality.

The eastbound shoulder should be bladed to remove the accumulated sediment and allow water runoff from the highway surface to flow down the sideslope to the ditch. The erosion gully should be filled with crushed gravel and the bank reseeded.

It is recommended to continue monitoring the existing instrumentation on a semi-annual basis, and to undertake annual geotechnical inspections as currently programmed. In addition, the quality of the ride over the west and east cracks in the westbound lanes should be monitored at least monthly by the MCI, and if significant changes occur an interim engineering site reconnaissance and assessment should be undertaken.

6. CLOSURE

We trust this assessment and recommendations meet with your needs at this time. Please contact the undersigned should questions arise or if the site conditions worsen.

Yours very truly,
Thurber Engineering Ltd.
Don Law, P.Eng.
Review Principal



Ken Froese, P.Eng.
Project Engineer
/dw

Attachments

cc: Mr. Roger Skirrow, P.Eng., Director of Geotechnical Services, AIT