Appendix D. Preliminary Geotechnical Design Report



# PRELIMINARY GEOTECHNICAL CONCEPT ASSESSMENT ARATAPU WATER STORAGE RESERVOIR

Engineers and Geologists

RILEY CONSULTANTS LTD New Zealand Email: riley@riley.co.nz Email: rileychch@riley.co.nz Web: www.riley.co.nz AUCKLAND 4 Fred Thomas Drive, Takapuna, Auckland 0622 PO Box 100253, North Shore, Auckland 0745 Tel: +64 9 489 7872 Fax: +64 9 489 7873 CHRISTCHURCH 22 Moorhouse Avenue, Addington, Christchurch 8011 PO Box 4355, Christchurch 8140 Tel: +64 3 379 4402 Fax: +64 3 379 4403



#### PRELIMINARY GEOTECHNICAL CONCEPT ASSESSMENT ARATAPU WATER STORAGE RESERVOIR

**Report prepared for:** 

Te Tai Tokerau Water Trust

Report prepared by:

Titus Smith, Technical Director - Geotechnical, CPEng

Report reviewed by:

Scott Vaughan, Managing Director - CPEng

Report approved for issue by:

Peter Lilley, Project Director

. . . . . . . . . .

**Report reference:** 

Date:

Copies to:

200240-B

1 September 2020

Te Tai Tokerau Water Trust	1 electronic copy
Williamson Water and Land Advisory	1 electronic copy
Riley Consultants Ltd	1 сору

Issue:	Details:	Date:
1.0	Preliminary Geotechnical Concept Assessment K13 Dam and Water Storage Reservoir	1 September 2020



### Contents

1.0	Introduction	. 1
2.0	Site Description and Topography	. 2
3.0	Existing Information	. 2
3.1	Regional Geology	. 2
3.2	Seismicity	.2
4.0	Geotechnical Site Investigations	. 3
4.1	Investigation Phases	. 3
4.2	Desktop Study and Initial Site Visit	. 3
4.3	Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation	. 3
4.	3.1 Geological Mapping	.4
4.	3.2 Test Pits	.4
4.	3.3 Cone Penetrometer Testing	.4
5.0	Investigation Results	.4
6.0	Dam Arrangement	. 5
6.1	Design Standards	.6
6.2	Design Ground Motions	.7
6.3	Key Dimensions and Features	.7
7.0	Design Considerations	. 8
7.1	Foundations and Abutments	. 8
7.	1.1 Local Precedent for Dams with Soft Soil Foundation Conditions	. 8
7.2	Staged Construction Approach to Soft Soil	10
7.3	Removal/Stabilisation Approach to Soft Soil	10
7.4	Liquefaction Susceptibility	12
7.5	Liquefaction Effects and Mitigation	13
7.6	Cyclic Softening	14
1.1	Seepage Design/Internal Stability	14
7.8	Reservoir Leakage	15
7.9	Reservoir Slope Stability	15
7.10		15
8.0		16
8.1		16
8.	1.1 Site Preparation and Stream Diversion	16
8.2	Earthworks and Dam Fill	16
8.3	Erosion and Sediment Control	16
9.0	LIMITATION	17

# Appendices

Appendix A:	Test pit logs
Appendix B:	CPT results
Appendix C:	RILEY Dwgs: 200240/2-0 to -3, -101 to -109

4 Fred Thomas Drive, Takapuna, Auckland 0622 
 Email: riley@riley.co.nz
 PO Box 100255, normal sites.

 Email: rileychch@riley.co.nz
 Tel: +64 9 489 7872

 Fax: +64 9 489 7873
 PO Box 100253, North Shore, Auckland 0745



#### PRELIMINARY GEOTECHNICAL CONCEPT ASSESSMENT ARATAPU WATER STORAGE RESERVOIR

#### 1.0 Introduction

Riley Consultants Ltd (RILEY), along with Williamson Water and Land Advisory Ltd (WWLA) and other project partners, has been commissioned by the Te Tai Tokerau Water Trust on behalf of Northland Regional Council (NRC) to prepare documentation to support a resource consent application for construction of the Aratapu Water Storage Reservoir located approximately 12km south of Dargaville.

The site is one of several options identified by the Northland Water Storage and Use Project (NWSUP): Pre-feasibility Demand Assessment and Design Study, which form part of a distributed system of reservoirs that could collectively supply irrigable water to suitable land along the northern end of the Pouto Peninsula.

This report outlines typical design, construction, and operational considerations for the reservoir with reference to the New Zealand Society of Large Dams (NZSOLD) Dam Safety Guidelines.

The primary objectives of the geotechnical and dam concept assessment are to:

- Specify the geological context of the dam site and reservoir basin, and how this • influences structural safety, water retention and reservoir slope integrity.
- Assess if any geological or geotechnical conditions exist that could prohibit safe and cost-effective dam construction and operation.
- Refine the most suitable dam type and appurtenant structures based on geological, • geotechnical, hydrological, and operational considerations.
- Gain an understanding of the potential failure modes and how defensive measures can • be incorporated into the design to reduce the risk of dam safety incidents or failure.
- Evaluate the present concept design against recommended performance criteria that • is commensurate with the hazard posed by the reservoir (potential impact classification).
- Outline additional recommendations for the progression of the project through design investigations and detailed design.

At the time of writing this report, additional intrusive geotechnical investigations (machine boreholes and laboratory testing) were being undertaken. This report, therefore, provides an assessment based on present understanding using available geotechnical information captured to date. The findings presented will need to be reviewed and updated once machine boreholes and laboratory testing can be completed.

This report should be read in conjunction with RILEY report 200240-D Hydrology and Hydraulic Assessment.





## 2.0 Site Description and Topography

The proposed reservoir site is located on the Pouto Peninsula approximately 12km south of Dargaville. The site is located to the east of a north-west to south-east orientated ridge at the western margin of the Wairoa floodplain. The site is situated within gentle valleys formed on the on the leeward side of a series of coalescing fixed parabolic dunes.

The proposed main embankment crosses a valley which is 70m wide at its base and approximately 170m wide at the proposed dam crest (RL 29m). The base of the gully contains a small spring fed watercourse which creates a swampy/wetland area.

A natural saddle is located beyond of the right abutment, within which a flood spillway could be located cut into natural ground.

Watercourses downstream generally pass through farmland. The current site is grassed and utilised for farming.

### 3.0 Existing Information

#### 3.1 Regional Geology

The dunes of the North Kaipara Barrier dominating this terrane were formed during the last interglacial periods from sand transported by the dominant south-westerly winds and supply of sediment from the coast. This has formed an extensive dune complex with the major central ridge line striking generally north-west to south-east.

The Geological and Nuclear Sciences (GNS) (1:250,000) Geological Map of the Whangarei Area suggests that the site is underlain by two distinct geological units:

- Tauranga Group Alluvium: Recent alluvial, swamp and estuarine deposits comprising unconsolidated mud, sand, gravel, and peat deposits (<12k-years old).
- Awhitu Group: fixed, parabolic, and transverse dunes comprising unconsolidated dune bedded sands with intercalated paleosols, lignite and cabonanceous mudstone and some sub-horizontally bedded sandstone of Late Pliocene age (1.8M to 3.6M-years old).

The reservoir basins are bounded by moderate to steep arcuate east facing slopes, a result of the dominant south-westerly wind forming and shaping the dunes. Above the proposed reservoir, the dunes are populated by a few small lakes, typically located at the head of gullies that either drain to the west or east. The gullies and streams on the eastern side of the ridges that will feed the reservoir.

Tauranga Group deposits are mapped within the valley floors and will form the foundation for the proposed embankment dam.

#### 3.2 Seismicity

The seismic hazard at the site is considered generally low in the New Zealand context, with no recorded large earthquakes since records began (c. 1840). There are no active faults mapped nearby (nearest is approximately 150km away). Inactive faults associated with the emplacement of the Northland Allochthon are noted to occur throughout the area, though not known to be within 10km of the proposed Aratapu Water Storage Reservoir.

Seismicity in terms of site hazard considerations are addressed in Section 6.2.

# 4.0 Geotechnical Site Investigations

#### 4.1 Investigation Phases

Investigations of the dam site are evolving in three phases. Phase 1 and Phase 2 were specifically configured to provide sufficient technical detail to support advancing the project through Resource Consents and Preliminary Dam design. Phase 3 investigations are configured to allow final design and support application for building consent. The three phases consist of:

- 1. A high-level review of available geotechnical information across the Kaipara coast. This was undertaken as part of the Northland Water Storage and Use project: Prefeasibility Demand Assessment and Design Study, and included an initial site visit.
- 2. Geological mapping and engineering geological assessment of the dam alignment and reservoir surrounds and preliminary geotechnical investigations.
- 3. Comprehensive geotechnical investigation to assist in detailed design are currently underway at the site and will be reported on at a later stage.

Results of the investigations are discussed within Section 5.0 of this report.

#### 4.2 Desktop Study and Initial Site Visit

A high-level review of available geotechnical information across the Kaipara coast was undertaken as part of the Northland Water Storage and Use project: Pre-feasibility Demand Assessment and Design Study. This considered likely ground conditions and the potential variability across several reservoir sites, and was used to highlight known regional hazards to be considered in the context of shortlisting and concept design for the water storage and distribution scheme. Information was obtained from the following sources:

- 1:250k Geological Map 2 Whangarei, GNS Science 2009.
- New Zealand Geology Webmap v.2.3 https://data.gns.cri.nz/geology.
- New Zealand Active Fault Database v3.3 https://data.gns.cri.nz/af.
- New Zealand Landslide Database v.4.1 https://data.gns.cri.nz/landslides.
- Geotechnical investigation information contained in the New Zealand Geotechnical Database https://www.nzgd.org.nz.
- Photoblique images captured in 2017 and 2018.
- Information relating to known recent or historic large dam projects nearby.
- Site Walkover assessment.
- ENGEO report for Kaipara District Council: Geotechnical Assessment West Coast Sites Kaipara District (2019).

#### 4.3 Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation

Preliminary geotechnical investigations were undertaken by RILEY on 30 April and 1 May 2020. The purpose of these investigations was to obtain initial information on actual ground conditions to inform a concept design for resource consenting and provide indicative construction costings (provided separately). The investigations involved:

• A site walkover and engineering geological inspection of the site and surrounding areas.

- Six excavated test pits, four at the dam embankment, one at the spillway and one in a potential borrow area.
- Five cone penetrometer tests (CPTs), three beneath the crest of the main dam embankment and two along the valley alignment at the upstream and downstream extents of the proposed dam. Two pore pressure dissipation tests were undertaken within CPT 4 (middle of dam crest).

Investigation locations and test pit logs are presented in Appendix A and C.

#### 4.3.1 Geological Mapping

A walkover was undertaken by an engineering geologist from RILEY to undertake preliminary geological mapping. Locations of outcrops are shown on the site plan (Appendix C).

#### 4.3.2 Test Pits

Test pits were excavated with a 15t excavator operated by a local contracting company. All samples were logged on-site by an engineering geologist in general accordance with the New Zealand Geotechnical Society (NZGS) Guidelines. Excavations were backfilled and the ground reinstated to its previous level upon completion.

Test pit logs are attached in Appendix A.

#### 4.3.3 Cone Penetrometer Testing

CPT tests were undertaken by Ground Investigation Limited on the 1 May 2020 using a Georig 220 with screw anchors. CPT5 located beneath the proposed dam crest toward the left abutment refused at 0.5m and was discontinued. The remainder of the CPTs extended to depths between 20.0m and 27.4m.

#### 5.0 Investigation Results

Ground conditions encountered in the valley floor (from test pits and CPT) show up to 12m of soft sediment across the middle portion of the valley which tapers to the valley sides. Valley infill material comprises very soft to soft, organic silt or silty peat. Material is described as spongey with fibrous plant matter including wood fragments and tree trunks. Shear vane tests recorded undrained shear strengths of between 6kPa and 32kPa but in many cases no reading could be obtained due to the vane sinking, i.e. very soft consistency. Test pits in these units also often collapsed at shallow depth (less than 3m) due to the saturated soft soils.

Tauranga Group deposits are underlain by sand and silty sand with minor clay (Awhitu Group) at depths of approximately 12m below ground level in the valley floor. The Awhitu Group sand is also exposed in the dam abutments. Awhitu Group deposits observed in test pits at the abutments and in borrow areas and in exposures were generally described as very loose to medium dense, fine grained sand and silty fine-grained sand with no or slight plasticity. Throughout the wider Kaipara area outcrops in road cuttings were observed as moderately weathered, very weak to extremely weak sandstone with thick bedding and occasional discontinuous cemented hard-pan layers. Occasional carbonaceous layers are noted throughout the material in various locations.

The geology and geomorphology of the valley is asymmetrical with steeper slopes on the western abutment, consistent with their orientation on the leeward side of the sand dunes. Therefore, Tauranga Group deposits are likely to from a thicker wedge at the left abutment of the dam in comparison to tapering out over a greater distance on the right.

Awhitu Group sands are generally loose to medium dense and can vary in density with depth (as is common with sand dune deposits). The level of cementation of the dune sand is also variable which is reflected in the CPT results. Abutment slopes in the Awhitu Group appear stable, although surficial failures developed in more recent active dune deposits were noted in places within the reservoir basin. Loose sands recorded nearer the surface on slopes could represent slopewash or colluvium historically washed down from the valley sides.

Awhitu Group deposits observed in borrow areas appear generally suitable for reuse in dam construction subject to further assessment. Layers containing higher proportions of silt and clay could be suitable as low permeability fill, whilst sandy silt and silty sand layers could be utilised as general fill.

Groundwater was typically encountered between 1.0m to 1.5m beneath existing ground level in the valley floor.

Comprehensive ground investigations are currently being undertaken at the site, to date investigation results are consistent with the existing geotechnical model summarised above.

#### 6.0 Dam Arrangement

Two dam height options are presented in this report which correspond to 1.5 or 4.0 million cubic metres of water storage. The relationship between storage volume and reservoir elevation is presented in Figure 1. To achieve the target storage volumes, dam crest elevations of RL 21m and RL 29m respectively are required. The existing ground level in the valley at the dam location is around RL 7m. Dam heights above existing ground level are therefore around 14m and 22m.

It is understood that final storage requirements will depend on demand for water and the storage size adopted for other proposed dam sites. This is why two dam options have been retained at this stage. It is understood that an intermediate dam storage/height combination could be selected for detailed design.

The 4.0 million cubic metre storage option has been used as the basis for the majority of this assessment as this represents the larger dam and associated design considerations.



Figure 1: Stage storage curve for Aratapu Water Storage Reservoir

The 4.0Mm<sup>3</sup> storage dam has been assessed as having a potential impact classification (PIC) of medium (refer RILEY 200240-D). However, it is recognised that the use of the reservoir may result in intensification of development in the area, which could result in a future increase to the PIC. Design standards in keeping with the upper range of a medium PIC have therefore been adopted in accordance with the NZSOLD Guidelines as follows:

- Operating Basis Earthquake (OBE): 1:150 AEP ground motion.
- Seismic Evaluation Earthquake (SEE): 1:2,500 AEP ground motion developed by a probabilistic approach.
- Incremental damage flood (IDF): 1:10,000 AEP event.

Performance standards and recommended factors of safety are nominated by the NZSOLD Guidelines for a range of operational and emergency scenarios. Minimum stability requirements adopted for design for non-seismic load cases are as set out in Table 1. Seismic performance standards are set out in Table 2.

#### Table 1: Minimum Factors of Safety for Slope Stability - Static Assessment (reproduced from NZSOLD, 2015)

Loading Condition	Slope	Minimum Factor of Safety <sup>1,2,4</sup>
End of construction before reservoir filling	Upstream and downstream	1.3
Long-term (steady state seepage, normal reservoir level)	Downstream	1.5
Full or partial rapid drawdown	Upstream	1.2 to 1.3 <sup>3</sup>

Loading Condition	Slope	Minimum Factor of Safety or Acceptable Deformation
Extreme (applied as pseudo-static load)	Upstream and downstream	1.0
OBE (consider embankment response)	Upstream and downstream	Generally 1.0. Minor deformations are acceptable provided the dam remains functional and the resulting damage is easily repairable
SEE (consider embankment response)	Upstream and downstream	Deformations are acceptable provided they do not lead to an uncontrolled release of the impounded contents
Post-earthquake	Upstream and downstream	1.2 to 1.3

# Table 2: Minimum Requirements for Slope Stability - Seismic Assessment(reproduced from NZSOLD, 2015)

#### 6.2 Design Ground Motions

A regional seismic hazard study for the Kaipara area has been commissioned but is not available at the time of writing. For purposes of preliminary geotechnical analysis and design, design ground motions corresponding to the OBE and SEE seismic cases have been obtained from the NZ Transport Agency Bridge Manual as summarised in Table 3.

Table 3:	Desian	around	motions	for Clas	s D/E sites	s from	NZTA	Bridae	Manual
	Design	ground	motions			5 11 0 111		Dilage	manaai

	OBE 1:150 AEP	SEE 1:2,500 AEP
Peak ground acceleration (g)	0.074	0.22
Magnitude (Mw)	5.8	6.5

#### 6.3 Key Dimensions and Features

The adopted typical dam section is outlined in the appended drawing set and incorporates:

- A crest width of 6m.
- Freeboard above full supply level of 2m.
- A geomembrane liner applied to the upstream face of the dam and a 40m wide geomembrane apron extending upstream from the dam toe.

- A low-level irrigation inlet/outlet pipe in the right abutment which also serves as the construction diversion.
- A passive (simple overflow) spillway cut into natural at the right dam abutment.

### 7.0 Design Considerations

#### 7.1 Foundations and Abutments

There are two general foundation treatment options for the portion of the dam underlain by a significant depth of soft Tauranga Group alluvium:

- 1. Limited undercut followed by staged construction, with allowance for settlement of the dam over time.
- 2. Limited undercut and mechanical stabilisation of soft soils to their full depth beneath the dam footprint.

These two options have implications both in terms of construction sequencing and the nature of works conducted on-site. This is discussed further in Section 7.2 and Section 7.3.

For the highest portion of the dam, foundation considerations include soft/compressible soils to a depth of up to 12m, underlying potentially liquefiable sands, and foundation seepage.

For the dam abutments the critical considerations are the potential for liquefaction induced slope instability in a design seismic event and foundation seepage.

#### 7.1.1 Local Precedent for Dams with Soft Soil Foundation Conditions

A considerable thickness of soft soil underlies the dam site in the valley section and is a key consideration for dam design. Two examples of similar reservoirs constructed in Northland are outlined below to highlight how failure can occur on similar soft soil sites, and secondly how appropriate design and construction measures can be implemented to ensure a dam can be safely constructed.

#### 7.1.1.1 Tanekaha Dam

Tanekaha Dam is a 12m high embankment dam which initially failed during the final stages of construction in 1995. The dam is located on the fringes of the Hikurangi Swamp and is underlain by between 12m and 25m of compressible, weak alluvial sediments. Elevated pore pressures occurring within the sediments due to the embankment surcharge resulting in strength loss was suspected to be the cause of failure.

A remedial strategy involving a 4m high fill buttresses, pressure relief wells beneath the downstream shoulder, an inclined chimney drain, and careful monitoring of foundation pore pressures and settlements was implemented – Figure 2. The dam was successfully commissioned in 1996 and has been operating ever since.





#### 7.1.1.2 Wilsons Dam

Wilsons Dam is an 18m high, zoned embankment dam constructed in 2002 approximately 5km north-west of Ruakaka. The dam foundation comprised 15m thick soft alluvial silts and clays interbedded with sands and gravel lenses, i.e. broadly similar soils to those identified at the subject sites. The designers applied the learnings from Tanekaha Dam, implementing specific engineering measures to address seepage, construction stability, settlement, and seismic stability. Figure 3 illustrates a typical cross section through the dam.

#### Figure 3: Cross section of Wilsons Dam



Key features of the successful completion of these two dams included:

- Wide berms on the upstream and downstream shoulders: to consolidate and strengthen a wide area of the foundation.
- Highly plastic core: to accommodate substantial settlements.
- Staged construction: allowing dissipation of excess pore pressure and strength gain between earthworks seasons. During construction, foundation pressures were measured by a series of vibrating wire piezometers; strength gains in the foundation were measured using 'Geonor' shear vane tests.
- Wick drains: to accelerate drainage and consolidation of soft soils.
- Cement-bentonite slurry cut-off wall: to minimise seepage through gravel lenses. Seepage losses were minimised through installation of wick drains and a cut-off wall.

#### 7.2 Staged Construction Approach to Soft Soil

Preliminary modelling of staged construction solution similar to the Tanekaha and Wilsons Dams has been completed for the 1.5Mm<sup>3</sup> storage option at the Aratapu site. The following comments apply to this approach:

- Peat soils encountered within the upper 2m to 4m of the soil profile are not considered suitable for inclusion in the dam foundation. This material requires excavation and disposal outside of the dam footprint.
- Limited dewatering, likely to include installation of surface drains and pumping will be required to support the foundation undercut.
- There are some indications that peat or highly organic soils could extend deeper than the upper 2m to 4m. Further investigation of the foundation is underway but not available at the time of writing. If significant peat or highly organic soil is encountered within the estimated 12m deep alluvial profile, appropriate allowances for decomposition and secondary settlement of the dam foundation will be required.
- On the basis of available data, modelling suggests that construction of the 1.5Mm<sup>3</sup> dam could theoretically be completed within a single 12-month period following foundation preparation, though it would be prudent to assume that it may extend over two seasons.
- Due to the soft soils, to spread foundation loading, significant fill buttresses are needed at the upstream and downstream toe of the dam to enhance embankment stability.
- Initial modelling has indicated to achieve a 12-month construction period, foundation drainage acceleration via installation of wick drains across the dam foundation is required. Additionally, careful management of construction sequencing and monitoring of foundation pore pressures and settlements is required to provide for appropriate safety factors against instability.
- Dam settlements in the order of 2m to 3m are predicted by preliminary modelling, with consolidation occurring during construction and for an estimated period of 35-years following completion of the dam. This will necessitate the design of the dam, liner, and seepage interception features to accommodate ongoing settlement following construction. In addition, a comprehensive monitoring and maintenance programme following filling will be required to confirm the dam is performing appropriately.

Given the large settlements predicted for the 1.5Mm<sup>3</sup> storage option, a similar approach for the larger 4Mm<sup>3</sup> storage option is not currently considered feasible.

#### 7.3 Removal/Stabilisation Approach to Soft Soil

An alternative has been considered that provides for full-depth removal or stabilisation of soft soils. Based on current information these appear to have a maximum depth of around 12m to 15m. It is proposed to excavate the upper 6m by means of temporary sheet-pile walls and well-point dewatering. Stabilisation of a variable depth of soft soil below 6m depth would then be completed to a depth of up to 8m. The following comments apply to this approach:

• Due to the very soft soils encountered to 12m to 15m depth, standard 12m long sheet piles may not have sufficient lateral capacity to allow excavation up against the sheet pile wall. The currently preferred option is to set-back the sheet pile wall from the dam toe so that a battered slope can be formed within the dewatered natural ground as shown in the appended drawing set.

- The dewatering programme applies to the entire dam footprint and will be relatively extensive is terms of the pumped water volumes and the duration.
- Once excavation and dewatering are complete, mass stabilisation of soft soils is proposed using lime or cement (or possibly a combination) by means of soil mixing with the in-situ foundation material. Excavator-mounted equipment is available in New Zealand that can stabilise to 8m depth relatively efficiently – refer to Figure 4 for an indication of the equipment involved.
- The mix design for lime or cement stabilisation is dependent on the composition of the in-situ soils, and chemical testing and dosing trials are required to support the detailed design. However, based on experience in other areas of New Zealand and published research, dosing rates are likely to be in the range 10% to 15% by mass.
- Where peat or organic soils require stabilisation at depth, there is additional complexity in the design process. Typically, organic soils do not experience the same strength gains as silt and clay soils and may still be subject to ongoing settlement. Indications of the improvement to primary and secondary consolidation coefficients for various cement dosage rates are shown in Figure 5, reproduced from a case study on Indian Peat by Paul and Hussain (2019)<sup>1</sup>.
- Following mass stabilisation, backfill of the excavated ground would be completed using compacted earth fill. Removal of dewatering equipment and sheet piles can occur once dam fill is above natural groundwater level.

# Figure 4: Mass stabilisation equipment (graphic reproduced from Juha et al 2018)



The removal and stabilisation approach removes the upper soft and compressible soils from within the dam footprint while significantly improving the strength and settlement characteristics of the underlying in-situ soils, allowing a higher embankment to be safely constructed without limitations on the rate of construction, or concerns around long-term excessive settlement. Initial indications are that this would also remove the need for the wide buttress fill required for stability in the staged approach, reducing the overall dam fill volume.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Abhinaba Paul, Monowar Hussain. An experiential investigation on the compressibility behaviour of cement-treated Indian peat. Bulletin of Engineering Geology and the Environment, September 2019.





The removal and stabilisation approach is considered to be appropriate for both 1.5Mm<sup>3</sup> and 4Mm<sup>3</sup> dam options.

#### 7.4 Liquefaction Susceptibility

Liquefaction can occur in saturated loose to medium-dense cohesionless deposits (sands and non-plastic silts) under moderate to severe ground shaking. Geologically recent materials, or very weak manmade fills are typically the most susceptible soils.

The soft Tauranga Group sediments are not considered at risk of liquefaction due to their composition, which is dominated by peat and plastic organic soils.

Soils become more resistant to liquefaction as they become older due to densification and various weathering and chemical cementation processes. The Awhitu Group dune sand deposits are assigned to the Late Pliocene age (1.8M to 3.6M-years old). There is evidence of cementation of sand grains and "hardpan" features in weathered outcrops around the site, which have a strength consistent with "weak rock" in terms of the NZGS field description guidelines (Photo 1)



Photo 1: Weathered dune outcrop showing cemented layering

Published guidance from Youd & Perkins (1978) indicates that dune sands of this age are "very unlikely" to be susceptible to liquefaction. This conclusion is reinforced by the observation that almost all liquefaction case history data are from Holocene deposits or constructed fills (Idris & Boulanger 2008). However, soil aging effects are difficult to quantify and are not typically included in design procedures.

Against the above comments, CPT and standard penetration testing available at the time of writing indicates that the aged dune deposits forming the right-abutment ridge comprise "loose sand". Application of available empirical liquefaction assessment methods indicates that this material is likely to be subject to liquefaction to 10m to 15m depth in a SEE event if it is in a saturated state. Unsaturated sands above water table are not susceptible to liquefaction.

The potential for Awhitu Group sands to be liquefiable has been identified by others, including ENGEO in their 2019 report for the Kaipara District Council.<sup>2</sup> This desktop study classified similar Pleistocene-aged dunes elsewhere Pouto Peninsula as having "medium liquefaction and lateral spread potential" on the basis of their anticipated composition, whilst noting the positive effects of soil aging.

Pending the outcome of further testing at the detailed design stage together with the recommendations of the anticipated regional seismic hazard study for the Kaipara area, the Awhitu Group dunes are assumed to be susceptible to liquefaction.

#### 7.5 Liquefaction Effects and Mitigation

Liquefaction effects on dam structures can include settlement resulting in cracking, loss of freeboard, lateral spreading of the dam shoulders, lateral spread of the abutments, and foundation bearing failure.

Within the centre portion of the dam where a significant thickness of soft soil (or improved soil) is present, preliminary modelling indicates that stability of the dam is unlikely to be affected by strength loss associated with liquefaction. Liquefaction induced settlements are predicted in the order of up to 200mm, though it is not clear that this would result in differential settlement of the dam with respect to the surrounding country.

The more critical location is near the dam abutments, where little to no capping of non-liquefiable soil is present within the dam foundation. Also, the natural dune formation of the right dam abutment is relatively narrow, and potentially at risk of liquefaction induced damage. In these locations modelling using liquefied strength parameters indicates that ground remediation is required to meet adopted stability and performance criteria.

The primary design response is the inclusion of a low permeability geomembrane liner to the dam and abutments, including a 40m apron extending upstream from the toe. This liner, together with a high-capacity upstream toe drain, is designed to limit the height to which the in-situ sand in the area can become saturated. All sand above groundwater level can be considered non-liquefiable. The effectiveness of this groundwater control system will be subject to ongoing verification and monitoring during dam filling and operation.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> ENGEO Limited. Geotechnical Assessment West Coast Sites Kaipara District (2019). Prepared for Kaipara District Council

For the portions of the dam abutments below groundwater level that remain saturated, liquefaction can still occur, and assessment of the dam performance in these areas has been completed. Modelling indicates that the stability of the downstream dam shoulder in the abutment area needs to be improved for the post-seismic liquefaction case. Buttress options have been evaluated but were found to be geometrically complex and not particularly effective. The preferred solution is to use the mass stabilisation equipment earmarked for improvement of the soft organic soils to form an 8m deep and approximately 20m wide "shear key" beneath the dam. Analysis indicates that, if appropriately positioned, this key has the potential to provide acceptable dam stability and deformation performance, even if liquefiable soils are present below the 8m treatment depth.

#### 7.6 Cyclic Softening

As noted, in Section 7.5, fine grained soils with significant plasticity are not considered liquefiable. However soft or sensitive cohesive sediments can be subject to cyclic softening. The mechanism for this softening is similar to liquefaction insofar as high intensity cyclic loading can cause significant shear strains to accumulate, with a corresponding increase in pore pressure and temporary reduction in shear strength.

A quantitative assessment of cyclic softening has not been completed and would only be of importance if a staged construction approach was adopted, with the dam being founded on the fine-grained Tauranga Group alluvium.

#### 7.7 Seepage Design/Internal Stability

The primary water retaining element in the dam is the geomembrane liner. An HDPE or EPDM product will be specified in the detailed design phase, underlain by a non-woven geofabric.

There is the potential for a distributed or concentrated leak in the geomembrane liner on the upstream dam shoulder. In the case of leakage, flow is expected to drain through the upstream dam shoulder fill or track down the back of the geomembrane and be intercepted either by the high capacity upstream toe drain, or strip drains, and discharged at the downstream dam toe.

The upstream toe drain will be designed to be filter compatible with the surrounding materials and will include a central high capacity drainage zone. An integral sloping upstream foundation cut-off drain is also provided to intercept any foundation seepage occurring beneath the liner apron.

A critical element for seepage design is the low-level outlet pipe penetration. The stiffness contrast between the pipe and the surrounding soil leads to the potential for differential movement and local flaws either within the soil or at the connection to the geomembrane liner.

A number of defensive design features are provided for the outlet pipe including:

- The conduit is to be founded within Awhitu Sand in the right abutment to minimise the risk of settlement induced damage as the dam is constructed.
- Concrete encasement of the conduit, to eliminate the potential for un-compacted fill within the pipe haunch zone.
- Sloped sides to the concrete encasement, to minimise the potential for cracking in the event of dam fill settlement.
- Inclusion of a filter compatible drainage surround to the culvert.

• De-pressurisation of the culvert once it has finished functioning as the construction diversion. Filling and emptying the reservoir will be by means of a smaller pressurised pipe suspended within the main concrete pipe.

#### 7.8 Reservoir Leakage

WWLA prepared a memo summarising a hydrogeological study into leakage rates for the dune lakes on the Pouto Peninsula undertaken by Jacobs NZ Ltd in 2014.

The study was based on a catchment model developed using the Soil Moisture Water Balance Model (SMWBM). The model used parameters such as daily rainfall and average monthly evaporation data combined with the local geology and vegetation to generate a daily stream flow and simulate soil moisture storage, attenuation, and losses through time. Nine lakes on the Pouto Peninsula were examined with 5.5m to 37m lake water depths. Estimated lake leakage rates ranged from 0.11mm to 1.32mm per day as a function of depth. It is not clear whether the presence of tomo or other erosional features were identified within the lakes of that study.

The reservoir for the Aratapu dam varies up to a maximum of 20m depth. Based on the findings above, we would anticipate reservoir leakage rates to be in a similar order, i.e. up to around 1mm per day or less which is considered acceptable. However, the presence of tomo features and springs within the reservoir basins would increase these leakage rates. Foundation seepages are anticipated to be minor owing to the reasonable thickness of generally low permeability soils.

#### 7.9 Reservoir Slope Stability

The dunes generally have gently rounded to flat ridge crests, flanked by moderate to steep slopes. The steeper slopes (24° to 34°) typically show signs of colluvium accumulation at their base and may be subject to soil creep. Exposed sand soils have limited resistance to erosion, and incised gully features are present where overland flow paths concentrate near the valley floor.

Tomos, or collapsed gully erosion features, are known to exist nearby and are typically located downslope of ponds and upslope of steep to very steep slopes. The depth of these can vary considerably but are often in the order of 1m to 3m deep and from 2m to 20m wide.

Generally, slope instability on the reservoir margins is expected to be minor in nature and unlikely to represent a hazard for the dam. Maintenance of grass and vegetative cover in the slopes above reservoir level is recommended to further minimise the potential for shallow slumping or erosion.

#### 7.10 Spillway Cut

Design of the spillway cut is covered in RILEY report RILEY Ref: 200240-D. Geotechnical considerations relevant to the spillway relate largely to protection of the underlying Awhitu Group sands from erosion. If disturbed, the fine sand making up the invert and side slopes of the channel are likely to be erodible under surface flows. In addition, careful detailing for seepage control is required where hard materials are used such as concrete linings or nib walls, as water tracking beneath such interfaces could cause internal erosion.

All non-engineered spillway surfaces should have topsoil cover reinstated with grass cover following excavation.

### 8.0 Construction Considerations

#### 8.1 Site Establishment and Traffic Movement

A new track and site turn-off area from West Coast Road is likely to be required to enable construction traffic and workers to safely access the site. During periods of rainfall the site can quickly become muddy and slippery. Haul roads and site access tracks will require surfacing with imported aggregate.

Construction will largely be conducted using site derived materials. Key materials to be transported to site include filter compatible drainage aggregate, geomembrane and geosythetics.

#### 8.1.1 Site Preparation and Stream Diversion

The location of the diversion culvert in the right abutment is arranged so that work required to install the culvert can be undertaken in the dry, without accessing the soft central portion of the valley. Construction of the coffer dam located upstream from the main site works will be required prior to dewatering and excavation activities commencing in the valley floor.

A risk-based assessment of the level of flood protection provided by the diversion works is presented in RILEY report RILEY Ref: 200240-D.

A significant initial task will be the excavation of unsuitable peat-dominated soil from within the dam footprint. It is anticipated that this material can be disposed of on-site, for example by re-spreading it on land for agricultural benefit or infilling and re-contouring a gully-head outside of the immediate area of the dam. Care is required to ensure peat and organic earth fills do not generate a risk either from instability or erosion. The gully into which the spillway discharges should not be used for disposal of unsuitables.

#### 8.2 Earthworks and Dam Fill

General dam fill will be obtained from onsite sources of Awhitu Group sand and silt mixtures. Several potential borrow sites have been identified within the reservoir area.

Sand dominated earth fills tend to require the addition of significant moisture to achieve an acceptable degree of compaction. This will necessitate access to a locally derived water source. The compacted sand fill is likely to be relatively free draining but may be subject to erosion due to water flow for example from rainfall on dam batters during construction.

#### 8.3 Erosion and Sediment Control

Further to the potential for erosion of compacted dam fill, there is potential for open borrow areas or potions of the dam footprint that have been stripped of topsoil to erode. Construction is to be managed to minimise the area of exposed soil at any time. Completed borrow areas shall be reinstated for example by using unsuitable soils obtained from the dam foundation undercut.

Appropriate sediment control is likely to take the form of careful worksite drainage, silt fences, and collection of site runoff into sediment stilling areas as indicated in the drawings.

# 9.0 Limitation

This report has been prepared solely for the benefit of the Te Tai Tokerau Water Trust as our client with respect to the brief and the relevant government authorities in processing the consent. The reliance by other parties on the information or opinions contained in the report shall, without our prior review and agreement in writing, be at such parties' sole risk.

Recommendations and opinions in this report are based on data from limited test positions. The nature and continuity of subsoil conditions away from the test positions are inferred, and it must be appreciated that actual conditions could vary considerably from the assumed model.

# APPENDIX A Test Pit Logs



2	RI CONS Engineers	ULT/ and G	EY ANTS eologists	Riley Consultants Level 1, 4 Fred Thomas Driv Auckland 0622 Tel: 09 489 7872	Limited <sup>e</sup>									T	ES	r f	Ы.	T LOG			
Proje	ct: hland l	rria	ation Pre	-Feasibility	Locatio	on: Te Kopu	ıru. Kair	ara	Coast	Ho t P	ole pos (13 Sp	ition: illway.	. W of I	idaeta	D.				N	0.:	
Job N	lo.: 19		2	Start Date: 30- Finish Date: 30-	04-20 04-20	Grour	nd Level	(m):	:	С	o-Ordi	nates	(Mt Ed	en 200	00):				TF	<b>P</b> 01	
Clier	it: orthlan	d Re	egional C	L			Hole D 5.70 r	epth n	:								Shee	et: 1	of 1		
uoi o	я ш	Unit					σ	lodn								ater	nre	s			
Elevat (m)	Depth (	Geological	(refe	Geological Desc er to separate Geotechnic nformation sheet for furth	ription cal and Geo ler informat	ological tion)	Legen	Unified Syr	Soil	She (I <u>) 10</u>	ar Stre (Pa) <u>0 150 2</u>	200	Scala (blov <u>3</u>	Penetro vs / 50 i	ometer mm) <u>12 1</u>	Groundwa	D Soil Moist	Sample		Tests	
	- 0.15		TOPSOIL				( [ [ [ [ [ [ [ [ [ [ [ [ [ [ [ [ [		×											∨ <sup>V= 41</sup> R= 23	
	- - - 0.70		Silty SAN sand, ver 0.50 m Be	D; light grey. Stiff/very loc y fine [AWHITU FIXED D ecomes very stiff to hard.	ose; dry; no UNE DEPC	n plastic; DSITS].	× .	}				 								∽ V= 203+	
	- - - <u>11.00</u>		Moderate fractured weak; we horizonta	ly weathered; light orange silty SANDSTONE. Very akly cemented; closely sp fractures filled with roote	e brown clo weak to ex baced, narn ets [HARD	osely tremely ow, sub PAN].	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	*									м			∽ V= 203+	
	-		Silty SAN moist; slig thin lense 1.40 m Be	D, some clay; light brown htly plastic with 1m long, s of organic silt. ecomes stiff.	d; × · ·	> >		       										√ V= 98 R= 49			
	- 2 		SILT, son to very sti	ne organics, trace to som ff; moist; slightly plastic; c	e clay; dark organics, ar	c brown. St morphous.	iff × · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	>													
	- - 	Group					× × ** ×					*   								∽ V= 203+	
	<u>3</u> 3.00 	- Awhitu	SAND; lig fine; limor	ht orange to light yellow. nite staining.	Medium de	ense; sand,	,    	· · ·				×   					мw			∽ V= 203+	
	-		Silty SAN Loose/ve medium.	D, trace clay; light yellow ry stiff; moist to wet; non p	to light ora blastic; san	nge. d, fine to	× · . · · ·	>		     	       									∨ V= 139 R= 75	
	- 4 -						× · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	> >				-       								∽ V= 203+	
	-						· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	> >													
	- 5 - -						× .	>													
	- - 5.70	V.	F011 5	70			× .	*													
	-		EOH @ 5	0.70 m																	
Exp Rock weath comp Relat firm/n	lanatic Mass W hered, mo letely we ive soil S hedium d Small Dis arge Dis	tring - unwea tely weather ed, residual th - very sof , stiff/dense, d Sample d Sample	a Penetron neability Te nidt Hamm J Vane She eak, R=Re enetrate er Strike (1s	neter - blov est ear Strengt sidual, UTF st, 2nd) a	vs/50n h (kPa P=Una nd	nm [ i) ible [	GRC	DUNDW None Slow Se Rapid Ir E TERM	ATER eep (de nflow ( //INATE	epth) depth) ED DUE	TO:				Remarks						
All d	J100 Un	in metre	utes)			Ta	irget De	pth	h Shear Vane No.					Logged by: Checked by							
	Sca	ie 1:	:34	CAT 313F										1706	C			AW	I	SRO	

2	RI CONS Engineers	ULT.	<b>EY</b> ANTS eologists	Riley Consultants Level 1, 4 Fred Thomas Driv Auckland 0622 Tel: 09 489 7872	Limited								TEST PI							T LOG				
Proje	ct:		tion Dro		Locatio	on:	ru Koin		Casat	Ho	le po	osition:	abt A	hutma	t					N	0.:			
Job N	lo.:	niya 197'		Start Date: 30	-04-20	Groun	d Level	(m):	Coasi		o-Orc	dinates	s (Mt I	Eden	2000)	):				TF	<b>20</b> 2			
Clien	t:	)211	2	Finish Date: 30	-04-20		Hole D	epth	:										Shee	et:				
No	orthlan	d Re	egional (	Council			4.20 n	n T												1 0	of 1			
Elevation (m )	Depth (m)	Geological Unit	(ref	Geological Desc fer to separate Geotechn Information sheet for furt	cription ical and Geo her informati	ological ion)	Legend	Unified Symbol	Soil :	Shea (k	ar Sti Pa) 150	rength	Sca (t	ala Pen blows / 6	etrome 50 mn 9 1	eter n) 12 1	Groundwater	Soil Moisture	Samples		Tests			
	- 0.15		TOPSOI	-														D						
	- 0.40 -		Silty SAN plastic; s	ID; orange brown. Hard/r and, fine [AWHITU FIXEI	nedium den DDUNE DE	se; non POSITS].		> - >	           		   				   						∨ V= 46 R= 17			
-	- - 1 -		Silty SAN stiff/loose 0.90 m G	ID, some clay; light gray l e; dry; slightly plastic; san irades to light brown to o	o light yellov d, fine. range brown	w. Very	× · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	> >													∽ V= 203+			
-	- - - -						× .    	>													∽ V= 203+			
-	- 2 - -	whitu Group –	2.00 m - brown; sl	2.50 m Minor amorphous ightly plastic.	s organics; d	ark orange	× . × . × .	>				  -  -									∽ V= 203+			
-	-	4					× · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	>				- 									∨ V= 203+			
	- 3 - -						× · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	>		▲       	×     										∨ V= 125 R= 72			
	- - - -		Sandy Si stiff; mois organics.	LT, minor clay; dark orar st to wet; non plastic; san	ge brown. V d, fine; trace	ery stiff to		> -		 ▲     	×     							мw			∨ <sup>V= 122</sup> R= 72			
-	- 4 						× × × ×			 	 ×  	   			   	     					∨ V= 136 R= 70			
	- -		EOH @ 4	4.20 m											   									
	-														   									
-	- 5 -										   				   									
-	-																							
-	-										     				   									
Expl Rock weath compl Relati firm/m	anatio Mass We ered, mo letely we ve soil S nedium de Gmall Dis arge Dis	ns: eathe odera ather treng ense turbe turbe	ring - unwe tely weathe ed, residua th - very so stiff/dense d Sample d Sample	athered, slightly red, highly weathered, lly weathered ft/very loose, soft/loose, , very stiff/very dense	V Scala Perm V Schrr V Insitu V=Pe to per to per Vate Vate Vate	ieter - blow st er ar Strengt sidual, UTF st, 2nd) , 2nd) a	l vs/50n h (kPa P=Una nd	nm ( 		JND None Slow S Rapid	VATER Seep (o Inflow	FER p (depth ) w (depth )						Remarks arial @0.15mbgl extended down ıbgl in E. cnr Tree erosion channel?						
∎ u All di	J100 Und mensi	ons	in metre	Rig Type:	∑ Rise	Time (minu	utes)			Tar	get D	epth		Shea 1	ar Va 706	ne N	lo.	L	.ogged	l by:	Checked b			

Project:         Location:           Northland Irrigation Pre-Feasibility         K13, Te Kopu												Hole positi  uru, Kaipara Coast   Middle of							n:	nkm	ont		No.:					
ortn o N				re-i	Sta	rt Da	y ate:	30-	04-2	<u>20</u>	Grour	nd Leve	ipar el (r	n):	Jast	Co	-Or	dinate	es (N	nkm 1t Ed	ent en 2	000)	):				TF	<b>2</b> 03
en	t:		<u>.</u>		FINI	sn L		30-	04-2	20		Hole [	Сер	th:												Shee	et:	
No	rthland	i Re ≝	egiona		Junc	41			4.00 m											1	of 1							
E)	Depth (m	Geological Ur	Geological Description (refer to separate Geotechnical and Geological Information sheet for further information)									Leaend		Unified Symbo	Soil \$	Shea (kF	r St Pa)	rengt	th <sup>s</sup>	Scala (blov	Pene ws / 5	trome 0 mm	eter 1) 2 1/	Groundwate	Soil Moisture	Samples		Tests
	0.15		TOPS	SOIL								<u>l</u> l	1												DM M			
			Orga wet; o ALLU	nic SII organio VIUM	_T; da cs, fibi i].	rk bro rous p	wn, mo	ottled emains	dark s [TAI	grey. JRAN	Spongy; fi IGA GROI		× × * *		×     							     		04/2020	w			V= 2 VR= 9 rooth
	- 1 - 1 - - 1.40		1.00 m Minor wood inclusions. Soft; saturated.										<u>×,</u> × ×	       	<       							     		<u> </u>	s			V= 1 → R= 5 rootI
		Group	Organic clayey SILT; dark reddish brown. Soft; saturated liquid limit exceeded; organics, fibrous plant remains, strong hydrogen sulfide odour.									₹ Æ	       								     						∨ V= 8 R= 6 V= 6	
	-2	Tauranga (											< + + +/ < + < + < + < + < + < + < + < +	- × × × × × × ×-														V= 6 V= 6 V= 6 R= - sanl rem
												× × × × × × × × × × × × × × × × × × ×																V -
	4.00												<   <									   						
	4 <del>00</del>	_ <b>y</b>	Colla EOH	0.000 000 000 000 000 000 000 000 000 0	rom 4 10 m	mbgl	to 3mb	ogl.																				~-
	- 5																					     						
	-																					     						
(pla ck f atho nplo lativ n/m	anatio Mass We ered, mo etely wea ve soil Si edium de mall Disi	ns: eathe derai athere rengt ense, urbee	ring - u tely wea ed, resid th - very stiff/de d Samp	there there tually soft/ nse, v	hered d, high weath very lc 'ery st	, sligh nly we nered pose, s	tly athere soft/loc y dense	ed, ose, e	¥ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓ ↓	Scala Perm Schn Insitu V=Pe to pe Wate	a Penetror neability Te nidt Hamm I Vane Sho eak, R=Re enetrate er Strike (1	neter - blo est ear Strens sidual, U st, 2nd	gth (l TP=L	50mm kPa) Jnable	) [ ] [	GROL N X SI R	JND None low apid	WATE Seep Inflov	ER (dep v (de	th 1.0 pth)	m)			1. 3 und onl cal	33mr drain y and ibrati	R m shean ed shea d conditi ion.	emarl vane bla rstrengt onal on	KS ade was use ths are estir results of

2	RI CONS Engineers	ULT.	EY ANTS eologists	Riley Consultants I Level 1, 4 Fred Thomas Drive Auckland 0622 Tel: 09 489 7872	imited		TES	ST	PI.	T L	OG						
Proje	ct:	rria	ation Pre	-Feasibility	Locatio	on: Te Kopu	ru Kair	ara	Coast	Hole po	osition:	ment				No.:	
Job N	No.: 19(	)272	2	Start Date: 30-0	)4-20	Groun	id Level	(m)		Co-Or	dinates (N	Vt Eden 2000):				TP04	
Clier	nt:						Hole D	epth	:						Shee	et:	
	orthlan	d Re 	·												1 of 1		
Elevatio (m)	Depth (m	Geological Ur	(refe	Geological Descr er to separate Geotechnic nformation sheet for furthe	ription al and Geo er informat	ological ion)	Legend	Unified Symb	Soil :	Shear St (kPa) 100 150	rength	Scala Penetromete (blows / 50 mm)	er Broundwate	Soil Moisture	Samples	Tests	
	- 0.15 -		TOPSOIL				/ <u>`×``</u> .		X				i	MW		∨ V= 46 R= 12	-
	- 0.40 	olluvium —	Silty SAN orange. F [COLLUV	D, minor clay; light yellow, ïrm; moist to wet; non plas ïIUM].	mottled da stic; sand, f	ark brown, fine		2 	 							∨ V= 41 R= 6	-
	- - 1	Ŭ	Silty SAN slightly pla rootlets.	D; dark brown to black. Fi astic; sand, fine; organics,	rm/very loc amorphou	ose; wet; us and	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	2 2 2					1/05/2020				
	- <u>1.20</u>      - 2	*	Silty PEA saturated inclusions tree trunk	T; black, mottled dark grey ; non plastic; organics, lar, and plant remains; no sh [TAURANGA GROUP AL	/. Spongy; ge tree trui earvane te LUVIUM].	soft; nk, wood est due to	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·							S			-
	- 2.20   - 2.80	<ul> <li>Tauranga Group</li> </ul>	Sandy Cla saturated sulfide od	ayey SILT, trace organics; ; moderately plastic; sand our.	greyish br , fine; stror	rown. Soft; ng hydroge	·n × · · × · × · × · × · × · × · × · × ·	<u>&gt;</u> .	                 							∨ <sup>V= 26</sup> R= 0	-
	- 3 -		2.80 m Co Silty sand highly pla	ollapse above 2.8m, bulgi ly CLAY; light greyish brov stic; sand, fine.	ng. vn. Very so ck specks.	oft; saturate	×, ×, ×, ×, ×, ×, ×, ×, ×, ×, ×, ×, ×, ×	-	       							∨ V= 32 R= 04	-
	- - - - 3.70							-	     							∨ <sup>V= 32</sup> R= 04	-
	- 4 - -		Collapsed EOH @ 3	i .70 m													-
	-																-
																	-
	  																-
	-																
Exp Rock weath comp Relati firm/n	lanatio Mass We hered, mo letely we ive soil S hedium d Small Dis Large Dis	NS: eathe dera ather treng ense turbe turbe	ering - unwea tely weather ed, residual th - very sof , stiff/dense, d Sample ed Sample	athered, slightly red, highly weathered, ly weathered t/very loose, soft/loose, very stiff/very dense	<ul> <li>V Scala</li> <li>Perm</li> <li>V Schn</li> <li>✓ Insitu</li> <li>V=Pe</li> <li>to pe</li> <li>Wate</li> <li>Vate</li> </ul>	a Penetron neability Te nidt Hamm Vane She eak, R=Re netrate er Strike (1 er Rise (1st	neter - blov st er sidual, UTF sidual, UTF st, 2nd) a	vs/50n h (kPa >=Una nd	nm ( i) [ ible [ H	GROUND None X Slow Rapid	WATER Seep (dep I Inflow (de RMINATEL	oth 1.2 m) epth ) O DUE TO:	1. dig an de	Move ger a d ste bris.	R ed 10m c access. S ep; poss	emarks lownslope for safe Slope was a bit bogg ibly located on slip	у
All d	imensi Sca	ons e 1	in metre	Rig Type: CAT 313F	<u>⊥</u> Rise	l'ime (mini	utes)			Jonapo		Shear Vane 1706	No.	L	ogged AW	by: Checked	by:

2	RI CONS Engineers	ULT.	ANTS eologists Riley Consultants Level 1, 4 Fred Thomas Dr Auckland 0622 Tel: 09 489 7872	LIMITED						TEST PIT LOG				OG
Proje	ct:			Location:			•	Hole pos	sition:		No.:			No.:
Job N	land I	rriga	Start Date: 30	-04-20 Grou	uru, Kaip nd Level	mara (m)	Coast	Co-Ordi	nates (I	toe of embankme Mt Eden 2000):	ent, centre.			TP06
Clien	190 .t <sup>.</sup>	)272	2 Finish Date: 30	-04-20	Hole D	enth					Sheet:			st.
Nc	orthlan	d Re	egional Council		3.00 r	n					1 of 1			1 of 1
Elevation (m)	Depth (m)	Geological Unit	Geological Des (refer to separate Geotechr Information sheet for fur	cription ical and Geological ther information)	Legend	Unified Symbol	Soil S	Shear Stre (kPa)	ength	Scala Penetrometer (blows / 50 mm) 3 6 9 12 1	م Groundwater	Soil Moisture	Samples	Tests
	- 0.15		TOPSOIL				I I					DM WS	6	
	-		Organic clayey SILT; dark brown. saturated; moderately plastic; org remains, tree trunks etc [TAURAI ALLUVIUM]. 0.70 m Tree trunk, ~500mm dia.	Soft to firm; wet to anics, fibrous plant NGA GROUP firm, fibrous.	× × × × × × × ×									∨ V= 11 R= 3
	1 - - - - <u>1.50</u>	inga Group				· · · ·	   xd				1 30/04/2020	s		∨ V= 9 ∨ R= 2 ∨ V= 7 R= 2
	- - - - <u>2<sup>2.00</sup></u>	Taura	Organic silty CLAY; dark orange liquid limit exceeded; organics, fit	orown, Soft; saturated rous wood. soft: Spongy: fibrous:			             							V= 6
	- - 2.50		saturated; organics, wood, and p hydrogen sulfide odour. 2.50 m Collapsing due to slow gr	ant remains; strong oundwater ingress from										
	- - - - <u>3</u> 3.00	V	above. Material saturated. Organic clayey SILT; dark reddisl saturated; liquid limit exceeded; c remains and tree trunks/roots up	n brown. Very soft; rganics, fibrous plant to~300mm.										<ul><li>✓-</li></ul>
	-		EOH @ 3.00 m											
	- 4 - -													
	- - -													
	- 5 - -													-
	- - - -													
Expl Rock weath comp Relati firm/m \$ \$ \$ \$ \$	Anatio Mass We ered, mo letely we ve soil S nedium d Small Dis arge Dis J100 Uno	ns: eather odera ather treng ense turbe turbe distur	ering - unweathered, slightly ttely weathered, highly weathered, ed, residually weathered th - very soft/very loose, soft/loose, , stiff/dense, very stiff/very dense ed Sample bed Sample bed Sample	<ul> <li>✓ Scala Penetro</li> <li>✓ Permeability T</li> <li>✓ Schmidt Hamr</li> <li>✓ Insitu Vane Sh</li> <li>V=Peak, R=Re</li> <li>to penetrate</li> <li>✓ Water Strike (1</li> <li>✓ Water Rise (15</li> <li>✓ Rise Time (mir</li> </ul>	meter - blov est ner ear Strengt esidual, UTF 1st, 2nd) a st, 2nd) a	h (kPa P=Una	nm G	GROUNDW GROUNDW None Slow Se Rapid II IOLE TERM Collapse	/ATER eep (dep nflow (de VINATED	oth 1.5 m ) epth ) DUE TO:	1. un onl cal	33m drair ly an librai	R m shean ned shea id conditi tion.	emarks vane blade was used - rstrengths are estimates onal on results of
All di	imensi Sca	ons le 1	in metres Rig Type: :34 CAT 313F				I			Shear Vane N 1706	lo.	l	Logged AW	I by: Checked by: T SRO

2	RI CONS Engineers	ULT.	EY ANTS eologists	Riley Consultants L Level 1, 4 Fred Thomas Drive Auckland 0622 Tel: 09 489 7872	_imited							TES	TF	Ы.	T L	OG	İ
Proje	ect: thland l	rria	ation Pre	-Feasibility	Locatio	on: Te Konu	ru Kain	ara	Coast	Hole p	position:	Area				N	0.:
Job	No.: 19(	)272	2	Start Date: 30-0	04-20	Groun	d Level	(m):		Co-O	rdinates	(Mt Eden 2000):	ТР07			<b>P</b> 07	
Clie	nt:		_		54 20		Hole D	epth	:					Sheet:			- <b>F</b> _ <b>A</b>
	ortnian	3 R0					4.20 h	n lo									
Elevatio (m)	Depth (m	Geological Ur	(refe	Geological Descr er to separate Geotechnic nformation sheet for furthe	ription al and Geo er informat	blogical ion)	Legend	Unified Symb	Soil S	Shear S (kPa)	Strength ) 50 200	Scala Penetrometer (blows / 50 mm) 3 6 9 12	Groundwate	C Soil Moisture	Samples		Tests
	- 0.15	A					( <u>× ; .</u>				ĺ		i				✓ V= 41 R= 12
	- 0.35 - - -		Silty SAN sand, fine	D; light grey. Loose/very s [AWHITU GROUP FIXED	stiff; dry; no D DUNE D	on plastic; EPOSITS].		<u>,</u>			* +						✓ V= 203+ ✓ V= 203+
	0.90		Sandy Sil plastic; sa Sandy Sil to modera	LT, some clay; light grey. V ately plastic: sand. fine.	√ery stiff; n	noist; slight	ly x x				- - 			м			∽ V= 203+ _
	-		1.20 m Be	ecomes slightly plastic.			× × ×				     *		   				√ V= 203+
													    				、 V= 92
	2.20	Awhitu Group	SILT, son grey. Ver fibrous.	ne clay, trace sand, trace t y stiff; moist; slightly plastic	to minor ro c; sand, fin	otlets; light e; rootlets,			▲       	×        			     				R= 14
	-		Silty SAN plastic; sa 2.60 m M	D; light grey to dark browr and, fine. inor clay, trace organics. S	n. Very stiff Slightly plas	; moist, nor stic;	n   X   · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				×   		     				✓ V= 203+
	<u>3.00</u> - -		SILT, son	amorphous. ne clay, some sand, trace ery stiff: moist: slightly plas	to organics	s; dark îne:	× · . · . · . × ×				+ + -		     				∽ V= 203+ _
	-		organics,	amorphous.													
	- 4 	V					× × × × × ×				*						∽ V= 203+ _
1	-		EOH @ 4	l.20 m													
	- - 5																-
	-																
	-																
Fyr		ns:			<b>X</b>							, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,				omor	
Roci weat com Rela firm/	k Mass We thered, mo pletely we tive soil S medium d Small Dis	ather ather ather reng ense	ering - unwea tely weather ed, residual th - very sof , stiff/dense, d Sample	athered, slightly red, highly weathered, ly weathered it/very loose, soft/loose, very stiff/very dense	▼ Scala Perm ▼ Schn ∨ Insitu V=Pe to pe ₩ Wate	a Penetrom neability Tes nidt Hamme I Vane She eak, R=Res netrate er Strike (1s	ieter - blov st er ar Strengt sidual, UTF st, 2nd)	vs/50n h (kPa P=Una	nm   G a) ible   [	X Nor Slow Rapi	VVATER ne V Seep (d id Inflow	depth) (depth)			K	einark	.5
	Large Dis U100 Und	turbe listur ons	ed Sample bed Sample in metre	Rig Type:	Ţ Wate ⊥ Rise	er Rise (1st Time (minu	, 2nd) a utes)	nd		Target	Depth	Shear Vane N	 No.	L	oggeo	by:	Checked by

# APPENDIX B CPT Results



Project:

Location:



#### **Overlay basic interpretation plots**

![](_page_31_Picture_0.jpeg)

Project:

Location:

![](_page_31_Figure_4.jpeg)

#### Normalized basic plots

![](_page_32_Picture_0.jpeg)

Project:

Location:

![](_page_32_Figure_4.jpeg)

#### Overlay estimation plots (1)

![](_page_33_Picture_0.jpeg)

#### Project:

Location:

![](_page_33_Figure_4.jpeg)

#### Overlay estimation plots (2)

![](_page_34_Picture_0.jpeg)

#### Project:

Location:

![](_page_34_Figure_4.jpeg)

# **APPENDIX C**

RILEY Dwgs: 200240/2-0 to -3, -101 to -109

# TE TAI TOKERAU WATER TRUST

# ARATAPU WATER STORAGE RESERVOIR

**DRAWING LIST - AUGUST 2020** 

DWG. No.	TITLE	REV
200240/1-0	DRAWING LIST & LOCATION PLAN	1
200240/1-1	DAM SITE AND INVESTIGATION PLAN	1
200240/1-2	DAM GEOTECHNICAL SECTION A	1
200240/1-3	DAM GEOTECHNICAL CROSS SECTION B	1
200240/1-101	DAM AND RESERVOIR LAYOUT - 4 Mm <sup>3</sup> OPTION	1
200240/1-102	DAM EMBANKMENT LAYOUT - 4 Mm <sup>3</sup> OPTION	1
200240/1-103	SPILLWAY DETAILS - 4 Mm <sup>3</sup> OPTION	1
200240/1-104	DAM EMBANKMENT DETAILS - 4 Mm <sup>3</sup> OPTION	1
200240/1-105	TYPICAL CONDUIT DETAILS	1
200240/1-106	SEDIMENT CONTROL WORKS - 4 Mm <sup>3</sup> OPTION	1
200240/1-107	DAM SITE AND INVESTIGATION LAYOUT - 1.5 Mm <sup>3</sup> OPTION	1
200240/1-108	DAM TYPICAL CROSS SECTION - 1.5 Mm <sup>3</sup> OPTION	1
200240/1-109	SPILLWAY DETAILS - 1.5 Mm <sup>3</sup> OPTION	1
200240/2-200	DOWNSTREAM FLOODPLAIN OVERVIEW	1
200240/2-201	SUNNY DAY BREACH - PEAK LEVELS (AREA 1)	1
200240/2-202	SUNNY DAY BREACH - PEAK LEVELS (AREA 2)	1
200240/2-203	SUNNY DAY BREACH - PEAK DEPTHS (AREA 1)	1
200240/2-204	SUNNY DAY BREACH - PEAK DEPTHS (AREA 2)	1
200240/2-205	SUNNY DAY BREACH - PEAK DEPTH VELOCITY PRODUCT (AREA 1)	1
200240/2-206	SUNNY DAY BREACH - PEAK DEPTH VELOCITY PRODUCT (AREA 2)	1
200240/2-210	CATCHMENT PLAN - AERIAL BACKGROUND	1
200240/1-211	CATCHMENT PLAN - GEOLOGY BACKGROUND	1
200240/2-220	10,000 YEAR DESIGN FLOOD - PEAK LEVELS	1
200240/2-221	10,000 YEAR DESIGN FLOOD - PEAK DEPTHS	1
200240/1-222	10,000 YEAR DESIGN FLOOD - PEAK VELOCITIES	1

![](_page_36_Picture_4.jpeg)

SITE LOCATION SCALE 1: 10 000

> SCAL 0 100 200

$\square$				DESIGN DES CHECK	APPROVED FOR ISSUE			CLIENT	TE TAI TOKERAU WATER
				DRAWN CAD CHECK	S.A. Vaughan		(G) WATER	ADDRESS	NORTHLAND WATER STORAGE AND
1		FOR CONCENT	MD	MP JM		AMSON ID ADVISORY	TRUST	PROJECT	ARATAPU WATER STORAGE RESI
REV	DATE	ISSUE	BY	AUG. 2020	01/09/20	 The Sp	Tiga Puna Wai. He kona Oranga Tangata He kona Oranga Whenudi The Springs of Water: A gift of life to our people. A gift of life to our land	SHEET TITLE	DRAWING LIST & LOCATIO

E 1:10,000 300 400	600 (m)	FOF
R TRUST		CADFILE

|--|

200240\_2-0.dwg SCALE (A3) ORIG. SHEET SIZE USE PROJECT ACENZ 1:10,000 A3 SERVOIR SITE ISO SEGRADIE SEGRADIE DRAWING No. REV. ON PLAN 200240/2-0 1

![](_page_37_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_37_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_37_Figure_2.jpeg)

			-				
TRUST		CADFILE 200240_2-1	.dwg				
JSE PROJECT	ACENZ	SCALE (A3)	ORIG. S	SHEET	SIZE		
RVOIR SITE	ISO	1:2500 DRAWING No.	A3 RE	EV.			
I PLAN	GCS	200240/2-1		1	1		

![](_page_38_Figure_0.jpeg)

RL 40(m) ——	HEIGHT ABOVE UPSTREAM TOE [30(m)			
30(m) ——	_ _ _ 	JPPLY LEVEL (FSL) 27m (4 Mm3 OPTION)	RL 29m DA	M CREST Mm <sup>3</sup> OPTION)
20(m) ——	- - 	FSL) 19m (1.5 Mm3 OPTION)	<u>RL 21m</u> DAM ↓ (1.5	CREST Mm <sup>3</sup> OPTION)
10(m) ——		K13-CPT	CPT4 (TP3)	K13-CPT2 (TP6)
0(m) ——	? TGA	- ? ? ?	?? TG,	? <u>↓</u> ? <u>↓</u>
-10(m)	RE-WORKED TG	A/AG ?	?	TGA/AG
-20(m)	AG	0 20 qc(MPa)	SECTION	0 20 qc(MPa)
-30(m)			SCALE 1:500	
				TGA: TAURANGA GROUP ALLU • ALLUVIAL, SWAMP AND • SOFT TO VERY SOFT OF • RECENT DEPOSITS (<12
				REWORKED TGA/AG • REDEPOSITED AWHITU G AG: AWHITU GROUP SAND DI • LOOSE TO MODERATE D
10 0	20 40m			EXTREMELY WEAK TO VI     LOCALISED CARBONACEC     LATE PLIOCENE (1.8M 1
SCALE 1:1000		DESIGN DES CHECK APPROVED FOR ISSUE		CLIENT TE TAI TOKERAU WATER
		DRAWN CAD CHECK S.A. Vaughan JM		ADDRESS NORTHLAND WATER STORAGE AND PROJECT ARATAPU WATER STORAGE RESI
1         FOR CONSENT           REV         DATE         ISSUE		MP DATE DRAWN ISSUE DATE WWW.FILE	Tigo Puno Wai He koho Oranga Tangata He koho Oranga Whenud The Springs of Water. A gift of He to our people. A gift of He to our land	SHEET TITLE DAM GEOTECHNICAL CROSS

ERVOIR SITE	
SECTION B	

USE PROJECT	

![](_page_39_Picture_3.jpeg)

	CADFILE					
	200240_2-2	&3.dwg	9			
NIZ	SCALE (A3) ORIG. SI					
INZ	1:4000	A3				
0 Inted	DRAWING No.	RE	REV.			
ĈS	200240/2-3	3	1	1		

DUNES DENSE SAND OR VERY WEAK SANDSTONE (WEAKLY CEMENTED) EOUS LENSES TO 3.6M YEARS OLD)

GROUP DEPOSITS MIXED WITH RECENT ALLUVIUM

UVIUM ESTUARINE DEPOSITS DRGANIC SILT AND SILT 2,000 YEARS OLD)

- ? ------

INFERRED GROUND WATER LEVEL

![](_page_40_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_41_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_42_Figure_0.jpeg)

-		<u>`</u> .	
-13.0	2%		
		-	
თ		ה	N
	L	0.0	9.
÷		2	7
ω	3	=	4
			9.9
ñ	č	7	÷
6	ç	2	3
- LO			0.0
Ŷ		1	Ÿ
0			9
0.0		2	<u>.</u> .
80		5	1
-	ا ر د		~ ~

ISO CEGAINED

CADFILE				
200240_2-103.dwg				
SCALE (A3)	ORIG.	SHEET	SIZE	
AS SHOWN	S SHOWN			
DRAWING No.	R	REV.		
200240/2-1		1		

![](_page_43_Figure_0.jpeg)

	RL (m)	
	30 —	
	_	
	—	
	20	
	_	
<	_	
	 10	
		S
		( ) ( )
	— ° ° –	
KIKIKIKIKIKIKI	\.X.X.X.X.X.X.X.X.X.	- ſ
	_	
	-10	
	-	
SHEET PILE WALL		
ELLPOINT DEWATERING		
2		
Ý ž		
Eg Eg		
LY STABILISED		
HERE REQUIRED		
— ? —¥		
0/5 & D/5 OF DAM)	FOR CONSEN	т
		<u> </u>
RTRUST	200240_2-104.dwg	
D USE PROJECT	ACENZ SCALE (A3) ORIG. SHEET SI	IZE
SERVOIR SITE	ISO DRAWING No. REV.	
4 Mm3 OPTION	200240/2-104 1	

![](_page_44_Figure_0.jpeg)

TRUST		CADFILE 200240 2-105.dwg		
USE PROJECT	ACENZ	SCALE (A3)	(A3) ORIG. SHEET SIZI	
ERVOIR SITE	ISO CERAISIED	ISO OCCS         AS DRAWING No.         A3           200240/2-105         1		A3 REV.
AILS	GCS			1

![](_page_45_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_46_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_46_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_46_Figure_2.jpeg)

SYN LINI	ITHETIC GEOMEMBRANE ER TO UPSTREAM FACE	4m WIDE REST
FULL SUPPLY	LEVEL RL 19m	TOPSOIL AND GRASS TO OUTER SLOPES TOPSOIL AND GRASS TO OUTER SLOPES RECOMPACTED DUNE SAND (OR OTHER SUITABLE MATERIAL) MAIN CONDUIT FOUNDATION STRIP
INDICATIVE COFFER DAM PROFILE ????	UNDERCUT UNSUITABLE MATERIAL FROM FOUNDATION (ASSUMED TO VARY UP TO 4m	ALLUVIAL AND SWAMP DEPOSITS
		<u>EP WICK DRAINS INSTALLED ON A 2m X 2m GRID</u> CROSS SECTION
10 0 20 40mm SCALE 1:1		
1     FOR CONSENT       REV     DATE	DESIGN       DES       CHECK       APPROVED       FOR       ISSUE         TS       TS       DRAWN       CAD       CHECK       S.A.       Vaughan         MP       JM       DATE       DRAWN       ISSUE       DATE       WWW.riley.co.nz         BY       AUG.       2020       01/09/20       Other State       DIATE       DIATE	VILLIAMSON VILLIA

R TRUST
ND USE PROJECT
SERVOIR SITE
- 1.5 Mm3 OPTION

![](_page_47_Picture_2.jpeg)

	CADFILE				
	200240_2-108.dwg				
5	SCALE (A3)	ORIG.	SHEET	SIZE	
	AS SHOWN	A3			
D	DRAWING No.		RE	REV.	
5	200240/2-108		1	1	

![](_page_47_Figure_5.jpeg)

DRAINS

![](_page_48_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_48_Picture_6.jpeg)

CADFILE 200240\_2-109.dwg SCALE (A3) ORIG. SHEET SIZE AS SHOWN A3 DRAWING No. REV. 200240/2-109 1