CITY OF LOS ANGELES
CALIFORNIA

DEPARTMENT OF
BUILDING AND SAFETY
201 NORTH FIGUEROA STREET
LOS ANGELES, CA 90012

RAYMOND S. CHAN, C.E., S.E.
GENERAL MANAGER

FRANK BUSH
EXECUTIVE OFFICER

GEOLOGY REPORT CORRECTION LETTER

May 15, 2015

LOG # 88174
SOILS/GEOLOGY FILE - 2
AP

Robert Budman
6044 Carlos Avenue
Los Angeles, CA 90028

TRACT: 2058
LOT(S): 26
LOCATION: 6044 Carlos Avenue

CURRENT REFERENCE REPORT/LETTER(S)	REPORT No.	DATE(S) OF DOCUMENT	PREPARED BY
Geology Report	LA-1230	04/28/2015	Group Delta
Oversized Doc(s).	``	``	``

The Grading Division of the Department of Building and Safety has reviewed the referenced report that presents a fault activity investigation at 6044 Carlos Avenue for the future devolvement of the property. The site is currently occupied by an apartment building. The property is located within an Official Earthquake Fault Zone that was established (November 6, 2014) by the California Geological Survey for the Hollywood fault (on the USGS 7.5 minute Hollywood Quadrangle).

The investigation included a transect of six continuous core borings and 13 CPT soundings arranged roughly north-south in a parking lot just east of the property, perpendicular to the trend of faulting in the area. The transect extended at least 50 feet to the south of the site. The age of the sediments observed in the borings were estimated based on pedological analysis by Dr. Roy Shlemon.

The review of the subject report can not be completed at this time and will be continued upon submittal of an addendum to the report that shall include, but not be limited to, the following:

1. The upper approximately 10 to 11 feet of natural soil is identified by the consultant as Holocene in age. However, the pedological analysis by Dr. Shlemon (Appendix B of the report) describes the uppermost natural soil as a Bt horizon with about 15 to 20 thousand years of weathering. If so, wouldn't the sediments have to have been deposited before the Holocene? Please clarify the age of the uppermost sediments at the site.

2. The upper soils are referred to as the "Beechwood Sand", suggesting they originated from the modern Beechwood Canyon. However, the local geomorphology suggests that the sediments

were derived from the "hill" to the northwest, as indicated by Dr. Shlemon. While the upper sediments may originally have been derived from Beechwood Canyon some several hundred thousand years ago, it would be more helpful for understanding the local geology and geomorphology to better assess the origin of these sediments. Based on Figure 5, it seems more likely that what has previously been referred to as the "Argyle Sand" represents more recent sediment from Beechwood Canyon, given the small catchment area of the "Argyle Fan" and the likely connection of the Argyle drainage with the western lobe of the existing Beechwood Canyon alluvial fan.

As mentioned above, the source of the upper sediments appear to have been derived from the northwest, from a local geomorphic feature that is related to neotectonics; not a modern alluvial fan. GDC previously identified the "Yucca Street" anticline at this located. The relatively steep south facing slope of this geomorphic feature forms a scarp area, previously mapped by Dr. Dolan. An investigation by GDC to the west also show that a buried fault separates folded old alluvium on the north from relatively non-folded to the south that project through the bottom of the "scarp."

Figure 5, which is intended to show the geomorphology of the region, is not very accurate relative to the discussion above. Revise the figure to show the "hill" feature discussed above relative to the surrounding fan sediments. Show the "Yucca Street" anticlinal axis and the "buried" fault and/or scarp (referred to as a break in slope on the figure). Based on the topography shown, the scarp extends further east toward the site.

3. Discuss the various marker beds/continuous bedding planes shown on Plate 2, Cross Section A-A'. The raw CPT and boring data do not appear to support the continuous bedding planes as shown. CPT-9 shows stratigraphy that is not continuous to the north or south, even with depth. The consultants hypothesize a paleochannel in the area. However, this does not explain the anomalies at depth and the apparent offset of a marker bed, located between a depth of 10 to 20 feet, across this area. Another possible offset of marker beds is located between CPT-11 and CPT-12. In addition, discuss the subsurface anomaly mentioned by Dr. Shlemon between CPT-4 and CPT-5.

4. Based on the comment above, provide additional exploration between the existing data points. If possible, excavate an exploratory trench, which would provide the best method to investigate this site. The current data does not preclude the existence of active faulting on the site.

Contact the undersigned geologist if there are any questions and to discuss additional exploration.

Daniel C Schneidereit

DANIEL C. SCHNEIDEREIT
Engineering Geologist I

DCS/dcs
Log No. 88174
213-482-0480

cc: Group Delta, Project Consultant
LA District Office