

# Structural Geotechnical Report

Proposed Retaining Wall #4  
SN 099-W125  
IDOT PTB 198-003  
FAI-80 over Des Plaines River Bridge  
Will County, Illinois

Prepared for



Illinois Department of Transportation  
Contract Number: D-91-204-19

Project Design Engineer Team  
WSP USA

Geotechnical Consultant



Revised July 17, 2025  
December 9, 2022



735 Remington Road  
Schaumburg, IL 60173  
Tel: 630.994.2600  
www.gsg-consultants.com

July 17, 2025

David Skaleski, P.E.  
Project Manager  
WSP USA  
30 N. LaSalle Street, Suite 4200  
Chicago, Illinois 60602

Structural Geotechnical Report  
Proposed Retaining Wall #4  
FAI-80 over Des Plaines River Bridge  
Will County, IL  
PTB 198-003

---

Dear Mr. Skaleski:

Attached is a copy of the Structural Geotechnical Report for the above referenced project. The report provides a description of the site investigation, site conditions, and foundation and construction recommendations. The site investigation for the proposed retaining wall included advancing fifteen (15) soil borings to depths between 2 and 15 feet and collecting 10-foot rock cores at nine borings.

Should you have any questions or require additional information, please call us at 630-994-2600.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Rachel Miller".

Rachel Miller, P.E.  
Senior Project Engineer

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Dawn Edgell".

Dawn Edgell, P.E.  
Geotechnical Department Manager

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>1.0</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1	Existing Conditions .....	1
1.2	Proposed Retaining Wall Information.....	3
<b>2.0</b>	<b>SITE SUBSURFACE CONDITIONS.....</b>	<b>4</b>
2.1	Subsurface Exploration and Laboratory Testing .....	4
2.2	Subsurface Bedrock Conditions .....	5
2.3	Laboratory Testing Program .....	7
2.4	Subsurface Soil Conditions.....	7
2.5	Groundwater Conditions.....	8
<b>3.0</b>	<b>GEOTECHNICAL ANALYSES .....</b>	<b>9</b>
3.1	Settlement .....	9
3.2	Seismic Parameters .....	9
<b>4.0</b>	<b>GEOTECHNICAL WALL DESIGN RECOMMENDATIONS .....</b>	<b>11</b>
4.1	Retaining Wall Type Recommendations .....	11
4.2	Retaining Wall Design Recommendations .....	11
4.3	MSE Wall Bearing Resistance Recommendations.....	14
4.4	Overall Stability .....	18
4.5	Slope Stability Results.....	18
<b>5.0</b>	<b>CONSTRUCTION CONSIDERATIONS .....</b>	<b>20</b>
5.1	Site Preparation.....	20
5.2	Existing Utilities and Structures .....	20
5.3	Site Excavation .....	21
5.4	Borrow Material and Compaction Requirements.....	21
5.5	Groundwater Management.....	22
<b>6.0</b>	<b>LIMITATIONS.....</b>	<b>24</b>

### **Exhibits**

Exhibit 1	Project Location Map
Exhibit 2	Existing Site Conditions at Proposed Retaining Wall Location
Exhibit 3	Structural Fill Placement Below MSE Wall

## **Tables**

Table 1	Retaining Wall Summary
Table 2	Summary of Subsurface Exploration Borings
Table 3	Rock Quality Designation
Table 4	Rock Core Summary and Classification
Table 5	Anticipated Embankment Settlement
Table 6	Seismic Parameters
Table 7	LRFD Load Factors for Retaining Wall Analysis
Table 8	Lateral Soil Parameters
Table 9	Equivalent Height of Soil for Vehicular Loading on Retaining Walls Parallel to Traffic
Table 10	Recommended Bearing Resistance
Table 11	Recommended Undercuts
Table 12	MSE Retaining Wall Description
Table 13	Stability Analysis Results – 0.7H

## **Appendices**


Appendix A	General Plan and Elevation (approved June 14, 2024) Roadway Profile, Cross Sections Center Street Ramp C
Appendix B	Soil Boring Location Plan and Soil Boring Profile
Appendix C	Soil Boring Logs
Appendix D	Laboratory Results
Appendix E	Slope Stability Analyses Exhibits
Appendix F	Summary of Soil Parameters



Structural Geotechnical Report  
Proposed Retaining Wall #4  
SN 099-W125  
FAI-80 over Des Plaines River Bridge  
Will County, Illinois  
IDOT PTB 198-003

## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

GSG Consultants, Inc. (GSG) completed a geotechnical investigation for the proposed retaining wall SN 099-W125 as part of the FAI-80 over Des Plaines project in the City of Joliet in Will County, Illinois. The purpose of the investigation was to explore the subsurface conditions, to determine engineering properties of the subsurface soil, and develop design and construction recommendations for the proposed retaining wall. **Exhibit 1** shows the general project location.



**Exhibit 1 – Project Location Map**

(Source: USGS Topographic Maps, [usgs.gov](https://www.usgs.gov))

### 1.1 Existing Conditions

It is understood the Ramp C and I-80 westbound alignment will be demolished and reconstructed approximately 140 feet to the north. Retaining Wall #4 will be constructed to support a portion of the new Ramp C embankment and to separate the new ramp from the mainline I-80 roadway. According to the approved GPE dated June 14, 2024, the retaining wall will be in a fill section where the new embankment will be constructed. The western portion of the proposed wall will

be constructed within the area of the existing I-80 interchange with Center Street, and the eastern portion of the wall will be within the neighboring residential area to the north, where new right of way has been obtained. **Exhibits 2a, 2b and 2c** show the existing conditions where the proposed retaining wall will be constructed.



**Exhibit 2a – Existing Shelby Street, Looking Northwest**



**Exhibit 2b – Existing Raynor Avenue, Looking East**





Exhibit 2c – Proposed Project Area, Aerial

### 1.2 Proposed Retaining Wall Information

Based on the GPE drawings provided by WSP, approved June 14, 2024, (see **Appendix A**) and a review of site topography, the proposed wall will be in a fill section along the newly constructed Ramp C embankment. The Ramp C embankment and Retaining Wall #4 will be constructed during the same construction stage. Retaining Wall #4 will have a maximum total wall height of up to approximately 18.7 feet, bearing at 3.5 feet below grade with a maximum exposed height of 15.2 feet. The proposed retaining wall will be approximately 519.4 feet in length and is anticipated to be a MSE wall. **Table 1** presents a summary of the proposed structure.

**Table 1 – Retaining Wall Summary**

Wall Name	Wall Stations*	Approximate Length (ft)	Maximum Anticipated Wall Height (ft)
Retaining Wall #4	Sta. 9+25.00 to Sta. 14+45.00	519' 5"	18.7

\* Based on Ramp C Stationing

A separate Roadway Geotechnical Report will be prepared for the design and construction recommendations of the new Ramp C embankment.

## 2.0 SITE SUBSURFACE CONDITIONS

This section describes the subsurface exploration program and laboratory testing program completed as part of this project. The proposed locations and depths of the soil borings were selected in accordance with IDOT requirements and reviewed with WSP based on the provided plans. The borings were completed in the field based on field conditions and accessibility.

### 2.1 Subsurface Exploration and Laboratory Testing

The site subsurface exploration for the proposed retaining wall structure was conducted between August 18 and October 27, 2022, and between March 20 and April 29, 2025. The investigation included advancing fifteen (15) borings along the proposed alignment to depths between 2.0 and 15.0 feet, including 10-foot rock cores at 9 locations. The borings were terminated upon encountering auger refusal on bedrock. The locations of these soil borings were adjusted in the field as necessary based on existing structures, utilities, and access. Elevations and as-drilled locations for the borings were gathered by GSG's field crew using GPS surveying equipment. The approximate as-drilled locations of the soil borings are shown on the Soil Boring Location Plan & Soil Boring Profile (**Appendix B**). **Table 2** presents a summary of the borings completed for the proposed retaining wall analysis.

**Table 2 – Summary of Subsurface Exploration Borings**

Boring ID	Station †	Offset (ft) †	Northing	Easting	Depth (ft)	Surface Elevation (ft)
RWB-28	10+12.02	14.41 RT	1765398.750	1049291.571	14.5*	571.45
RWB-29	10+5.46	25.76 LT	1765358.066	1049290.353	6.0**	571.33
RWB-30	9+23.32	35.99 LT	1765331.474	1049367.913	15.0*	570.69
RWB-32	14+73.32	32.94 LT	1765439.154	1048829.597	14.0*	589.06
RWB-33	14+23.12	32.90 LT	1765429.739	1048878.902	6.0**	587.09
RWB-34	13+52.49	32.57 LT	1765420.090	1048930.975	15.0*	592.09
RWB-35	13+17.68	33.11 LT	1765409.670	1048982.420	8.0**	589.01
RWB-48	11+96.23	39.70 LT	1765380.317	1049100.452	14.0*	579.53
RWB-49	11+65.05	31.80 LT	1765382.202	1049132.564	3.0**	577.90
RWB-50	11+23.60	20.20 LT	1765385.777	1049175.449	15.0*	576.22
RWB-51	10+72.47	46.04 LT	1765350.776	1049220.795	17.0*	574.74
RWB-52	10+28.75	29.50 LT	1765358.781	1049266.855	2.0**	573.43



Boring ID	Station †	Offset (ft) †	Northing	Easting	Depth (ft)	Surface Elevation (ft)
RWB-53	9+75.76	39.37 LT	1765338.961	1049316.513	12.0*	572.70
RWB-54	9+22.71	25.49 LT	1765341.600	1049370.771	2.0**	572.26
RWB-55	8+70.43	24.30 LT	1765338.945	1049421.870	11.5*	571.42

\* Depth includes Bedrock Core (10 feet)

\*\* Terminated upon encountering practical auger refusal

† Based on proposed Ramp C Stationing

Copies of the Soil Boring Logs are provided in **Appendix C**.

The soil borings were drilled using truck mounted Diedrich D-50 (hammer efficiency 96%), ATV mounted Diedrich D-50 (hammer efficiency 91%), Mobile B-57 (hammer efficiency 89%), CME-75 (hammer efficiency 79%), and 2025 Diedrich D-50 (hammer efficiency 98%) drill rigs, each equipped with 3¼-inch I.D. hollow stem augers and an automatic hammer. Soil sampling was performed according to AASHTO T 206, "Penetration Test and Split Barrel Sampling of Soils." Soil samples were obtained at 2.5-foot intervals to the boring termination depths or auger refusal on bedrock. Water level measurements were made in each boring when evidence of free groundwater was detected on the drill rods or in the samples. The boreholes were also checked for free water immediately after auger removal, and before filling the open boreholes with soil cuttings and surface patching with asphalt where necessary to match the existing pavement.

GSG’s field representative inspected, visually classified and logged the soil samples during the subsurface exploration activities and performed unconfined compressive strength tests on cohesive soil samples using a calibrated Rimac compression tester and a calibrated hand penetrometer in accordance with IDOT procedures and requirements. Representative soil samples were collected from each sample interval and were placed in jars and returned to the laboratory for further testing and evaluation.

## 2.2 Subsurface Bedrock Conditions

GSG collected rock core runs from nine of the soil borings with the use of either a five-foot or a ten-foot, diamond bit, NX-5 split core barrel during the investigation. The bedrock cores were evaluated in the field for texture, physical condition, recovery percentage, and Rock Quality Designation (RQD). The extracted bedrock cores were visually inspected, classified and the Rock

Quality Designation (RQD) was determined according to ASTM D 6032, “Standard Test Method for Determining Rock Quality Designation (RQD) of Rock Core” and as per the IDOT geotechnical manual by totaling all sections with a length in excess of four inches (4”) and dividing it by the total length of the core run. The RQD is given a classification based upon the numeric value as indicated in **Table 3**. Photographs of the rock cores are included with the respective soil borings in **Appendix C**.

**Table 3 – Rock Quality Designation Summary**

Rock Quality Designation (RQD)	Descriptions
< 25%	Very Poor
25 – 50%	Poor
51 – 75%	Fair
76 – 90%	Good
91 – 100%	Excellent

**Table 4** provides the RQD values of the rock cores extracted during the site investigation. Photographs of the cores are included with the boring logs in **Appendix C**.

**Table 4 – Rock Core Summary and Classification**

Boring Number	Length (ft)	Core Depth (feet)	Type of Rock	RQD (%)	RQD Description	Depth (ft)/ Compressive Strength (psi)
RWB-28	10	4.5 – 14.5	Limestone	42.9	Poor	7.5-8/6,516
RWB-30	10	5.0 – 15.0	Limestone	27.1	Poor	14-14.5/8,417
RWB-32	10	4.0 – 14.0	Limestone	37.0	Poor	12-12.5/5,398
RWB-34	10	5.0 – 15.0	Limestone	34.0	Poor	11-11.5/15,194
RWB-48	10	4.0 – 14.0	Limestone	55.0	Fair	n/a*
RWB-50	10	5.0 – 15.0	Limestone	28.8	Poor	n/a*
RWB-51	10	7.0 – 17.0	Limestone	58.3	Fair	n/a*
RWB-53	10	2.0 – 12.0	Limestone	26.3	Poor	n/a*
RWB-55	10	1.5 – 11.5	Limestone	10.8	Very Poor	n/a*

\*Minimum length of sample was not obtained to complete lab testing

### 2.3 Laboratory Testing Program

All samples were inspected in the laboratory to verify the field classifications. A laboratory testing program was undertaken to characterize and determine engineering properties of the subsurface soils encountered in the area. The following laboratory tests were performed on representative soil and rock samples:

- Moisture content – ASTM D2216 / AASHTO T-265
- Unconfined Compression Strength on Rock – ASTM D2938

The laboratory tests were performed in accordance with test procedures outlined in the most current IDOT Geotechnical Manual, and per ASTM and AASHTO requirements. Based on the laboratory test results, the soils encountered were classified according to the AASHTO classification systems. The results of the laboratory testing program are shown along with the field test results in the Soil Boring Logs (**Appendix C**) and in the Laboratory Results (**Appendix D**).

### 2.4 Subsurface Soil Conditions

This section provides a brief description of the soils encountered in the borings performed in the vicinity of the proposed retaining wall. Variations in the general subsurface soil profile were noted during the drilling activities. Detailed descriptions of the subsurface soils are provided in the soil boring logs and are shown graphically in the Boring Location Plan & Soil Boring Profile. The soil boring logs provide specific conditions encountered at each boring location and include soil descriptions, stratifications, penetration resistance, elevations, location of the samples, and laboratory test data. Unless otherwise noted, soil descriptions indicated on boring logs are visual identifications. The stratifications shown on the boring logs represent the conditions only at the actual boring locations and represent the approximate boundary between subsurface materials; however, the actual transition may be gradual.

The surface elevations of the borings ranged between El. 570.7 and 592.1 feet. The borings initially encountered 3 to 12 inches of topsoil; between 3 and 9 inches of asphalt pavement underlain by 3 to 9 inches of aggregate subbase; or 1 inch of asphalt and gravel subbase. Beneath the surficial topsoil and pavement, brown and gray silty clay fill, sand fill, or sandy loam fill materials were generally encountered to depths of 1.5 to 7 feet (El. 567.3 to 590.6 feet). Very dense brown and gray sand, gravel, and sand with gravel materials were then encountered to



depths of 1.5 to 8 feet (El. 567.7 to 587.1 feet), terminating at the surface of bedrock. About 0.5 to 2 feet of weathered rock was observed at boring locations RWB-28, 29, 30, 48, 52, 53, and 54 prior to encountering auger refusal on solid bedrock. Rock cores were then collected from nine of the soil boring locations.

## **2.5 Groundwater Conditions**

Water levels were checked in each boring to determine the general groundwater conditions present at the site and were measured while drilling and after each boring was completed. Groundwater was not encountered during or immediately after drilling at the fifteen boring locations. None of the borings were left open after the completion of drilling.

Based on lack of observed water, it is anticipated that the long-term groundwater level may be at an approximate elevation of 567.3 to 587.1 feet or within the bedrock. Perched water may also be present within the fill materials observed at the surface of the borings. Water level readings were made in the boreholes at times and under conditions shown on the boring logs and stated in the text of this report. However, it should be noted that fluctuations in groundwater level may occur due to variations in the rainfall, other climatic conditions, or other factors not evident at the time measurements were made and reported herein.

### 3.0 GEOTECHNICAL ANALYSES

This section provides GSG’s geotechnical analysis for the design of the proposed retaining wall and embankment based on the results of the field exploration, laboratory testing, and geotechnical analysis. Subsurface conditions between borings may vary from those encountered at the boring locations. If structure locations, loadings, or elevations are changed, we request that GSG be contacted so that we may re-evaluate our recommendations.

#### 3.1 Settlement

Based on the Center Street Ramp C Cross Sections drawings, it is anticipated that up to about 21.5 feet of new fill may be required to construct the new Ramp C embankment between Ramp C Station 9+25.00 to 14+45.00.

Based on the proposed new embankment fill of up to 21.5 feet, an analysis was performed to evaluate the anticipated amount of total settlement in the area behind Retaining Wall #4. The maximum estimated settlement for the proposed retaining wall within the native soils was calculated as shown in **Table 5**. The settlement estimates do not include the settlement within the new embankment fill itself, only the settlement within the existing soils (caused by adding embankment fill). Based on the predominantly granular nature of the native soils below the embankment, it is anticipated that most of the settlement will occur during the construction phase of the project.

**Table 5 – Anticipated Embankment Settlement**

Assumed Embankment Length Along Wall (ft)	Assumed Embankment Width (ft)	Max. Embankment Height (ft)	Max. Anticipated Settlement (in)	Differential Settlement (in)
519.4	100	21.5	0.84	0.75

#### 3.2 Seismic Parameters

The seismic hazard for the site was analyzed per the IDOT Geotechnical Manual, IDOT Bridge Design Manual, and AASHTO LRFD Bridge Design Specifications. The Seismic Soil Site Class was determined per the requirements of All Geotechnical Manual Users (AGMU) Memo 9.1, Design Guide for Seismic Site Class Determination, and the “Seismic Site Class Determination” Excel

spreadsheet provided by IDOT. A global Site Class Definition was determined for this project, and was found to be Soil Site Class C. The Seismic Performance Zone (SPZ) was determined using Figure 2.3.10-2 in the IDOT Bridge Manual and was found to be Seismic Performance Zone 1.

The AASHTO Seismic Design Parameters program was used to determine the peak ground acceleration coefficient (PGA), and the short ( $S_{DS}$ ) and long ( $S_{D1}$ ) period design spectral acceleration coefficients for each of the proposed structures. For this section of the project, the  $S_{DS}$  and the  $S_{D1}$  were determined using 2020 AASHTO Guide Specifications as shown in **Table 6**. Given the site location and materials encountered, the potential for liquefaction is minimal.

**Table 6 – Seismic Parameters**

Building Code Reference	PGA	$S_{DS}$	$S_{D1}$
2020 AASHTO Guide for LRFD Seismic Bridge Design	0.049g	0.125g	0.068g

## 4.0 GEOTECHNICAL WALL DESIGN RECOMMENDATIONS

This section provides retaining wall design parameters including recommendations on foundation type, bearing capacity, settlement, and lateral earth pressures. The foundations for the proposed retaining walls must provide sufficient support to resist the dead and live loads, as well as seismic loading.

### 4.1 Retaining Wall Type Recommendations

It is anticipated that the proposed new Ramp C embankment will be a new fill area. The new Retaining Wall #4 will be constructed along a portion of the Ramp C embankment, between the new ramp and the mainline I-80 roadway. A MSE wall or prefabricated modular gravity wall are feasible options for Wall #4.

Based on the proposed wall height, provided drawings and location of the wall within a fill area, GSG concurs with the design plan to use a MSE wall for Retaining Wall #4. Advantages of the MSE wall include a relatively rapid construction schedule that does not require specialized labor or equipment, provided excavation for the reinforcement is not extensive. This type of retaining wall can accommodate relatively large total and differential settlements without distress, and the reinforcement materials are light and easy to handle.

GSG evaluated the global and external stability, and settlement to determine the suitability of the retaining wall for this section of the project. The wall section should be analyzed to determine that adequate factors of safety are achieved relative to sliding and overturning failure.

### 4.2 Retaining Wall Design Recommendations

The engineering analyses performed for evaluation of the retaining wall options followed the current AASHTO Load and Resistance Factor Design (LRFD) Methodology as required by IDOT. LRFD methodology incorporates the use of load factors and resistance factors to account for uncertainty in applied loads and load resistance of structure elements separately. The AASHTO LRFD Bridge Design Specifications outline load factors and combinations for various strength, extreme event, service, and fatigue limit states. Section 11, which outlines geotechnical criteria for retaining walls, of the AASHTO Specifications requires the evaluation of bearing resistance failure, lateral sliding, and overturning at the strength limit state and excessive vertical displacement, excessive lateral displacement, and overall stability at the service limit state. The

selected wall should also be evaluated with respect to the collision load. **Table 7** outlines the load factors used in the evaluation of the retaining wall in accordance with AASHTO Specification Tables 3.4.1-1 and 3.4.1-2.

**Table 7 - LRFD Load Factors for Retaining Wall Analysis**

	Type of Load	Sliding and Eccentricity Strength	Bearing Resistance Strength I	Sliding and Eccentricity Extreme II	Bearing Resistance Extreme II	Settlement Service I
Load Factors for Vertical Loads	Dead Load of Structural Components (DC)	0.90	1.25	1.00	1.00	1.00
	Vertical Earth Pressure Load (EV)	1.00	1.35	1.00	1.00	1.00
	Earth Surcharge Load (ES)		1.50			
	Live Load Surcharge (LS)		1.75		0.50	1.00
Load Factors for Horizontal Loads	Horizontal Earth Pressure Load (EH)	1.50		1.00	1.00	1.00
	Active		1.50			
	At-Rest		1.35			
	AEP for anchored walls		1.35			
	Earth Surcharge (ES)	1.50	1.50			
	Live Load Surcharge (LS)	1.75	1.75	0.50	0.50	1.00
Load Factor for Vehicular Collision				1.00	1.00	

#### 4.2.1 Lateral Earth Pressures and Loading

The wall should be designed to withstand earth and live lateral earth pressures. The lateral earth pressures on retaining walls depend on the type of wall (i.e., restrained or unrestrained), the type of backfill and the method of placement against the wall, and the magnitude of surcharge weight on the ground surface adjacent to the wall. The active earth pressure coefficient ( $K_a$ ), and the passive earth pressure coefficient ( $K_p$ ) were determined in accordance with AASHTO Section 3.11.5.3 and 3.11.5.4. **Table 8** presents the soil design properties for the retaining wall for the anticipated soil types at the site. Additional soil parameters for the site are included in **Appendix F**.

**Table 8 – Lateral Soil Parameters**

Depth Range, Elevation Range (feet)	Soil Description	Long-term/Drained		
		Active Earth Pressure Coefficient ( $K_a$ )	Passive Earth Pressure Coefficient ( $K_p$ )	At-Rest Earth Pressure Coefficient ( $K_o$ )
	New Engineered Clay Fill	0.41	2.46	0.58
	New Engineered Granular Fill	0.33	3.00	0.50
0-19.5 (590-570.5)	Light Brown and Gray Very Dense Sand with Gravel / Gravel with Sand	0.17	5.82	0.29
19.5-20.5 (570.5-569.5)	Light Brown and Gray Very Dense Weathered Limestone	0.18	5.54	0.31
0-2.5 (590-587.5) <b>RWB-34, RWB-35 only</b>	Fill Brown and Gray Silty Clay	0.41	2.46	0.58
19.5-22.5 (570.5-567.5) <b>RWB-29 only</b>	Fill Brown and Gray Silty Clay	0.41	2.46	0.58
14-17 (576-573) <b>RWB-49, RWB-50 only</b>	Fill Dark Brown Silty Clay	0.41	2.46	0.58
13-18 (577-572) <b>RWB-48, RWB-51 only</b>	Fill Brown, Gray, and Black Sand / Sandy Loam	0.33	3.00	0.50

Although not anticipated, traffic and other surcharge loads should be included in the retaining wall design as applicable. A live load surcharge shall be applied where vehicular load is expected

to act on the surface of the backfill within a distance equal to one-half the wall height behind the back face of the wall in accordance with AASHTO 3.11.6.4. The live load surcharge may be estimated as a uniform horizontal earth pressure due to an equivalent height ( $H_{eq}$ ) of soil. **Table 9** provides the equivalent heights of soil for vehicular loadings on retaining walls.

**Table 9 - Equivalent Height of Soil for Vehicular Loading on Retaining Walls Parallel to Traffic**

Retaining Wall Height (ft)	$H_{eq}$ Distance from Wall Back face to Edge of Traffic	
	0 feet	1.0 feet or Further
5	5.0 feet	2.0 feet
10	3.5 feet	2.0 feet
$\geq 20$	2.0 feet	2.0 feet

Reference: AASHTO LRFD Table 3.11.6.4-2

The retaining wall design should include a drainage system to allow movement of any water behind the wall and not allow hydrostatic pressures to develop in the active soil wedge behind the wall. This could be accomplished by placing a Geocomposite Wall Drain over the entire length of the back face of the wall connected to a perforated drainpipe and backfilling a minimum of 2 feet of free draining materials, Porous Granular Embankment, as measured laterally from the back of the wall. The size of the perforated pipe should be determined based on hydraulic analyses. The backfill should be placed in accordance with the IDOT SSRBC.

Heavy compaction equipment should not be allowed closer than five (5) feet to the retaining wall to prevent inducing high lateral earth pressures and causing wall yielding and/or other damage. The passive lateral earth pressure coefficient ( $K_p$ ) from the upper 3.5 feet of level backfill at the toe of the wall should be neglected unless the soil is confined or protected by a concrete slab or well-drained pavement. The passive lateral earth pressure coefficient from the upper 3.5 feet of soil for a descending slope at the wall toe should also be neglected, regardless of any surface protection.

#### 4.3 MSE Wall Bearing Resistance Recommendations

It is anticipated that the MSE wall will bear on new granular engineered fill over suitable, very dense native sand and gravel. Bearing resistance for the retaining wall shall be evaluated at the strength limit state using load factors (See Table 8), and factored bearing resistance. The bearing resistance factor,  $\phi_b$ , for a MSE wall is 0.65 per AASHTO Table 11.5.7-1. The bearing resistance



shall be checked for the extreme limit state with a resistance factor of 1.0. **Table 10** presents the proposed bearing elevations and recommended bearing resistances of suitable materials to support the wall system.

**Table 10 – Recommended Bearing Resistance**

Soil Borings	Approx. Station Limits	Approximate Bearing Elevation (feet)	Nominal Resistance (ksf)	Factored Bearing Resistance (ksf)	Bearing Resistance for 1-inch Settlement Service Limit (ksf)	Bearing Resistance for 2-inch Settlement Service Limit (ksf)	Anticipated Bearing Soil
RWB-30, 54, 55	9+25 to 10+00	584.5 – 586.1	18.5	12.0	8.3	12.0	Granular Engineered Fill over Native Very Dense Gravel or Weathered Limestone
RWB-29, 51, 52, 53	10+00 to 11+00	582.7 – 584.2	17.1	11.1	5.6	9.7	Granular Engineered Fill over Sandy Loam Fill, Native Very Dense Gravel, or Weathered Limestone
RWB-48, 49, 50	11+00 to 12+50	581.9 – 585.2	17.1	11.1	11.1	11.1	Granular Engineered Fill over Sand Fill, Weathered Limestone or Limestone
RWB-34 & 35	12+50 to 13+75	587.7 – 597.4	24.1	15.7	12.8	15.7	Granular Engineered Fill over Native Very Dense Gravel or Sand
RWB-32 & 33	13+75 to 14+45	600.1 – 605.2	34.4	22.4	7.2	12.6	Granular Engineered Fill over Native Very Dense Gravel or Sand with Gravel

The minimum depth of the leveling pad should be 3.5 feet below the final exterior grade to alleviate the effects of frost. A MSE reinforcement width of 0.7H (14 feet) was used for bearing and settlement calculations, based on the results of the slope stability analysis discussed in **Section 4.5**.

#### 4.3.1 Subgrade Undercut Areas

The subgrade soils at bearing grade should be evaluated per the guidelines provided in Section 8.9 of IDOT Geotechnical Manual (2020) for suitability/workability prior to placing any portion of the proposed structures. According to Section 540, IDOT SSRBC (2022) a minimum of 6-inches of porous granular material should be provided as bedding material, which will serve as a working platform.

GSG recommends undercutting any existing silty clay fill soils along the wall alignment. The observed sand fill and sandy loam fill exhibited SPT N-values of greater than 50 bpf and may remain in-place. Undercuts to depths of up to 5.0 feet below existing site grades may be anticipated to reach the very dense native sand and gravel. The undercut depth should be verified in the field during construction and backfilled with compacted granular engineered fill to support the proposed retaining wall. Anticipated undercut depths are presented in **Table 11**.


**Table 11 – Recommended Undercuts**

Soil Borings	Station Limits	Undercut Depth Below Existing Grade (Elevation, feet)	Approximate Bearing Elevation (feet)*	Comments
RWB-29	10+25 to 9+90	4.0 (567.5)	584.5	Existing unsuitable fill Low strength <1.5 tsf
RWB-34	14+00 to 13+25	1.5 (590.5)	594.5	Existing unsuitable fill Trace roots
RWB-35	13+25 to 12+50	5.0 (584.0)	592.5	Existing unsuitable fill Trace brick debris
RWB-49	11+80 to 11+50	3.0 (575.0)	582.0	Existing unsuitable fill Trace roots
RWB-50	11+50 to 11+00	5.0 (571.0)	582.5	Existing unsuitable fill Trace concrete

\* Assumed bearing elevation at about El. 581.9 to El. 605.2 feet based on the GPE drawings

Settlement generally depends on the foundation size and bearing resistance, as well as the strength and compressibility characteristics of the underlying bearing soil.

Undercut areas should be replaced with structural fill in accordance with IDOT Standard Specifications for Road and Bridge Construction. The lateral limit of the structural fill should extend a minimum of 1 foot beyond the edge of the MSE wall leveling pad, then an additional 1 foot laterally for every 2 feet of structural fill depth as depicted in **Exhibit 3**. The structural fill should be placed and compacted to a minimum of 95% of the maximum dry density, as determined by AASHTO T-180: Standard Test Methods for Moisture-Density Relations of Soil and Soil-Aggregate Mixtures (ASTM D1557) in accordance with IDOT standard construction requirements.



**Exhibit 3 - Structural Fill Placement below MSE Wall**

#### 4.3.2 Sliding and Overturning Stability

The wall base width should be sufficient to resist sliding. The frictional resistance shall include the friction between granular backfill for the wall and supportive cohesive or granular soils, and the friction between the wall foundation and bearing soils.

The factored resistance against sliding should be calculated using equation 10.6.3.4-1 in the AASHTO LRFD manual. A sliding resistance factor,  $\phi$ , of 1.0 (Table 11.5.7-1) shall be applied to the nominal sliding resistance of soil-on-soil beneath the MSE wall. A maximum frictional coefficient of 0.53 (tan 28 degrees) could be used for determining the sliding resistance for the soil to soil interfaces. The width of the MSE wall (length of the reinforcing) must be wide enough to resist overturning forces. The location of the resultant forces shall be within the middle two-

thirds of the MSE base width. Based on the wall geometry and anticipated loads, the minimum wall base width and soil reinforcement length may extend beyond the minimum values specified in AASHTO Manual Section 11.10.2.1.

#### 4.4 Overall Stability

Based on the drawings provided by WSP, the following parameters in **Table 12** were used to evaluate the overall stability of the wall.

**Table 12 – MSE Retaining Wall Description**

Maximum height of the retaining wall (H)	18.7 feet
Minimum length of reinforcement $0.7 \times H$ (initial assumption)	14 feet
Unit weight of the retained soil (embankment)	125 pcf
Unit weight of MSE wall backfill	120 pcf
Assumed embankment width	40 feet
Slope behind embankment	1V:3H
Slope below MSE wall	1V:3.1H down, then 1V:4.1H up

The actual wall width and total height of the wall should be based on structural analysis performed by a Licensed Structural Engineer in the State of Illinois.

#### 4.5 Slope Stability Results

Slide2 is a comprehensive slope stability analysis software used to evaluate the global slope stability of the proposed retaining wall based on the limit equilibrium method. Circular failure analyses were evaluated using the simplified Bishop analysis method for the proposed wall and slope geometries.

A circular analysis was evaluated for both short-term (undrained) and long-term (drained) conditions for the proposed retaining wall. Based on the GPE drawings, the retaining wall will have a maximum height of 18.7 feet. The top of the retaining wall leveling pad is anticipated to be about 3.5 feet below the front face of the wall, at about El. 582.5 feet near station 12+15. The results of the analysis are shown in **Table 13**.

**Table 13 – Stability Analysis Results – 0.7H**

Station	Proposed Profile	Failure Type	Factor of Safety	Required Minimum Factor of Safety
12+15	18.7 ft MSE Wall, 0.7H Reinforcement	Circular – Short-Term	1.8	1.5
		Circular – Long-Term	1.5	

Based on the analyses performed, the proposed 18.7-foot-tall retaining wall with a reinforcement length of 0.7H (14 feet) meets the minimum factor of safety of 1.5 for the short- and long-term conditions. Copies of the Slope Stability analysis exhibits are included in **Appendix E**.

## 5.0 CONSTRUCTION CONSIDERATIONS

All work performed for the proposed project should conform to the requirements in the IDOT Standard Specifications for Road and Bridge Construction (SSRBC) (2022). Any deviation from the requirements in the manuals above should be approved by the design engineer.

### 5.1 Site Preparation

All trees, pavements, vegetation, landscaping, and surface topsoil should be cleared and removed from the vicinity of the proposed foundations. It is anticipated that several structures may be demolished in the area of the new wall and embankment. Any foundations that will impact construction should also be removed. Where possible, the engineer may require proof-rolling of the subgrade with a 35-ton loaded truck or other pneumatic-tired vehicle of similar size and weight. The purpose of the proof-rolling is to locate soft, weak, or excessively wet soils present at the time of construction. Proof-rolling should be performed during a time of good weather and not while the site is wet, frozen, or severely desiccated. Any unsuitable materials observed during the evaluation and proof-rolling operations should be undercut and replaced with compacted structural fill and/or stabilized in-place. The possible need for, and extent of, undercutting and/or in-place stabilization required can best be determined by the geotechnical engineer at the time of construction. Once the site has been properly prepared, at grade construction may proceed.

Foundation aggregate fill should not be placed upon wet or frozen subgrade soils. If the subgrade or structural fill becomes frozen, desiccated, wet, disturbed, softened, or loose, the affected materials should be scarified, dried and moisture conditioned, and compacted to the full depth of the affected area or the soils should be removed. Rainfall and runoff can soften soils and affect the load bearing capacity of the soils. All water entering foundation excavation should be removed prior to placement backfill materials above the wall bottom.

### 5.2 Existing Utilities and Structures

Before proceeding with construction, all existing underground utility lines or structures that will interfere with construction should be completely relocated from the proposed construction areas. Where possible, existing utility lines that are to be abandoned in place should be removed and/or plugged with cement grout. All excavations resulting from underground utilities or structure removal activities should be cleaned of loose and disturbed materials, including all

previously placed backfill, and backfilled with suitable fill materials in accordance with the requirements of this section. During the clearing and stripping operations, positive surface drainage should be maintained to prevent the accumulation of water.

### **5.3 Site Excavation**

Site excavations are expected to encounter various types of soils as described in the Subsurface Exploration section of this report. The contractor will be responsible for providing a safe excavation during the construction activities of the project. All excavations should be conducted in accordance with applicable federal, state, and local safety regulations, including, but not limited to the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) excavation safety standards. Excavation stability and soil pressures on temporary shoring are dependent on soil conditions, depth of excavations, installation procedures, and the magnitude of any surcharge loads on the ground surface adjacent to the excavation. Excavation near existing structures and underground utilities should be performed with extreme care to avoid undermining existing structures. Excavations should not extend below the level of adjacent existing foundations or utilities unless underpinning or other support is installed. It is the responsibility of the contractor for field determinations of applicable conditions and providing adequate shoring (if needed) for all excavation activities.

### **5.4 Borrow Material and Compaction Requirements**

If borrow material is to be used for onsite construction, it should conform to Section 204 "Borrow and Furnish Excavations" of the IDOT Construction Manual (2021). The fill material should be free of organic matter and debris and should be placed and compacted in accordance with the Construction Manual. Earth-moving operations should be avoided during excessively cold or wet weather to avoid freezing or softening subgrade soils.

Suitable structural fill materials shall be of a nature that will compact and develop stability satisfactory to the geotechnical engineer. Structural fill shall consist of crushed limestone or recycled concrete consistent with IDOT CA-6 gradation or medium plasticity silty clays. Suitable structural fill should meet the IDOT SSRBC requirements.



Should fill be placed during cool, wet seasons, the use of granular fill may be necessary since weather conditions will make compaction of cohesive soils more difficult. If water seepage while excavating and backfilling procedures, or where wet conditions are encountered such that the water cannot be removed with conventional sump and pump procedures, GSG recommends placing open grade stone similar to IDOT CA-7 to stabilize the bottom of the excavation. The CA-7 stone should be placed 12 inches above the water level, in 12-inch lifts, and should be compacted with the use of a heavy smooth drum roller or heavy vibratory plate compactor until stable. The remaining portion of the excavation should be backfilled using approved engineered fill.

GSG recommends that foundation excavations, subgrade preparation, and structural fill placement and compaction be inspected by a GSG geotechnical engineer to verify the type and strength of soil materials present at the site and their conformance with the geotechnical recommendations in this report.

## **5.5 Groundwater Management**

Long term groundwater may be at an approximate elevation of 567.3 to 587.1 feet or deeper, within the bedrock. GSG does not anticipate that groundwater related issues occur during construction activity, however, perched water may be encountered within the existing fill materials. If rainwater run-off or groundwater is accumulated at the base of excavations, the contractor should remove accumulated water using conventional sump pit and pump procedures and maintain a dry and stable excavation. The location of the sump should be determined by the contractor based on field conditions. During earthmoving activities at the site, grading should be performed to ensure that drainage is maintained throughout the construction period. Water should not be allowed to accumulate in the foundation area either during or after construction. Undercut and excavated areas should be sloped toward one corner to facilitate removal of any collected rainwater or surface run-off. Grades should be sloped away from the excavations to minimize runoff from entering.

If water seepage occurs during excavations or where wet conditions are encountered such that the water cannot be removed with conventional sumping, we recommend placing open grade stone similar to IDOT CA-7 to stabilize the bottom of the excavation below the water table. The CA-7 stone should be placed 12 inches above the water table, in 12-inch lifts, and should be



compacted with the use of a heavy smooth drum roller or heavy vibratory plate compactor until stable. The remaining portion of the excavation beneath the footings should be backfilled using approved structural fill.

## **6.0 LIMITATIONS**

This report has been prepared for the exclusive use of the Illinois Department of Transportation (IDOT) and its Design Section Engineer consultant. The recommendations provided in the report are specific to the project described herein and are based on the information obtained at the soil boring locations within the proposed retaining wall area. The analyses have been performed and the recommendations provided in this report are based on subsurface conditions determined at the location of the borings. This report may not reflect all variations that may occur between boring locations or at some other time, the nature and extent of which may not become evident until the time of construction. If variations in subsurface conditions become evident after submission of this report, it will be necessary to evaluate their nature and review the recommendations presented herein.

**Appendix A**  
**General Plan and Elevation**  
**(approved June 14, 2024)**

**Roadway Profile, Cross**  
**Sections Center Street Ramp C**

Benchmark: Chiseled "x" on top of SE bolt of Fire Hydrant at south ROW of Jasper St. (in front of 640 Jasper St. address), Elev. 585.86.  
Existing Structure: None.  
Traffic Control: WB I-80 traffic to Center St. will be detoured to the west at Larkin Ave.  
Salvage: None.

**DESIGN STRESSES**

FIELD UNITS  
f'c = 3,500 psi  
fy = 60,000 psi (Reinforcement)  
PRECAST UNITS  
f'c = 4,500 psi

**DESIGN SPECIFICATIONS**


2020 AASHTO LRFD Bridge Design Specifications, 9th Edition

**HIGHWAY SPECIFICATION**



Center Street Ramp C  
Functional Class: Interstate  
ADT: 4,550 (2017); 6,220 (2040)  
ADTT: 228 (2017); 311 (2040)  
DHV: 684 (2040)  
Design Speed: 40 m.p.h.  
Posted Speed: 40 m.p.h.  
1-Way Traffic

**LEGEND**

- Exist. Fence
- Exist. Electrical Cable
- Exist. Storm Sewer
- Exist. Watermain
- Exist. Gas line
- Exist. Light Pole
- Prop. Storm Sewer
- Tree
- Soil Boring
- Exist. ROW
  
- Approx. Limits of Reinforced Soil Mass
- Approx. Limits of Prop. Undercutting
  
- F.F. Front Face
- B.F. Back Face



**APPROVED**  
JUNE 14, 2024  
AS A BASIS FOR PREPARATION OF DETAILED PLANS



**NOTES:**  
1. Stations and offsets are measured along the centerline of Center Street to the front face of the precast panels.  
2. For Table 1- Wall Elevations, Typical Section thru MSE Walls, Profile Grade Lines and Curve Data, See Sheet 2 of 2.

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION





USER NAME =	DESIGNED - PG	REVISED -
	CHECKED - MI	REVISED -
PLOT SCALE =	DRAWN - PG	REVISED -
PLOT DATE =	CHECKED - MI	REVISED -

F.A.I. RTE.	SECTION	COUNTY	TOTAL SHEETS	SHEET NO.
80	FAI 80 21 INTERCHANGE	WILL	2	1
CONTRACT NO. 62R22				

MODEL: Default  
FILE NAME: p:\projects\trans\scorp-pw1-hosted\Documents\Projects\_2018\CH401\401180022\03-WSP\CAD\62R22-INT-4 - (Center)\Sheets\Structural\SN-099-W125-62R22-TS11  
6/13/2024 2:42:15 PM

TABLE 1- WALL ELEVATIONS

Station	Offset	A	B	C	D	E
		Top of C.I.P. Coping	Top of Exposed Panel Line	Exist. Grade at FF Wall	Finished Grade at FF Wall	Top of Barrier
09+25.00	22.95' LT	591.09	589.34	569.45	589.61	594.63
09+50.00	23.58' LT	591.50	589.75	569.78	589.54	595.04
09+75.00	24.20' LT	592.00	590.25	571.39	588.52	595.54
10+00.00	24.83' LT	592.75	591.00	571.35	587.99	596.29
10+14.62	25.19' LT	593.19	591.44	571.33	587.68	596.73
10+25.00	25.45' LT	593.68	591.93	571.80	587.46	597.22
10+50.00	26.07' LT	594.66	592.91	572.46	586.98	598.20
10+75.00	26.70' LT	595.65	593.90	576.18	586.55	599.19
11+00.00	27.32' LT	596.64	594.89	576.50	586.18	600.18
11+25.00	27.95' LT	597.62	595.87	574.88	585.87	601.16
11+50.00	28.57' LT	598.61	596.86	576.14	585.61	602.15
11+70.40	29.08' LT	599.40	597.65	577.17	585.40	602.94
11+75.00	29.08' LT	599.59	597.84	577.63	585.45	603.13
12+00.00	29.08' LT	600.58	598.83	578.25	585.52	604.12
12+25.00	29.08' LT	601.57	599.82	579.65	586.34	605.11
12+50.00	29.08' LT	602.56	600.81	580.76	588.73	606.10
12+75.00	29.08' LT	603.55	601.80	582.54	591.17	607.09
13+00.00	29.08' LT	604.54	602.79	586.86	593.66	608.08
13+25.00	29.08' LT	605.53	603.78	589.47	595.94	609.07
13+50.00	29.08' LT	606.52	604.77	591.43	598.23	610.06
13+75.00	29.08' LT	607.51	605.76	591.52	600.87	611.05
14+00.00	29.08' LT	608.49	606.74	587.17	603.56	612.03
14+25.00	29.08' LT	609.43	607.68	587.68	606.57	612.97
14+45.00	29.08' LT	610.15	608.40	588.50	608.68	613.69



**PR CURVE CENTER RAMP C (CENTER C1)**

PI Sta. = 9+07.47  
 $\Delta = 03^\circ 49' 25''$  (LT)  
 $D = 01^\circ 46' 54''$   
 $R = 3,216.00'$   
 $T = 107.35'$   
 $L = 214.63'$   
 $E = 1.79'$   
 $e = 3.20\%$   
 $T.R. = 64.0'$   
 $S.E. RUN = 102.4'$   
 $P.C. STA. = 8+00.12$   
 $P.T. STA. = 10+14.75$

**DETAILS**  
**RETAINING WALL 4**  
**ALONG CENTER STREET RAMP C**  
**F.A.I. ROUTE I-80**  
**SECTION C-91-109-22**  
**WILL COUNTY**  
**STA. 9+25.00 TO STA. 14+45.00**  
**STRUCTURE NO. 099-W125**

\* Subject to change in Final Design

MODEL: Default  
 FILE NAME: pw:\transystems-pw.bentley.com\transystems-pw1-hosted\Documents\Projects\_2018\CH401\401180022\03-WSP\CAD\62R22-INT-4 (Center)\Sheets\Structural\SN-099-W125-RW4\099-W125-62R22-TSL2



USER NAME =	DESIGNED - PG	REVISED -
PLOT SCALE =	CHECKED - MI	REVISED -
PLOT DATE =	DRAWN - PG	REVISED -
	CHECKED - MI	REVISED -


STATE OF ILLINOIS  
 DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

F.A.I. RTE.	SECTION	COUNTY	TOTAL SHEETS	SHEET NO.
80	FAI 80 21 INTERCHANGE	WILL	2	2
CONTRACT NO. 62R22				
ILLINOIS FED. AID PROJECT				

PLAN	SURVEYED	BY	DATE
	PLOTTED		
PROFILE	ALIGNED		
	CHECKED		
NOTE BOOK	NO.		
	FILE NAME		

PROFILE	SURVEYED	BY	DATE
	PLOTTED		
NOTE BOOK	GRADES CHECKED		
	STRUCTURE NOTATIONS CHKD		
NOTE BOOK	NO.		
	FILE NAME		

MODEL: PCL - Profile 1 [Sheet]  
 FILE NAME: p:\projects\transystems\pwr\benley.com\transys\corp\pw1\shared\Documents\Projects\_2018\CH401\401180022\03-WSP\CAD\62R22-INT-4 (Center)\Sheet\c:\w\1\2\2\22-shp-prf\18-ramp.cad



**STATE OF ILLINOIS  
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION**

**ROADWAY PROFILE  
CENTER STREET RAMP C**

USER NAME	donahuek1	DESIGNED	-	REVISED	-
PLOT SCALE	0.16666667' / in.	DRAWN	-	REVISED	-
PLOT DATE	8/16/2022	CHECKED	-	REVISED	-
		DATE	-	REVISED	-

SCALE: HORIZ: 1"=50' VERT: 1"=5' SHEET OF SHEETS STA. TO STA.


F.A.I. RTE.	SECTION	COUNTY	TOTAL SHEETS	SHEET NO.
80	FAI 80 21 INTERCHANGE	WILL	234	44
CONTRACT NO. 62R22			ILLINOIS FED. AID PROJECT	



PLAN	SURVEYED	BY	DATE
	PLOTTED		
NOTE BOOK NO.	ALIGNMENT CHECKED		
	GRADE CHECKED		
NOTE BOOK NO.	STRUCTURE NOTATION CHECKED		
	FILE NAME		

PROFILE	SURVEYED	BY	DATE
	PLOTTED		
NOTE BOOK NO.	GRADES CHECKED		
	STRUCTURE NOTATION CHECKED		
NOTE BOOK NO.	FILE NAME		

MODEL: PCL - Profile 2 (Sheet)  
 FILE NAME: p:\projects\trans\systems\pw\_bentley.com\trans\scorp\pw1\shared\Documents\Projects\_2018\CH401\401180022\03\WSP\CAD\62R22\INT-4 (Center)\Sheet\Profile\62R22-shp-profile-ramp.cad



592.87	608.50	588.44	610.49	590.69	612.14	602.80	613.25
14+00		15+00					



WSP USA Inc.  
 30 N. LASALLE STREET  
 SUITE 4200  
 CHICAGO, IL 60602  
 TEL (312) 782-8150

USER NAME	= donahuek1	DESIGNED	-	REVISED	-
DRAWN	-	REVISION	-	REVISION	-
PLOT SCALE	= 0.16666667 ' / in.	CHECKED	-	REVISION	-
PLOT DATE	= 8/16/2022	DATE	-	REVISION	-

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
 DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

ROADWAY PROFILE  
 CENTER STREET RAMP C

SCALE: HORIZ: 1"=50'  
 VERT: 1"=5'


SHEET OF SHEETS STA. TO STA.

F.A.I. RTE.	SECTION	COUNTY	TOTAL SHEETS	SHEET NO.
80	FAI 80 21 INTERCHANGE	WILL	234	45
CONTRACT NO. 62R22				
ILLINOIS FED. AID PROJECT				

FINAL SURVEY NO.	SURVEYED	DATE
NOTE BOOK	PLOTTED	
NO.	TEMPLATE	
	AREAS CHECKED	

ORIGINAL SURVEY NO.	SURVEYED	DATE
NOTE BOOK	PLOTTED	
NO.	TEMPLATE	
	AREAS CHECKED	

MODEL: RW4 - 9+00.00 (Sheet)  
FILE NAME: D:\RW4\23\RW4.dgn



**STA 9+00.00**

USER NAME = donahuek1	DESIGNED -	REVISED -
PLOT SCALE = 0.16666685' / m.	DRAWN -	REVISED -
PLOT DATE = 8/16/2022	CHECKED -	REVISED -
	DATE -	REVISED -

**STATE OF ILLINOIS  
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION**

**CENTER STREET RAMP C CROSS SECTIONS  
RETAINING WALL #4**


SCALE: \_\_\_\_\_ SHEET \_\_\_\_\_ OF \_\_\_\_\_ SHEETS STA. \_\_\_\_\_

F.A.R.T.E.	SECTION	COUNTY	TOTAL SHEETS	SHEET NO.
CONTRACT NO. _____				
ILLINOIS		FED. AID PROJECT		

FINAL SURVEY NO.	SURVEYED	DATE
NOTE BOOK	PLOTTED	
NO.	TEMPLATE	
	AREAS	
	CHECKED	

ORIGINAL SURVEY NO.	SURVEYED	DATE
NOTE BOOK	PLOTTED	
NO.	TEMPLATE	
	AREAS	
	CHECKED	

MODEL: RW4 - 9+25.00 (Sheet)  
FILE NAME: D:\R22\35RW4.DWG



**STA 9+25.00**

USER NAME = donahuek1	DESIGNED -	REVISED -
PLLOT SCALE = 0.16666685 / m.	DRAWN -	REVISED -
PLLOT DATE = 8/16/2022	CHECKED -	REVISED -
	DATE -	REVISED -

**STATE OF ILLINOIS  
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION**

**CENTER STREET RAMP C CROSS SECTIONS  
RETAINING WALL #4**

SCALE: \_\_\_\_\_ SHEET \_\_\_\_\_ OF \_\_\_\_\_ SHEETS STA. \_\_\_\_\_


F.A.R.T.E.	SECTION	COUNTY	TOTAL SHEETS	SHEET NO.
CONTRACT NO. _____				
ILLINOIS FED. AID PROJECT				



FINAL SURVEY	SURVEYED	DATE
NOTE BOOK	PLOTTED	
NO.	TEMPLATE	
	AREAS	
	CHECKED	

ORIGINAL SURVEY	SURVEYED	DATE
NOTE BOOK	PLOTTED	
NO.	TEMPLATE	
	AREAS	
	CHECKED	

MODEL: RW4 - 9+50.00 (Sheet)  
FILE NAME: D:\RW4\23\RW4.dgn



**STA 9+50.00**

USER NAME = donahuek1	DESIGNED -	REVISED -
PLOT SCALE = 0.16666685 / m.	DRAWN -	REVISED -
PLOT DATE = 8/16/2022	CHECKED -	REVISED -
	DATE -	REVISED -

**STATE OF ILLINOIS  
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION**

**CENTER STREET RAMP C CROSS SECTIONS  
RETAINING WALL #4**


SCALE: \_\_\_\_\_ SHEET \_\_\_\_\_ OF \_\_\_\_\_ SHEETS STA. \_\_\_\_\_

F.A. RTE.	SECTION	COUNTY	TOTAL SHEETS	SHEET NO.
CONTRACT NO. _____				
ILLINOIS FED. AID PROJECT				

FINAL SURVEY	SURVEYED	DATE
NOTE BOOK	PLOTTED	
NO.	TEMPLATE	
	AREAS	
	CHECKED	

ORIGINAL SURVEY	SURVEYED	DATE
NOTE BOOK	PLOTTED	
NO.	TEMPLATE	
	AREAS	
	CHECKED	

MODEL: RW4 - 9+75.00 (Sheet)  
FILE NAME: D:\R22\35\RW4.dgn



**STA 9+75.00**

USER NAME = donahuek1	DESIGNED -	REVISED -
PLOT SCALE = 0.16666685 / m.	DRAWN -	REVISED -
PLOT DATE = 8/16/2022	CHECKED -	REVISED -
	DATE -	REVISED -

**STATE OF ILLINOIS  
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION**

**CENTER STREET RAMP C CROSS SECTIONS  
RETAINING WALL #4**

SCALE: \_\_\_\_\_ SHEET \_\_\_\_\_ OF \_\_\_\_\_ SHEETS STA. \_\_\_\_\_


F.A. RTE.	SECTION	COUNTY	TOTAL SHEETS	SHEET NO.
CONTRACT NO. _____				
ILLINOIS		FED. AID PROJECT		



FINAL SURVEY	SURVEYED	DATE
NOTE BOOK	PLOTTED	
NO.	TEMPLATE	
	AREAS	
	CHECKED	

ORIGINAL SURVEY	SURVEYED	DATE
NOTE BOOK	PLOTTED	
NO.	TEMPLATE	
	AREAS	
	CHECKED	

MODEL: RW4 - 10+00.00 (15) (1) (1)  
FILE NAME: D:\RW4\22\35\RW4.CPJ



STA 10+00.00

USER NAME = donahuek1	DESIGNED -	REVISED -
PLOT SCALE = 0.16666685' / m.	DRAWN -	REVISED -
PLOT DATE = 8/16/2022	CHECKED -	REVISED -
	DATE -	REVISED -

**STATE OF ILLINOIS  
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION**

**CENTER STREET RAMP C CROSS SECTIONS  
RETAINING WALL #4**


SCALE: \_\_\_\_\_ SHEET \_\_\_\_\_ OF \_\_\_\_\_ SHEETS STA. \_\_\_\_\_

F.A. RTE.	SECTION	COUNTY	TOTAL SHEETS	SHEET NO.
CONTRACT NO.				
ILLINOIS FED. AID PROJECT				

FINAL SURVEY NO.	SURVEYED	DATE
NOTE BOOK	PLOTTED	
NO.	TEMPLATE	
	AREAS	
	CHECKED	

ORIGINAL SURVEY NO.	SURVEYED	DATE
NOTE BOOK	PLOTTED	
NO.	TEMPLATE	
	AREAS	
	CHECKED	

MODEL: RW4\_10+25.00 (51-hrt)  
FILE NAME: D:\R22\35\RW4.CPJ



**STA 10+25.00**

USER NAME = donahuek1	DESIGNED -	REVISED -
PLOT SCALE = 0.16666685' / m.	DRAWN -	REVISED -
PLOT DATE = 8/16/2022	CHECKED -	REVISED -
	DATE -	REVISED -

**STATE OF ILLINOIS  
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION**

**CENTER STREET RAMP C CROSS SECTIONS  
RETAINING WALL #4**

SCALE: \_\_\_\_\_ SHEET \_\_\_\_\_ OF \_\_\_\_\_ SHEETS STA. \_\_\_\_\_


F.A. RTE.	SECTION	COUNTY	TOTAL SHEETS	SHEET NO.
CONTRACT NO. _____				
ILLINOIS		FED. AID PROJECT		



FINAL SURVEY NO.	SURVEYED	DATE
NOTE BOOK	PLOTTED	
	TEMPLATE	
	AREAS	
	CHECKED	

ORIGINAL SURVEY NO.	SURVEYED	DATE
NOTE BOOK	PLOTTED	
	TEMPLATE	
	AREAS	
	CHECKED	

MODEL: RW4 - 10+50.00 (51) (1)  
FILE NAME: D:\CR22-25\RW4.dgn



**STA 10+50.00**

USER NAME = donahuek1	DESIGNED -	REVISED -
PLOT SCALE = 0.16666685' / in.	DRAWN -	REVISED -
PLOT DATE = 8/16/2022	CHECKED -	REVISED -
	DATE -	REVISED -

**STATE OF ILLINOIS  
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION**

**CENTER STREET RAMP C CROSS SECTIONS  
RETAINING WALL #4**

SCALE: \_\_\_\_\_ SHEET \_\_\_\_\_ OF \_\_\_\_\_ SHEETS STA. \_\_\_\_\_


F.A. RTE.	SECTION	COUNTY	TOTAL SHEETS	SHEET NO.
CONTRACT NO.				
ILLINOIS FED. AID PROJECT				



FINAL SURVEY	SURVEYED	DATE
NOTE BOOK	PLOTTED	
NO.	TEMPLATE	
	AREAS	
	CHECKED	

ORIGINAL SURVEY	SURVEYED	DATE
NOTE BOOK	PLOTTED	
NO.	TEMPLATE	
	AREAS	
	CHECKED	

MODEL: RW4 - 10+75.00 (Sheet)  
FILE NAME: D:\RW4\23\RW4.CPJ



**STA 10+75.00**

USER NAME = donahuek1	DESIGNED -	REVISED -
PLOT SCALE = 0.16666685 / m.	DRAWN -	REVISED -
PLOT DATE = 8/16/2022	CHECKED -	REVISED -
	DATE -	REVISED -

**STATE OF ILLINOIS  
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION**

**CENTER STREET RAMP C CROSS SECTIONS  
RETAINING WALL #4**

SCALE: \_\_\_\_\_ SHEET \_\_\_\_\_ OF \_\_\_\_\_ SHEETS STA. \_\_\_\_\_


F.A.R.T.E.	SECTION	COUNTY	TOTAL SHEETS	SHEET NO.
CONTRACT NO. _____				
ILLINOIS FED. AID PROJECT				



FINAL SURVEY	SURVEYED	DATE
NOTE BOOK	PLOTTED	
NO.	TEMPLATE	
	AREAS	
	CHECKED	

ORIGINAL SURVEY	SURVEYED	DATE
NOTE BOOK	PLOTTED	
NO.	TEMPLATE	
	AREAS	
	CHECKED	

MODEL: RW4 11+00.00 (11.rvt)  
FILE NAME: D:\RW4\23\RW4.rvt



**STA 11+00.00**

USER NAME = donahuek1	DESIGNED -	REVISED -
PLOT SCALE = 0.16666685 / m.	DRAWN -	REVISED -
PLOT DATE = 8/16/2022	CHECKED -	REVISED -
	DATE -	REVISED -

**STATE OF ILLINOIS  
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION**

**CENTER STREET RAMP C CROSS SECTIONS  
RETAINING WALL #4**

SCALE: \_\_\_\_\_ SHEET \_\_\_\_\_ OF \_\_\_\_\_ SHEETS STA. \_\_\_\_\_


F.A. RTE.	SECTION	COUNTY	TOTAL SHEETS	SHEET NO.
CONTRACT NO. _____				
ILLINOIS FED. AID PROJECT				



FINAL SURVEY	SURVEYED	DATE
NOTE BOOK	PLOTTED	
NO.	TEMPLATE	
	AREAS	
	CHECKED	

ORIGINAL SURVEY	SURVEYED	DATE
NOTE BOOK	PLOTTED	
NO.	TEMPLATE	
	AREAS	
	CHECKED	

MODEL: RW4 - 11+25.00 (Sheet)  
FILE NAME: D:\RW4\22\RW4.RVP



**STA 11+25.00**

USER NAME = donahuek1	DESIGNED -	REVISED -
PLOT SCALE = 0.16666685 / m.	DRAWN -	REVISED -
PLOT DATE = 8/16/2022	CHECKED -	REVISED -
	DATE -	REVISED -

**STATE OF ILLINOIS  
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION**

**CENTER STREET RAMP C CROSS SECTIONS  
RETAINING WALL #4**

SCALE: \_\_\_\_\_ SHEET \_\_\_\_\_ OF \_\_\_\_\_ SHEETS STA. \_\_\_\_\_


F.A.R.T.E.	SECTION	COUNTY	TOTAL SHEETS	SHEET NO.
CONTRACT NO. _____				
ILLINOIS FED. AID PROJECT				



FINAL SURVEY NO.	SURVEYED	DATE
NOTE BOOK NO.	PLOTTED	
	TEMPLATE	
	AREAS	
	CHECKED	

ORIGINAL SURVEY NO.	SURVEYED	DATE
NOTE BOOK NO.	PLOTTED	
	TEMPLATE	
	AREAS	
	CHECKED	

MODEL: RW4 11+50.00 (51.rvt)  
FILE NAME: D:\R22\25\RW4.dgn



**STA 11+50.00**

USER NAME = donahuek1	DESIGNED -	REVISED -
PLOT SCALE = 0.16666685 / m.	DRAWN -	REVISED -
PLOT DATE = 8/16/2022	CHECKED -	REVISED -
	DATE -	REVISED -

**STATE OF ILLINOIS  
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION**

**CENTER STREET RAMP C CROSS SECTIONS  
RETAINING WALL #4**

SCALE: \_\_\_\_\_ SHEET \_\_\_\_\_ OF \_\_\_\_\_ SHEETS STA. \_\_\_\_\_


F.A.R.T.E.	SECTION	COUNTY	TOTAL SHEETS	SHEET NO.
CONTRACT NO. _____				
ILLINOIS FED. AID PROJECT				



FINAL SURVEY	SURVEYED	DATE
NOTE BOOK	PLOTTED	BY
NO.	TEMPLATE	
	AREAS	
	CHECKED	

ORIGINAL SURVEY	SURVEYED	DATE
NOTE BOOK	PLOTTED	BY
NO.	TEMPLATE	
	AREAS	
	CHECKED	

MODEL: RW4\_11+75.00 (Sheet)  
FILE NAME: D:\RW4\23\RW4.CAD



**STA 11+75.00**

USER NAME = donahuek1	DESIGNED -	REVISED -
PILOT SCALE = 0.1666668' / m.	DRAWN -	REVISED -
PILOT DATE = 8/16/2022	CHECKED -	REVISED -
	DATE -	REVISED -

**STATE OF ILLINOIS  
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION**

**CENTER STREET RAMP C CROSS SECTIONS  
RETAINING WALL #4**

SCALE: \_\_\_\_\_ SHEET \_\_\_\_\_ OF \_\_\_\_\_ SHEETS STA. \_\_\_\_\_


F.A. RTE.	SECTION	COUNTY	TOTAL SHEETS	SHEET NO.
CONTRACT NO. _____				
ILLINOIS FED. AID PROJECT				



FINAL SURVEY	SURVEYED	DATE
NOTE BOOK	PLOTTED	
NO.	TEMPLATE	
	AREAS	
	CHECKED	

ORIGINAL SURVEY	SURVEYED	DATE
NOTE BOOK	PLOTTED	
NO.	TEMPLATE	
	AREAS	
	CHECKED	

MODEL: RW4 - 12+00.00 (Sheet)  
FILE NAME: D:\RW4\23\RW4.CAD



STA 12+00.00

USER NAME = donahuek1	DESIGNED -	REVISED -
PLOT SCALE = 0.1666668' / m.	DRAWN -	REVISED -
PLOT DATE = 8/16/2022	CHECKED -	REVISED -
	DATE -	REVISED -

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

CENTER STREET RAMP C CROSS SECTIONS  
RETAINING WALL #4

SCALE: SHEET OF SHEETS STA.


F.A.R.T.E.	SECTION	COUNTY	TOTAL SHEETS	SHEET NO.
CONTRACT NO.				
ILLINOIS		FED. AID PROJECT		



FINAL SURVEY	SURVEYED	DATE
NOTE BOOK	PLOTTED	
NO.	TEMPLATE	
	AREAS	
	CHECKED	

ORIGINAL SURVEY	SURVEYED	DATE
NOTE BOOK	PLOTTED	
NO.	TEMPLATE	
	AREAS	
	CHECKED	

MODEL: RW4 - 12x25.00 (Sheet)  
FILE NAME: D:\R22\25-RW4.dwg



STA 12+25.00

USER NAME = donahuek1	DESIGNED -	REVISED -
PLOT SCALE = 0.16666685 / m.	DRAWN -	REVISED -
PLOT DATE = 8/16/2022	CHECKED -	REVISED -
	DATE -	REVISED -

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

CENTER STREET RAMP C CROSS SECTIONS  
RETAINING WALL #4

F.A. RTE.	SECTION	COUNTY	TOTAL SHEETS	SHEET NO.
CONTRACT NO.				
ILLINOIS FED. AID PROJECT				


SCALE: SHEET OF SHEETS STA.



FINAL SURVEY NO.	SURVEYED	DATE
NOTE BOOK	PLOTTED	
NO.	TEMPLATE	
	AREAS	
	CHECKED	

ORIGINAL SURVEY NO.	SURVEYED	DATE
NOTE BOOK	PLOTTED	
NO.	TEMPLATE	
	AREAS	
	CHECKED	

MODEL: RW4 - 12+50.00 (51) (1)  
FILE NAME: D:\R22-25\RW4.DWG



STA 12+50.00

USER NAME = donahuek1	DESIGNED -	REVISED -
PLOT SCALE = 0.16666685 / m.	DRAWN -	REVISED -
PLOT DATE = 8/16/2022	CHECKED -	REVISED -
	DATE -	REVISED -

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

CENTER STREET RAMP C CROSS SECTIONS  
RETAINING WALL #4

SCALE: SHEET OF SHEETS STA.


F.A.R.T.E.	SECTION	COUNTY	TOTAL SHEETS	SHEET NO.
CONTRACT NO.				
ILLINOIS FED. AID PROJECT				



FINAL SURVEY NO.	SURVEYED	DATE
NOTE BOOK	PLOTTED	
NO.	TEMPLATE	
	AREAS CHECKED	

ORIGINAL SURVEY NO.	SURVEYED	DATE
NOTE BOOK	PLOTTED	
NO.	TEMPLATE	
	AREAS CHECKED	

MODEL: RW4 - 12 x 75 00 (SHEET)  
FILE NAME: D:\RW42\23RW4.CSV



**STA 12+75.00**

USER NAME = donahuek1	DESIGNED -	REVISED -
PLOT SCALE = 0.16666685' / m.	DRAWN -	REVISED -
PLOT DATE = 8/16/2022	CHECKED -	REVISED -
	DATE -	REVISED -

**STATE OF ILLINOIS  
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION**

**CENTER STREET RAMP C CROSS SECTIONS  
RETAINING WALL #4**


SCALE: \_\_\_\_\_ SHEET \_\_\_\_\_ OF \_\_\_\_\_ SHEETS STA. \_\_\_\_\_

F.A. RTE.	SECTION	COUNTY	TOTAL SHEETS	SHEET NO.
CONTRACT NO. _____				
ILLINOIS		FED. AID PROJECT		

FINAL SURVEY NO.	SURVEYED	DATE
NOTE BOOK	PLOTTED	
NO.	TEMPLATE	
	AREAS	
	CHECKED	

ORIGINAL SURVEY NO.	SURVEYED	DATE
NOTE BOOK	PLOTTED	
NO.	TEMPLATE	
	AREAS	
	CHECKED	

MODEL: RW4 - 13+00.00 (15) (1) (1)  
FILE NAME: D:\RW4\23\RW4.CAD



**STA 13+00.00**

USER NAME = donahuek1	DESIGNED -	REVISED -
PLOT SCALE = 0.16666685 / m	DRAWN -	REVISED -
PLOT DATE = 8/16/2022	CHECKED -	REVISED -
	DATE -	REVISED -

**STATE OF ILLINOIS  
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION**

**CENTER STREET RAMP C CROSS SECTIONS  
RETAINING WALL #4**

SCALE: \_\_\_\_\_ SHEET \_\_\_\_\_ OF \_\_\_\_\_ SHEETS STA. \_\_\_\_\_


F.A. RTE.	SECTION	COUNTY	TOTAL SHEETS	SHEET NO.
CONTRACT NO. _____				
ILLINOIS FED. AID PROJECT				



FINAL SURVEY NO.	SURVEYED	DATE
NOTE BOOK NO.	PLOTTED	
	TEMPLATE	
	AREAS CHECKED	

ORIGINAL SURVEY NO.	SURVEYED	DATE
NOTE BOOK NO.	PLOTTED	
	TEMPLATE	
	AREAS CHECKED	

MODEL: RW4 - 13+25.00 (51-hr)  
FILE NAME: D:\R22\25\RW4.dgn



**STA 13+25.00**

USER NAME = donahuek1	DESIGNED -	REVISED -
PLOT SCALE = 0.16666685 / m.	DRAWN -	REVISED -
PLOT DATE = 8/16/2022	CHECKED -	REVISED -
	DATE -	REVISED -

**STATE OF ILLINOIS  
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION**

**CENTER STREET RAMP C CROSS SECTIONS  
RETAINING WALL #4**

SCALE: \_\_\_\_\_ SHEET \_\_\_\_\_ OF \_\_\_\_\_ SHEETS STA. \_\_\_\_\_


F.A. RTE.	SECTION	COUNTY	TOTAL SHEETS	SHEET NO.
CONTRACT NO. _____				
ILLINOIS FED. AID PROJECT				



FINAL SURVEY	SURVEYED	DATE
NOTE BOOK	PLOTTED	
NO.	TEMPLATE	
	AREAS	
	CHECKED	

ORIGINAL SURVEY	SURVEYED	DATE
NOTE BOOK	PLOTTED	
NO.	TEMPLATE	
	AREAS	
	CHECKED	

MODEL: RW4 - 13+50.00 (1) (1) (1)  
FILE NAME: D:\R22\23\RW4.C3P



**STA 13+50.00**

USER NAME = donahuek1	DESIGNED -	REVISED -
PLOT SCALE = 0.16666685 / m.	DRAWN -	REVISED -
PLOT DATE = 8/16/2022	CHECKED -	REVISED -
	DATE -	REVISED -

**STATE OF ILLINOIS  
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION**

**CENTER STREET RAMP C CROSS SECTIONS  
RETAINING WALL #4**

SCALE: \_\_\_\_\_ SHEET \_\_\_\_\_ OF \_\_\_\_\_ SHEETS STA. \_\_\_\_\_


F.A. RTE.	SECTION	COUNTY	TOTAL SHEETS	SHEET NO.
CONTRACT NO. _____				
ILLINOIS FED. AID PROJECT				



FINAL SURVEY NO.	SURVEYED	DATE
NOTE BOOK NO.	PLOTTED	
	TEMPLATE	
	AREAS	
	CHECKED	

ORIGINAL SURVEY NO.	SURVEYED	DATE
NOTE BOOK NO.	PLOTTED	
	TEMPLATE	
	AREAS	
	CHECKED	

MODEL: RW4 - 13+75.00 (Sheet)  
FILE NAME: D:\R22-25-RWA.dwg



**STA 13+75.00**

USER NAME = donahuek1	DESIGNED -	REVISED -
	DRAWN -	REVISED -
PLOT SCALE = 0.16666685 / m.	CHECKED -	REVISED -
PLOT DATE = 8/16/2022	DATE -	REVISED -

**STATE OF ILLINOIS  
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION**

**CENTER STREET RAMP C CROSS SECTIONS  
RETAINING WALL #4**

SCALE: SHEET OF SHEETS STA.


F.A. RTE.	SECTION	COUNTY	TOTAL SHEETS	SHEET NO.
CONTRACT NO.				
ILLINOIS FED. AID PROJECT				



FINAL SURVEY NOTE BOOK NO.	SURVEYED PLOTTED TEMPLATE AREAS CHECKED	BY	DATE

ORIGINAL SURVEY NOTE BOOK NO.	SURVEYED PLOTTED TEMPLATE AREAS CHECKED	BY	DATE

MODEL: RW4 14+00.00 (51.rvt)  
 FILE NAME: D:\RP22\35\RW4.dwg



**STA 14+00.00**

USER NAME = donahuek1	DESIGNED -	REVISED -
PLOT SCALE = 0.16666685 / m.	DRAWN -	REVISED -
PLOT DATE = 8/16/2022	CHECKED -	REVISED -
	DATE -	REVISED -

**STATE OF ILLINOIS  
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION**

<b>CENTER STREET RAMP C CROSS SECTIONS RETAINING WALL #4</b>			
SCALE: _____	SHEET _____	OF _____	SHEETS _____
STA. _____		CONTRACT NO. _____	
ILLINOIS		FED. AID PROJECT	


F.A.RTE.	SECTION	COUNTY	TOTAL SHEETS	SHEET NO.



FINAL SURVEY NO.	SURVEYED	DATE
NOTE BOOK	PLOTTED	
NO.	TEMPLATE	
	AREAS	
	CHECKED	

ORIGINAL SURVEY NO.	SURVEYED	DATE
NOTE BOOK	PLOTTED	
NO.	TEMPLATE	
	AREAS	
	CHECKED	

MODEL: RW4\_14+25.00 (5).prt  
FILE NAME: D:\RW4\22\25.RWA.dgn



USER NAME = donahuek1	DESIGNED -	REVISED -
PLOT SCALE = 0.16666665' / m.	DRAWN -	REVISED -
PLOT DATE = 8/16/2022	CHECKED -	REVISED -
	DATE -	REVISED -

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

CENTER STREET RAMP C CROSS SECTIONS  
RETAINING WALL #4

SCALE: \_\_\_\_\_ SHEET \_\_\_\_\_ OF \_\_\_\_\_ SHEETS STA. \_\_\_\_\_

F.A. RTE.	SECTION	COUNTY	TOTAL SHEETS	SHEET NO.
CONTRACT NO.				
ILLINOIS FED. AID PROJECT				


STA 14+25.00



FINAL SURVEY	SURVEYED	DATE
NOTE BOOK	PLOTTED	BY
NO.	TEMPLATE	
	AREAS	
	CHECKED	

ORIGINAL SURVEY	SURVEYED	DATE
NOTE BOOK	PLOTTED	BY
NO.	TEMPLATE	
	AREAS	
	CHECKED	

MODEL: RW4\_1\_14+45.00 [Sheet]  
FILE NAME: D:\RW4\23\RW4.dgn



**STA 14+45.00**

USER NAME = donahuek1	DESIGNED -	REVISED -
PLOT SCALE = 0.16666685 / m.	DRAWN -	REVISED -
PLOT DATE = 8/16/2022	CHECKED -	REVISED -
	DATE -	REVISED -

**STATE OF ILLINOIS  
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION**

**CENTER STREET RAMP C CROSS SECTIONS  
RETAINING WALL #4**

SCALE: \_\_\_\_\_ SHEET 1 OF \_\_\_\_\_ SHEETS STA. \_\_\_\_\_


F.A. RTE.	SECTION	COUNTY	TOTAL SHEETS	SHEET NO.
CONTRACT NO. _____				
ILLINOIS FED. AID PROJECT				



FINAL SURVEY	SURVEYED	DATE
NOTE BOOK	PLOTTED	
NO.	TEMPLATE	
	AREAS	
	CHECKED	

ORIGINAL SURVEY	SURVEYED	DATE
NOTE BOOK	PLOTTED	
NO.	TEMPLATE	
	AREAS	
	CHECKED	

MODEL: RW4 - 14+50.00 (15) (HW) 1  
 FILE NAME: D:\R22\25\RW4.dgn



STA 14+50.00

USER NAME = donahuek1	DESIGNED -	REVISED -
PLOT SCALE = 0.16666685 / m.	DRAWN -	REVISED -
PLOT DATE = 8/16/2022	CHECKED -	REVISED -
	DATE -	REVISED -

STATE OF ILLINOIS  
 DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

CENTER STREET RAMP C CROSS SECTIONS  
 RETAINING WALL #4



SCALE: \_\_\_\_\_ SHEET 1 OF 1 SHEETS STA. \_\_\_\_\_

F.A. RTE.	SECTION	COUNTY	TOTAL SHEETS	SHEET NO.
CONTRACT NO. _____				
ILLINOIS FED. AID PROJECT				


**Appendix B**  
**Soil Boring Location Plan and Soil Boring Profile**



FILE NAME: Z:\Projects\Illinois DOT\WSP\_199-003\Geotechnical\Retaining Walls\Retaining Wall No. 4 - Ramp C Exhibits\DCNs\Retaining Wall No. 4 - PL-01.dgn  
 PEN TABLE: \$PEN\$  
 TYP DATE: 6/3/2025  
 SHEET SIZE: \$SHEET\$  
 PLOT SCALE: \$SCALE\$  
 USER NAME: nno



**LEGEND**

 SOIL BORINGS

**GSG CONSULTANTS, INC.**  
 735 E. REMINGTON RD., SCHAUMBURG, IL 60173  
 TEL: +1630.994.2600 | WWW.GSG-CONSULTANTS.COM

USER NAME	= nno	DESIGNED	- RM
SHEET SIZE	= \$SHEET\$	DRAWN	- NN
PLOT SCALE	= \$SCALE\$	CHECKED	- DE
PLOT DATE	= 6/3/2025	DATE	- 05/20/2025


**STATE OF ILLINOIS  
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION**

RETAINING WALL NO. 4 - RAMP C		F.A. RTE.	SECTION	COUNTY	TOTAL SHEETS	SHEET NO.
SOIL BORING LOCATION PLAN JOLIET, ILLINOIS				WILL	4	1
SCALE: 1:50	SHEET 1 OF 1 SHEETS	STA.	TO STA.	CONTRACT NO. PTB-198-003		

ILLINOIS	FED. AID PROJECT
----------	------------------

**LEGEND**

PAVEMENT		FILL: SAND / GRAVEL		SANDY CLAY / LOAM		GRAVEL	
BASE COURSE		SILTY CLAY		SILTY SAND / SANDY LOAM		APPROXIMATE EXTENT OF PROPOSED UNDERCUT TO BE FIELD VERIFIED	
TOPSOIL		SAND		ORGANIC SILTY CLAY			
FILL: CLAY / SILTY CLAY		SILT / SILTY LOAM		BEDROCK			




FILE NAME: Z:\Projects\Illinois DOT\WSP-198-003\Geotechnical\Retaining Walls\Retaining Wall No. 4 - Ramp C Exhibits\DCNs\Retaining Wall No. 4 - PR-01.dgn  
 PEN TABLE: #PENTBL#  
 PLOT DATE: 6/3/2025  
 SHEET SIZE: #SHEETSIZE#  
 PLOT SCALE: #SCALE#  
 USER NAME: nmano

<b>GSG CONSULTANTS, INC.</b> 735 E. REMINGTON RD. SCHAUMBURG, IL 60173 TEL: +1630.994.2600   WWW.GSG-CONSULTANTS.COM	USER NAME = nmano SHEET SIZE = \$SHEETSIZE\$ PLOT SCALE = \$SCALE\$ PLOT DATE = 6/3/2025	DESIGNED - RM DRAWN - NN CHECKED - DE DATE - 05/20/2025	<b>STATE OF ILLINOIS</b> <b>DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION</b>	<b>RETAINING WALL NO. 4</b> <b>SOIL BORING PROFILE</b>	SCALE: AS NOTED SHEET 1 OF 3 SHEETS STA. 14+75 TO STA. 12+25	F.A. RTE. SECTION COUNTY WILL TOTAL SHEETS 4 SHEET NO. 2 CONTRACT NO. PTB-198-003 ILLINOIS FED. AID PROJECT
--	---	--	---	---	--	--



FILE NAME : Z:\Projects\Illinois DOT\WSP\_198-003\Geotechnical\Retaining Walls\Retaining Wall No. 4 - RR-02.dgn  
 PLOT DATE : 6/3/2025  
 TIME : 5:09:14 PM  
 PLOT SCALE : \$SCALE\$  
 USER NAME : rmano



LEGEND					
PAVEMENT		FILL: SAND / GRAVEL		SANDY CLAY / LOAM	
BASE COURSE		SILTY CLAY		SILTY SAND / SANDY LOAM	
TOPSOIL		SAND		ORGANIC SILTY CLAY	
FILL: CLAY / SILTY CLAY		SILT / SILTY LOAM		BEDROCK	
				GRAVEL	
				APPROXIMATE EXTENT OF PROPOSED UNDERCUT TO BE FIELD VERIFIED	

12+25	12+00	11+75	11+50	11+25	11+00	10+75	10+50	10+25	10+00
-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------

**GSG**  
 GSG CONSULTANTS, INC.  
 735 E. REMINGTON RD. SCHAMBURG, IL 60173  
 TEL: +1630.994.2600 | WWW.GSG-CONSULTANTS.COM

USER NAME	▪ rmano	DESIGNED	- RM
SHEET SIZE	= \$SHEETSIZE\$	DRAWN	- NN
PLOT SCALE	= \$SCALE\$	CHECKED	- DE
PLOT DATE	▪ 6/3/2025	DATE	- 05/20/2025

**STATE OF ILLINOIS  
 DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION**

<b>RETAINING WALL NO. 4</b>			
<b>SOIL BORING PROFILE</b>			
SCALE: AS NOTED	SHEET 2 OF 3 SHEETS	STA. 12+25 TO STA. 10+00	

F.A. RTE.	SECTION	COUNTY	TOTAL SHEETS	SHEET NO.
		WILL	4	3
CONTRACT NO. PTB- 198-003				
ILLINOIS FED. AID PROJECT				

**LEGEND**

PAVEMENT		FILL: SAND / GRAVEL		SANDY CLAY / LOAM		GRAVEL	
BASE COURSE		SILTY CLAY		SILTY SAND / SANDY LOAM		APPROXIMATE EXTENT OF PROPOSED UNDERCUT TO BE FIELD VERIFIED	
TOPSOIL		SAND		ORGANIC SILTY CLAY			
FILL: CLAY / SILTY CLAY		SILT / SILTY LOAM		BEDROCK			

MATCH LINE STA.: 10+00



FILE NAME: Z:\Projects\Illinois DOT\NSP-198-003\Geotechnical\Retaining Walls\Retaining Wall No. 4 - RR-03.dgn  
 PEN TABLE: #PENTBLL\*  
 PLOT DATE: 6/4/2025  
 SHEET SIZE: #SHEETSIZE\*  
 PLOT SCALE: #SCALE\*  
 USER NAME: #NAME\*

**GSG CONSULTANTS, INC.**  
735 E. REMINGTON RD. SCHAUMBURG, IL 60173  
TEL: +1630.994.2600 | WWW.GSG-CONSULTANTS.COM

USER NAME =	nneno	DESIGNED =	RM
SHEET SIZE =	\$SHEETSIZE\$	DRAWN =	NN
PLOT SCALE =	\$SCALE\$	CHECKED =	DE
PLOT DATE =	6/4/2025	DATE =	05/20/2025

**STATE OF ILLINOIS  
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION**

<b>RETAINING WALL NO. 4</b>			
<b>SOIL BORING PROFILE</b>			
SCALE: AS NOTED	SHEET 3 OF 3 SHEETS	STA. 10+00 TO STA. 7+50	

F.A. RTE.	SECTION	COUNTY	TOTAL SHEETS	SHEET NO.
		WILL	4	4
CONTRACT NO. PTB-198-003				
ILLINOIS		FED. AID PROJECT		



**Appendix C**  
**Soil Boring Logs**



SOIL BORING LOG

ROUTE I-80 DESCRIPTION Retaining Wall No. 4 LOGGED BY AA

SECTION C-91-109-22 LOCATION SEC. 16, TWP. 35 N, RNG. 10 E,

COUNTY Will DRILLING RIG Mobile B-57 DRILLING METHOD HSA HAMMER TYPE Auto HAMMER EFF (%) 89

Table with columns for depth, blow count, UCS, moisture, and elevation. Includes data for soil layers like 'Very Dense, Light Brown, Moist GRAVEL, with sand (GP)' and 'WEATHERED LIMESTONE'.

The Unconfined Compressive Strength (UCS) Failure Mode is indicated by (B-Bulge, S-Shear, P-Penetrometer) The SPT (N value) is the sum of the last two blow values in each sampling zone (AASHTO T206)

Retaining Wall #4  
 RWB-28  
 Will County, IL



Boring No.	Run	Depth (ft)	Recovery (%)	RQD (%)	RQD Classification	Compressive Strength (psi)	Description
RWB-28	1	4.5' – 14.5'	100.0	42.9	Poor	6,516	Light Brown and Light Gray Limestone Slightly Weathered, Moderately to Heavily Fractured, Trace Sand, Trace Vugs



# Illinois Department of Transportation

Division of Highways  
GSG Consultants

# SOIL BORING LOG

Date 10/19/22

ROUTE I-80 DESCRIPTION Retaining Wall No. 4 - Ramp C Sta 8+00 LOGGED BY AA

SECTION C-91-109-22 LOCATION SEC. 16, TWP. 35 N, RNG. 10 E,

COUNTY Will DRILLING RIG Latitude , Longitude  
Diedrich D-50  
DRILLING METHOD HSA HAMMER TYPE Auto  
HAMMER EFF (%) 96

STRUCT. NO. 099-W125  
Station \_\_\_\_\_

BORING NO. RWB-29  
Station 10+5.4610  
Offset 25.76ft LT  
Ground Surface Elev. 571.33 ft

**D  
E  
P  
T  
H**  
**B  
L  
O  
W  
S**  
**U  
C  
S**  
**M  
O  
I  
S  
T**  
**Qu**  
**(ft)**  
**(/6")**  
**(tsf)**  
**(%)**

Surface Water Elev. N/A ft  
Stream Bed Elev. N/A ft  
Groundwater Elev.:  
First Encounter Dry ft  
Upon Completion N/A ft  
After \_\_\_\_\_ Hrs. N/A ft

9 inches of Asphalt  
3 inches of Aggregate Subbase 570.58  
570.33

Dark Brown and Dark Gray, Moist to Very Moist  
FILL: SILTY CLAY, with sand and gravel

7  
18 0.8 26  
50/3" P

567.33

50/5"  
0.5 16  
P

Gray, Moist WEATHERED LIMESTONE

565.33

Auger refusal at 6 feet  
End of Boring

-10

-15

-20

The Unconfined Compressive Strength (UCS) Failure Mode is indicated by (B-Bulge, S-Shear, P-Penetrometer)  
The SPT (N value) is the sum of the last two blow values in each sampling zone (AASHTO T206)






Retaining Wall #4  
 RWB-30  
 Will County, IL



Boring No.	Run	Depth (ft)	Recovery (%)	RQD (%)	RQD Classification	Compressive Strength (psi)	Description
RWB-30	1	5.0' – 15.0'	95.0	27.1	Poor	8,417	Light Brown and Light Gray Limestone Slightly to Moderately Weathered, Moderately to Heavily Fractured, Trace Vertical Fractures, Trace Sand, Trace Vugs



Retaining Wall #4  
 RWB-32  
 Will County, IL



Boring No.	Run	Depth (ft)	Recovery (%)	RQD (%)	RQD Classification	Compressive Strength (psi)	Description
RWB-32	1	4.0' – 14.0'	100.0	37.0	Poor	5,398	Light Brown Limestone Slightly Weathered, Moderately to Heavily Fractured, Trace Sand, Trace Clay at 7 feet, Some Vugs







Retaining Wall #4  
 RWB-34  
 Will County, IL

Top  
 Depth = 5.0 ft  
 Elev. = 587.09



Depth = 15.0 ft  
 Elev. = 577.09  
 Bottom

Boring No.	Run	Depth (ft)	Recovery (%)	RQD (%)	RQD Classification	Compressive Strength (psi)	Description
RWB-34	1	5.0' – 15.0'	100.0	34.0	Poor	15,194	Light Brown Limestone Moderately to Slightly Weathered, Moderately to Heavily Fractured, Some Vertical Fractures, Trace Sand, Some Vugs







# SOIL BORING LOG

ROUTE I-80 DESCRIPTION Retaining Wall No. 4 - Ramp C LOGGED BY DV

SECTION C-91-109-22 LOCATION SEC. 16, TWP. 35 N, RNG. 10 E,

COUNTY Will DRILLING RIG CME-75 HAMMER TYPE Auto  
 DRILLING METHOD HSA HAMMER EFF (%) 78.8

STRUCT. NO. <u>099-W125</u>	D E P T H  (ft)	B L O W S  (/6")	U C S  (tsf)	M O I S T  (%)	Surface Water Elev. <u>N/A</u> ft
Station _____					Stream Bed Elev. <u>N/A</u> ft
BORING NO. <u>RWB-48 (Wall 4)</u>	576.53	50/3"		91	Groundwater Elev.:
Station <u>11+96.23</u>					First Encounter <u>Dry</u> ft
Offset <u>39.70ft LT</u>					Upon Completion <u>N/A</u> ft
Ground Surface Elev. <u>579.53</u> ft					After _____ Hrs. <u>N/A</u> ft

Brown, Wet FILL: SAND, with gravel	8	50/3"		91	
WEATHERED LIMESTONE	576.53	50/2"			
Auger refusal at 4 feet	575.53				
Gray and Brown LIMESTONE, moderately weathered, slightly to moderately fractured, trace shale	-5				
Run 1: 4' - 14' Recovery: 95.0% RQD: 55.0% (Fair)					
	-10				
	565.53				
End of Boring	-15				
	-20				

The Unconfined Compressive Strength (UCS) Failure Mode is indicated by (B-Bulge, S-Shear, P-Penetrometer)  
 The SPT (N value) is the sum of the last two blow values in each sampling zone (AASHTO T206)

Retaining Wall #4 – Ramp C  
 Boring Number: RWB-48  
 Will County, IL




Boring No.	Run	Depth (ft)	Recovery (%)	RQD (%)	RQD Classification	Description
RWB-48	1	4'-14'	95.0	55.0	Fair	Gray and Brown Limestone Slightly Weathered, Moderately to Heavily Fractured, Trace Shale







Retaining Wall #4 – Ramp C  
 RWB-50  
 Will County, IL



Boring No.	Run	Depth (ft)	Recovery (%)	RQD (%)	RQD Classification	Description
RWB-50	1	5' – 15'	100	28.8	Poor	Brown and Gray Limestone Slightly Weathered, Moderately to Heavily Fractured, Some Vugs





Retaining Wall #4 – Ramp C  
 RWB-51  
 Will County, IL



Boring No.	Run	Depth (ft)	Recovery (%)	RQD (%)	RQD Classification	Description
RWB-51	1	7' – 17'	96.7	58.3	Fair	Brown and Gray Limestone Slightly Weathered, Moderately to Heavily Fractured, Some Vugs







# SOIL BORING LOG

ROUTE I-80 DESCRIPTION Retaining Wall No. 4 - Ramp C LOGGED BY SB

SECTION C-91-109-22 LOCATION SEC. 16, TWP. 35 N, RNG. 10 E,

COUNTY Will DRILLING RIG Latitude , Longitude  
Mobile B-57 DRILLING METHOD HSA HAMMER TYPE Auto  
 HAMMER EFF (%) 89

STRUCT. NO. <u>099-W125</u>	D E P T H	B L O W S	U C S  Qu	M O I S T	Surface Water Elev. <u>N/A</u> ft
Station _____					Stream Bed Elev. <u>N/A</u> ft
BORING NO. <u>RWB-53</u>	(ft)	(/6")	(tsf)	(%)	Groundwater Elev.:
Station <u>9+75.76</u>					First Encounter <u>Dry</u> ft
Offset <u>39.37ft LT</u>					Upon Completion <u>N/A</u> ft
Ground Surface Elev. <u>572.70</u> ft					After _____ Hrs. <u>N/A</u> ft

3 inches of Topsoil	572.45				
Very Dense Light Brown, Moist GRAVEL, with sand, trace clay (GP)	571.20 570.70	50/5"		7	
WEATHERED LIMESTONE					
Auger refusal at 2 feet Gray LIMESTONE, slightly to moderately weathered, moderately to heavily fractured, some vugs					-5
Run 1: 2' - 12' Recovery: 100% RQD: 26.3% (Poor)					
					-10
	560.70				
End of Boring					
					-15
					-20

The Unconfined Compressive Strength (UCS) Failure Mode is indicated by (B-Bulge, S-Shear, P-Penetrometer)  
 The SPT (N value) is the sum of the last two blow values in each sampling zone (AASHTO T206)

Retaining Wall #4 – Ramp C  
 RWB-53  
 Will County, IL



Boring No.	Run	Depth (ft)	Recovery (%)	RQD (%)	RQD Classification	Description
RWB-53	1	2' – 12'	100	26.3	Poor	Brown and Gray Limestone Slightly to Moderately Weathered, Moderately to Heavily Fractured, Some Vugs



SOIL BORING LOG

ROUTE I-80 DESCRIPTION Retaining Wall No. 4 - Ramp C LOGGED BY SB

SECTION C-91-109-22 LOCATION SEC. 16, TWP. 35 N, RNG. 10 E,

COUNTY Will DRILLING RIG Mobile B-57 DRILLING METHOD HSA HAMMER TYPE Auto HAMMER EFF (%) 89

STRUCT. NO. 099-W125  
Station

BORING NO. RWB-54  
Station 9+22.71  
Offset 25.49ft LT  
Ground Surface Elev. 572.26 ft

D E P T H (ft)  
B L O W S (/6")  
U C S (tsf)  
M O I S T (%)

Surface Water Elev. N/A ft  
Stream Bed Elev. N/A ft  
Groundwater Elev.:  
First Encounter Dry ft  
Upon Completion N/A ft  
After Hrs. N/A ft


Table with columns for depth, blow count, UCS, and moisture content. Includes entries for topsoil, gravel, and weathered limestone.

The Unconfined Compressive Strength (UCS) Failure Mode is indicated by (B-Bulge, S-Shear, P-Penetrometer)  
The SPT (N value) is the sum of the last two blow values in each sampling zone (AASHTO T206)





Retaining Wall #4 – Ramp C  
 RWB-55  
 Will County, IL



Boring No.	Run	Depth (ft)	Recovery (%)	RQD (%)	RQD Classification	Description
RWB-55	1	1.5' – 11.5'	100	10.8	Very Poor	Brown and Gray Limestone Slightly to Moderately Weathered, Heavily Fractured, Some Vugs

**Appendix D**  
**Laboratory Test Results**



# Compressive Strength of Rock by ASTM D7012 - Method C



**GSG CONSULTANTS, INC.**  
735 Remington Road, Schaumburg, IL 60173  
Tel: 630.994.2600, www.gsg-consultants.com

Project Name: WSP\_198-003 I-80  
 Boring ID: RWB-28  
 Sample Depth (ft): 7.5-8  
 Lithological Description: Sandy stone  
 Formation Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Load Direction: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Appearance (e.g. cracks, shearing, spalling): \_\_\_\_\_

Project No: 21-2007  
 Bulk/Prep \_\_\_\_\_ MC/CS \_\_\_\_\_  
 Tester: AJ Tester: AJ  
 Date: 11/02/22 Date: 11/02/22  
 Vertical \_\_\_\_\_ Angle Drilled: Vertical

### Bulk Density Determination

	1	2	3	Average
Height, in.	4.3520	4.3475	4.3425	4.3473
Diameter, in.	1.9860	1.9885	1.9855	1.9867
Specimen Mass, g	584.7			Ratio (2.0-2.5)
Bulk Density, pcf	165.3			2.19

### Moisture Condition - D2216

Container ID	22
container, g	469.2
container + wet rock, g	1034.8
container + dry soil, g	1019.2
moisture content, w%	2.8


### Preparation Check

	Yes	No	Reason/Readings If No:
Ends Flat within 0.02 mm prior to capping?	X		
Ends perpendicular to side within 0.25 degrees?	X		
Ends parallel to each other within 0.25 degrees?	X		

### Axial Loading

		Remarks
Seating Load ( $\leq 1000$ psi)	1000	Best efforts have been made for the specimen to meet the required tolerances of D4543. See IH3 Procedure for efforts made.
Rate of Loading (73-145 psi/s)	75	
Time to Failure (2-15 min)	1 min 24 sec	
Load @ Failure, lbf	20,200	
Uniaxial Compressive Strength, psi	6,516	

### After Preparation



### After Break (check applicable appearance)

 Type 1 Reasonably well-formed cones on both ends, less than 1 in. [25 mm] of cracking through caps <input type="checkbox"/>	 Type 2 Well-formed cone on one end, vertical cracks running through caps, no well-defined cone on other end <input type="checkbox"/>	 Type 3 Columnar vertical cracking through both ends, no well-formed cones <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
 Type 4 Diagonal fracture with no cracking through ends; tap with hammer to distinguish from Type 1 <input type="checkbox"/>	 Type 5 Side fractures at top or bottom (occur commonly with unbonded caps) <input type="checkbox"/>	 Type 6 Similar to Type 5 but end of cylinder is pointed <input type="checkbox"/>

Sketch if Other:



# Compressive Strength of Rock by ASTM D7012 - Method C



**GSG CONSULTANTS, INC.**  
735 Remington Road, Schaumburg, IL 60173  
Tel: 630.994.2600, www.gsg-consultants.com

Project Name: WSP\_198-003 I-80  
 Boring ID: RWB-30  
 Sample Depth (ft): 14-14.5  
 Lithological Description: Limestone  
 Formation Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Load Direction: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Appearance (e.g. cracks, shearing, spalling): \_\_\_\_\_

Project No: 21-2007  
 Bulk/Prep MC/CS  
 Tester: SM Tester: SM  
 Date: 11/02/22 Date: 11/02/22  
 Vertical Angle Drilled: Vertical  
 \_\_\_\_\_ holes

### Bulk Density Determination

	1	2	3	Average
Height, <i>in.</i>	4.5130	4.5105	4.5110	4.5115
Diameter, <i>in.</i>	1.9835	1.9825	1.9845	1.9835
Specimen Mass, <i>g</i>	606.0		Ratio (2.0-2.5)	
Bulk Density, <i>pcf</i>	165.6		2.27	

### Moisture Condition - D2216

Container ID	24
container, <i>g</i>	471.2
container + wet rock, <i>g</i>	1071.7
container + dry soil, <i>g</i>	1057.1
moisture content, <i>w%</i>	2.5

### Preparation Check

	Yes	No	Reason/Readings If No:
Ends Flat within 0.02 mm prior to capping?	X		
Ends perpendicular to side within 0.25 degrees?	X		
Ends parallel to each other within 0.25 degrees?	X		

### Axial Loading

		Remarks
Seating Load ( $\leq 1000$ psi)	1000	Best efforts have been made for the specimen to meet the required tolerances of D4543. See IH3 Procedure for efforts made.
Rate of Loading (73-145 psi/s)	75	
Time to Failure (2-15 min)	1 min 47 sec	
Load @ Failure, <i>lbf</i>	26,009	
Uniaxial Compressive Strength, <i>psi</i>	8,417	

### After Preparation



### After Break (check applicable appearance)

 Type 1 Reasonably well-formed cones on both ends, less than 1 in. [25 mm] of cracking through caps <input type="checkbox"/>	 Type 2 Well-formed cone on one end, vertical cracks running through caps, no well-defined cone on other end <input type="checkbox"/>	 Type 3 Columnar vertical cracking through both ends, no well-formed cones <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
 Type 4 Diagonal fracture with no cracking through ends; tap with hammer to distinguish from Type 1 <input type="checkbox"/>	 Type 5 Side fractures at top or bottom (occur commonly with unbonded caps) <input type="checkbox"/>	 Type 6 Similar to Type 5 but end of cylinder is pointed <input type="checkbox"/>

Sketch if Other:



# Compressive Strength of Rock by ASTM D7012 - Method C



**GSG CONSULTANTS, INC.**  
735 Remington Road, Schaumburg, IL 60173  
Tel: 630.994.2600, www.gsg-consultants.com

Project Name: WSP\_198-003 I-80  
 Boring ID: RWB-32  
 Sample Depth (ft): 12-12.5  
 Lithological Description: Limestone  
 Formation Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Load Direction: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Appearance (e.g. cracks, shearing, spalling): \_\_\_\_\_

Project No: 21-2007  
Bulk/Prep MC/CS  
 Tester: SM Tester: SM  
 Date: 10/26/22 Date: 10/26/22  
 Angle Drilled: Vertical

### Bulk Density Determination

	1	2	3	Average
Height, in.	3.3420	3.3450	3.3455	3.3442
Diameter, in.	1.9840	1.9855	1.9860	1.9852
Specimen Mass, g	420.0			Ratio (2.0-2.5)
Bulk Density, pcf	154.6			1.68

### Moisture Condition - D2216

Container ID	OREO
container, g	226.5
container + wet rock, g	646.0
container + dry soil, g	642.0
moisture content, w%	1.0


### Preparation Check

	Yes	No	Reason/Readings If No:
Ends Flat within 0.02 mm prior to capping?	X		
Ends perpendicular to side within 0.25 degrees?	X		
Ends parallel to each other within 0.25 degrees?	X		

### Axial Loading

		Remarks
Seating Load ( $\leq 1000$ psi)	1000	Test Speciman non-comformancy with standard D7012 for Length to diameter ratio requirements due to lack of available specimens , The results may differ from results obtained from a test specimen that meets the requirements Length to diameter ratio.
Rate of Loading (73-145 psi/s)	75	
Time to Failure (2-15 min)	1 min 8 sec	
Load @ Failure, lbf	16,708	
Uniaxial Compressive Strength, psi	5,398	

### After Preparation



### After Break (check applicable appearance)

Sketch   $< 1$  in. [25 mm]

Type 1  
Reasonably well-formed cones on both ends, less than 1 in. [25 mm] of cracking through caps

Type 2  
Well-formed cone on one end, vertical cracks running through caps, no well-defined cone on other end

Type 3  
Columnar vertical cracking through both ends, no well-formed cones

---

Type 4  
Diagonal fracture with no cracking through ends; tap with hammer to distinguish from Type 1

Type 5  
Side fractures at top or bottom (occur commonly with unbonded caps)

Type 6  
Similar to Type 5 but end of cylinder is pointed


Sketch if Other:







**Appendix E**  
**Slope Stability Analysis Exhibits**



Material Name	Color	Unit Weight (lbs/ft3)	Strength Type	Cohesion (psf)	Phi (deg)
Clay Engineered Fill Undrained		125	Mohr-Coulomb	1000	0
Granular Engineered Fill Undrained		125	Mohr-Coulomb	0	30
Brown Sand Fill		143	Mohr-Coulomb	0	33
Light Brown and Gray Very Dense Weathered Limestone		142	Mohr-Coulomb	0	44
MSE Wall		120	Infinite strength		
Limestone		165	Mohr-Coulomb	0	50

 735 Remington Road, Schaumburg, IL 60173 Tel: 630.994.2600, www.gsg-consultants.com	Project		IDOT PTB 198-003 - Retaining Wall #4	
	Group	0.7H	Scenario	Short Term Stability - Water El. 577 feet
	Drawn By	RM	Company	GSG Consultants, Inc.
	Date	7/15/2021, 12:22:18 PM	File Name	Retaining Wall #4 0.7H v1.slmd
	SLIDEINTERPRET 9.025			





**Appendix F**  
**Summary of Soil Parameters**

**Table F-1 – Summary of Soil Parameters**

Depth / Elevation Range (feet)	Soil Description	In situ Unit Weight $\gamma$ (pcf)	Undrained		Drained	
			Cohesion c (psf)	Friction Angle $\phi$ (°)	Cohesion c (psf)	Friction Angle $\phi$ (°)
	New Engineered Clay Fill	125	1,000	0	50	25
	New Engineered Granular Fill	125	0	30	0	30
0-19.5 (590-570.5)	Light Brown and Gray Very Dense Sand with Gravel / Gravel with Sand	143	0	45	0	45
19.5-20.5 (570.5-569.5)	Light Brown and Gray Very Dense Weathered Limestone	142	0	44	0	44
0-2.5 (590-587.5) <b>RWB-34, RWB-35</b>	Fill Brown and Gray Silty Clay	135	3,100	0	310	25
19.5-22.5 (570.5-567.5) <b>RWB-29 only</b>	Fill Brown and Gray Silty Clay	125	650	0	65	25
14-17 (576-573) <b>RWB-49, RWB-50</b>	Fill Dark Brown Silty Clay	132	2,300	0	230	25
13-18 (577-572) <b>RWB-48, RWB-51</b>	Fill Brown, Gray, and Black Sand / Sandy Loam	143	0	33	0	33