STRUCTURE GEOTECHNICAL REPORT ILLINOIS ROUTE 59 RETAINING WALLS PR SN 022-2998 and 022-2999 LAKE COUNTY, ILLINOIS

For Collins Engineers, Inc. 123 North Wacker Drive, Suite 900 Chicago, IL 60606

> Submitted by Wang Engineering, Inc. 1145 North Main Street Lombard, IL 60148

> > Original Report: December 28, 2017 Revised Report: March 6, 2018

1 Title and Subtitle		2 Original Datas Dacambar 28, 2017
	t, IL Route 59 Retaining Walls	2. Original Date: December 28, 2017 Revised Date: March 6, 2018
182/004 NA 9. Prepared by Contributor(s) Wang Engineering, Inc. Author: Mickey L. Snider, PE 1145 N Main Street QA/QC: Corina T. Farez, PE, F Lombard, IL 60148 PM: Mickey L. Snider, PE 10. Prepared for Contact(s) Collins Engineers Inc. Jason Schneider, PE, SE 123 North Wacker Drive Suite 900 Chicago, IL, 60606 Contact(s)		3. Report Type ⊠ SGR □ RGR □ Draft □ Final ⊠ Revised
	ct/ Region	5. Job/ Contract
6. PTB / Item No. 182/ 004	_	8. Proposed Structure Number(s) SN 022-2998 and 022-2999
1145 N Main Street	Author: Mickey L. Snider, PE QA/QC: Corina T. Farez, PE, PG	Contact Information (630) 953-9928 ext. 1027 <u>msnider@wangeng.com</u>
10. Prepared for Collins Engineers Inc. 123 North Wacker Drive Suite 900	Contact(s)	Contact Information (312) 236-5953 JSchneider@collinsengr.com
11. Abstract		
use path. The south wall w Station 510+80 to 512+80; of-pavement. Total and exp not be taller than 6 feet exp Along the walls, the existin natural stiff to hard silty of sandy gravel. Groundwater The proposed retaining wa lagging, mechanically-stab soldier pile and lagging w within prebored holes with deflection, with the equilib factor of 0.75. We estimate the foundation	will extend from Station 505+00 to Sta the face of both walls will be construct posed wall heights have not yet been c cosed. Each of the walls will, however, it ing soils consists of stiff to hard silty cla- clay. Deeper foundation soils include to was not encountered during the investi- alls will be in a fill sections and shou- ilized earth (MSE), or reinforced-concr- all that could be installed either by dr in diameters of 36 inches. The wall shou- rium evaluation including a lateral load in soil has a maximum nominal bearing	ation 507+57 and the north wall from ed about 15 feet east of the IL59 edge- onfirmed, but we understand they will have a noise wall erected on top. ay or dense sandy gravel fill overlying medium dense to dense fine sand and gation. ald be constructed as soldier pile and rete cantilever (RCC) walls. A flexible iving or by installing the solider piles ould be designed for equilibrium and d factor of 1.5 and a passive resistance resistance of 8,200 psf; the maximum
factored bearing resistance resistance factor of 0.45. T under the applied bearing p	is 5,300 psf for an MSE resistance fa The foundation soils will undergo long pressures. The factor of safety in global	actor of 0.65 or 3,700 psf for an RCC -term settlement of less than 1.0 inch I stability for a wall with a total height
Dewatering will not be required a second sec	uired during construction.	
S:\Netprojects\4862303\Reports\F	RPT_Wang_MLS_4862303IL59RWS_20171201	

Technical Report Documentation Page

Geotechnical · Construction · Environmental Quality Engineering Services Since 1982



TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0	INTRODUCTION	1
1.1	PROPOSED STRUCTURE	1
1.2	EXISTING STRUCTURE AND LAND USE	1
2.0	GEOLOGICAL SETTING	2
2.1	Physiography	2
2.2	SUFICIAL COVER	2
2.3	Bedrock	
3.0	METHODS OF INVESTIGATION	3
3.1	FIELD INVESTIGATION	
3.2	LABORATORY TESTING	4
4.0	INVESTIGATION RESULTS	4
4.1	LITHOLOGICAL PROFILE	4
4.2	GROUNDWATER CONDITIONS	5
5.0	FOUNDATION ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	5
5.0		······ J
5.0	SEISMIC DESIGN CONSIDERATIONS	
		6
5.1	SEISMIC DESIGN CONSIDERATIONS	6
5.1 5.2 5.3	SEISMIC DESIGN CONSIDERATIONS	6 6 7
5.1 5.2 5.3 5.	SEISMIC DESIGN CONSIDERATIONS SOLDIER PILE AND LAGGING WALL MSE AND RCC WALLS	6 6 7 7
5.1 5.2 5.3 5.	SEISMIC DESIGN CONSIDERATIONS SOLDIER PILE AND LAGGING WALL MSE AND RCC WALLS 5.3.1 Bearing Resistance and Sliding	6 6 7 7
5.1 5.2 5.3 5. 5.	SEISMIC DESIGN CONSIDERATIONS SOLDIER PILE AND LAGGING WALL MSE AND RCC WALLS	
5.1 5.2 5.3 5. 5. 5.4	SEISMIC DESIGN CONSIDERATIONS SOLDIER PILE AND LAGGING WALL MSE AND RCC WALLS 5.3.1 Bearing Resistance and Sliding 5.3.2 Settlement GLOBAL STABILITY	
5.1 5.2 5.3 5. 5.4 6.0	SEISMIC DESIGN CONSIDERATIONS SOLDIER PILE AND LAGGING WALL MSE AND RCC WALLS	
5.1 5.2 5.3 5. 5.4 6.0 6.1	SEISMIC DESIGN CONSIDERATIONS	
5.1 5.2 5.3 5. 5.4 6.0 6.1 6.2	SEISMIC DESIGN CONSIDERATIONS	
5.1 5.2 5.3 5. 5.4 6.0 6.1 6.2 6.3	SEISMIC DESIGN CONSIDERATIONS	



EXHIBITS

1. SITE LOCATION MAP

2. BORING LOCATION PLAN

3. Soil Profile

APPENDIX A

BORING LOGS

APPENDIX B

LABORATORY TEST RESULTS

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Long-term (Drained) Geotechnical Parameters for Design of Soldier Pile Walls	. 6
Table 2: Recommended Parameters for Lateral Load Analysis of Soldier Pile Walls	7



1145 North Main Street Lombard, Illinois 60148 Phone (630) 953-9928 www.wangeng.com

STRUCTURE GEOTECHNICAL REPORT ILLINOIS ROUTE 59 RETAINING WALLS PR SN 022-2998 and 022-2999 DUPAGE COUNTY, ILLINOIS FOR COLLINS ENGINEERS

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The following report presents the results of the subsurface investigation, laboratory testing, and geotechnical engineering evaluations for two new Retaining Walls along northbound Illinois Route 59 just north of Army Trail Road in DuPage County, Illinois. A Site Location Map is presented as Exhibit 1.

1.1 Proposed Structure

Based on the concept information provided by Collins Engineers, Inc., Wang Engineering, Inc. (Wang) understands the south retaining wall runs from Station 505+00 to Station 507+57 and the north wall will run from Station 510+80 to 512+80; the face of both walls will be constructed about 15 feet east of the IL59 edge-of-pavement. Wall heights have not yet been confirmed, but we understand they will not be taller than 6 feet exposed. Each of the walls will, however, support a noise wall. The walls will support a multi-use path to be constructed alongside northbound IL59.

1.2 Existing Structure and Land Use

There is currently a 10- to 18-foot tall noise wall between Stations 505+00 and 512+80. Adjacent to the existing IL59 edge-of-pavement, the ground dips down into a 4-to 6-foot deep drainage ditch before meeting the existing noise wall. The concept plan is to fill the ditch by constructing the retaining wall and moving the noise wall to the top.

The purpose of this investigation was to characterize the site soil and groundwater conditions, perform geotechnical analyses, and provide recommendations for the design and construction of the proposed retaining and noise walls.



2.0 GEOLOGICAL SETTING

The project area is located in northwestern DuPage County, in Wayne Township. On the USGS West Chicago Quadrangle 7.5 Minute Series map, the proposed improvement extends on each side of IL 59 and Army Trail Road intersection in Section 16 of Tier 40 N, Range 9 E of the Third Principal Meridian.

The following review of published geologic data, with emphasis on factors that might influence the design and construction of the proposed engineering works, is meant to place the project area within a geological framework and, thus, to confirm the dependability and consistency of the present subsurface investigation results. For the study of the regional geologic framework, Wang considered northeastern Illinois area in general and DuPage County in particular.

2.1 Physiography

Most of DuPage County is part of the Valparaiso Morainic System with its broad parallel ridges that encircle Lake Michigan. The north south trending West Chicago Moraine dominates the project area (Leighton at al. 1948). The project stretches over ferly flat moraine broad crest and elevation of about 800 feet characterized the area. About 1000 feet east, the surface elevation slopes abruptly to about 750 feet into intermorainic area between West Chicago and Wheaton Moraines. DuPage River flows southward within the low-relief area between the two moraines.

2.2 Surficial Cover

According to the available geological information, the surficial geology of the project area is primarily the result of Wisconsinan-age glacial activity. The over 100-foot thick glacial cover is made up predominantly of diamicton attributed to the Wadsworth Formation that interfingers with outwash of the Henry Formation and silty clay diamicton and loamy diamicton of the Lemont Formation (Hansel and Johnson 1996; Curry 2007). The Wadsworth Formation characterized by fairly uniform, gray till with clay to silty clay matrix, a high content of dolomite and shale clasts and occasional lenses of sorted and stratified silt and sand (Hansel and Johnson 1996, Curry 2007). From a geotechnical viewpoint, the Wadsworth diamicton is characterised by low plasticity, medium to low moisture content, medium to very stiff consistency, poor permeability, and low compressibility (Bauer et al. 1991). The Henry Formation consists of mainly stratified sand and gravel deposits (Hansel and Johnson 1996, Curry 2007). The Lemont Formation clayey and loamy diamictons facieses interfinger with the Henry formation outwash (Curry 2007). The Lemont



Formation diamictons are characterized by low plasticity, low to moderate moisture content, low compressibility (Bauer et al. 1991).

2.3 Bedrock

In DuPage County, the surficial cover rests unconformably on top of Silurian-age dolostone bedrock that dips eastward at a pace of about 15 feet per mile. Within the project limits, the top of the bedrock lies at about 130 feet below the ground surface (bgs) at about 670 feet elevation. Structurally, the site is located on the eastern flank of the Wisconsin Arch (Willman 1971, Nelson 2010). No active faults or underground mines are known in the area (ISGS 2017).

Our subsurface investigation results fit into the local geologic context. The borings drilled in the project area revealed the native sediments consist of clay to silty clay diamicton of the Wadsworth Formation overlying sand and gravel from the Henry Formation. Bedrock was not encountered during this investigation.

3.0 METHODS OF INVESTIGATION

The following sections outline the subsurface and laboratory investigations performed by Wang.

3.1 Field Investigation

The subsurface investigation along the wall alignments includes eight structure borings, designated RW-01 through RW-08 drilled by Wang in November 2017. The borings were drilled from elevations of 795.6 to 805.5 feet to depths of 20 feet below the ground surface (bgs). The as-drilled northings, eastings, and elevations were acquired with a mapping-grade GPS unit. The boring location information is included in the *Boring Logs* (Appendix A) and the as-drilled locations are shown in the *Boring Location Plan* (Exhibit 2).

A truck-mounted drilling rig equipped with hollow stem augers was used to advance and maintain an open borehole. Soil sampling was performed according to AASHTO T 206, "Penetration Test and Split Barrel Sampling of Soils" at 2.5-foot intervals to the boring termination depths.

At each boring location, the boreholes were backfilled upon completion with cuttings and bentonite chips, and the surface was restored as much as possible to its original condition.



Field boring logs, prepared and maintained by a Wang field engineer, included lithological descriptions, visual-manual soil classifications, pocket penetrometer and Rimac unconfined compressive strength tests, and results of field standard penetration test (SPT) results recorded as blows per 6 inches of penetration. Groundwater levels were measured while drilling and at completion of each boring. Samples collected from each sampling interval were placed in sealed glass jars and transported to the laboratory for testing.

3.2 Laboratory Testing

Soil samples were tested in our laboratory for moisture content (AASHTO T 265). Atterberg limit (AASHTO T 89/90) and particle size (AASHTO T 88) analyses was performed on a selected sample. Field visual descriptions of soil samples were verified in the laboratory and index tested soils were classified according to the IDH Soil Classification System. The laboratory test results are shown in the *Boring Logs* (Appendix A) and *Laboratory Test Results* (Appendix B).

4.0 INVESTIGATION RESULTS

Detailed descriptions of the soil conditions encountered during the subsurface investigation are presented in the attached *Boring Logs* (Appendix A) and in the *Soil Profile* (Exhibit 3). Please note that strata contact lines represent approximate boundaries between soil types. The actual transition between soil types in the field may be gradual in horizontal and vertical directions.

4.1 Lithological Profile

The borings were advanced along the edge of IL59 and encountered surface conditions of 9 to 11 inches of concrete pavement over 8 to 13 inches of sandy gravel base. In descending order, the general lithologic succession encountered beneath the topsoil includes 1) man-made ground (fill); 2) stiff to hard silty clay; and 3) medium dense to dense sand and sandy gravel.

(1) Man-made ground (fill)

Below the pavement, the borings encountered 4 to 6 feet of fill materials. The fill consists of either stiff to hard, brown and gray silty clay or dense, brown and gray sandy gravel. The silty clay has unconfined compressive strength (Q_u) values of 1.0 to 4.0 tsf and moisture content values of 12 to 18%. The sandy gravel has an N-value of 35 blows per foot of penetration.



(2) Stiff to hard silty clay

Beneath the fill the borings advanced through stiff to hard, brown and gray silty clay to silty clay loam diamicton. This unit is the predominate foundation soil type beneath the proposed retaining wall with thickness of 15 to 20 feet and was the only soil type revealed in Boring RW-04. The silty clay has Q_u values of 1.6 to greater than 6.0 tsf and moisture content values of 15 to 28%.

Borings RW-04 and RW-05, drilled in the middle portion of the project and at the low point in the IL59 profile, each encountered a single sample with Q_u less than 2.0 and moisture content greater than 25%. These samples likely represent a thin lacustrine deposit overlying the thicker, dryer diamicton. Laboratory testing on these two samples shows liquid limit (L_L) values of 55 to 60% and plastic limit (P_L) values of 19 to 21%; the liquidity index of this unit is between 0.15 and 0.20, indicating soils that will not be prone to excessive deformations despite the slightly higher moisture contents.

(3) Medium dense to dense sand

Deeper soil conditions at both the far north and south ends of the wall limits include medium dense to dense, gray, fine sand and sandy gravel. The granular soils have N-values of 13 to 49 blows per foot of penetration. This unit was first encountered 12 to 18 feet below existing grade and will have minimal impact on the design of the retaining walls.

4.2 Groundwater Conditions

The sand and sandy gravel samples from **Layer 3** were encountered damp to moist. The samples did not indicate the presence of a permanent phreatic surface; however, they do indicate that during certain periods of precipitation, groundwater should be expected at these depths. The boreholes were recorded as dry at the completion of drilling.

5.0 FOUNDATION ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The proposed 6-foot exposed height walls will support a new multi-use path between Stations 505+00 and 507+57 and Stations 510+80 and 512+80 along IL59. We understand a soldier pile and lagging wall is the preferred wall type, as the soldier piles can be extended up to receive the noise wall panels. As alternatives, the wall could also be constructed as a mechanically-stabilized earth (MSE) or reinforced-concrete cantilever (RCC) wall.



5.1 Seismic Design Considerations

Seismic design is not required for retaining wall structures located in Seismic Performance Zone (SPZ) 1 in accordance with the IDOT *Bridge Manual* (2012).

5.2 Soldier Pile and Lagging Wall

If soldier piles are designed to support the walls, they could be installed either by driving or by setting them within prebored holes. The chosen system should be designed for both lateral earth pressure and lateral deformation. The embedment depth in moment equilibrium for the wall sections should be designed in accordance with the LRFD guidelines (AASHTO 2016), which will require an active lateral earth load factor of 1.5 and a passive lateral earth pressure resistance factor of 0.75. These guidelines have been known to result in deeper embedment depths and larger soldier pile sizes, than those designed under Allowable Stress Design (ASD).

Generally, both granular soils and overconsolidated clayey soils, such as the stiff to hard silty clay encountered in the borings will exhibit lower overall shear strength in the long-term condition. Therefore, in accordance with AASHTO (2016) the lateral earth pressure analysis should be performed for walls in the long-term (drained) condition using the soil parameters shown in Table 1. The earth pressure coefficients provided are for straight backfill behind and in front of the wall.

Soil Description		Drained She Prope	0	Earth Pressure Coefficie (Straight Backfill)		
Avg Depth Limit bgs	Unit Weight, γ (pcf)	Cohesion (psf)	Friction Angle (°)	Active Pressure	Passive Pressure	
Stiff to Hard SI CLAY FILL Surface to 5 feet	120	100	30	0.33	3.00	
Dense SANDY GRAVEL FILL (RW-05) Surface to 5 feet	120	0	32	0.31	3.26	
Stiff to hard SI CLAY From 5 to 17 feet	120	100	30	0.33	3.00	
M Dense to Dense SAND and SA GRAVEL From 17 to 20 feet	125	0	32	0.31	3.26	

Table 1: Long-term (Drained) Geotechnical Parameters for Design of Soldier Pile Walls



The lateral deformation of the wall should be designed for movement and moment fixity at the base of the pile or prebore. The evaluations should be performed using the parameters shown in Table 2 via p-y curve (COM624) method.

Soil Description	Unit	Undrained Shear	Estimated Friction	Estimated Lateral Soil Modulus	Estimated Soil Strain
Avg Depth Limit bgs	Weight, γ (pcf)	Strength, c _u (psf)	Angle, Φ (°)	Parameter, k (pci)	Parameter, ε_{50} (%)
Stiff to Hard SI					
CLAY FILL	120	2000	0	1000	0.6
Surface to 5 feet					
Dense SANDY					
GRAVEL FILL (RW-05)	120	0	32	60	
Surface to 5 feet					
Stiff to hard SI CLAY	120	2500	0	1000	0.5
From 5 to 17 feet	120	2500	0	1000	0.5
M Dense to Dense SAND					
and SA GRAVEL	125	0	32	90	
From 17 to 20 feet					

Table 2: Recommended	Parameters for	Lateral Load	Analysis of	f Soldier Pile Walls

5.3 MSE and RCC Walls

An MSE retaining wall base should be established a minimum of 3.5 feet below the finished grade at the front face of the wall, while a RCC wall should be established a minimum of 4.0 feet. MSE walls are constructed in accordance with IDOT Section 522 (2016).

5.3.1 Bearing Resistance and Sliding

From the concept geometry we estimate that the MSE wall will have a total height of 9.5 feet and will apply a maximum factored bearing pressure of 2,400 psf, accounting for vertical and lateral load factors (AASHTO 2016). The foundation will be established on stiff to hard silty clay (**Layer 2**) soils. The estimated nominal bearing resistance of the soil is 8,200 psf and the factored bearing resistance is 5,300 psf based on a geotechnical resistance factor of 0.65 (AASHTO 2016). The RCC alternative would apply a maximum factored bearing pressure of 2,200 psf and the foundation soils would have a factored resistance of 3,700 psf with a resistance factor of 0.45.



The foundation soils are sufficient for the support of both the MSE and RCC walls. Depending on the design of the noise wall, however, there may be additional dead and/or wind load that may increase the applied bearing pressure of the wall.

The estimated friction angle between an MSE base and the underlying silty clay is 30°, and the corresponding friction coefficient is 0.58. MSE walls are designed based on an AASTHO soil-to-soil contact geotechnical sliding resistance factor of 1.0 (2016). The friction angle between a cast-in-place RCC wall and the underlying silty clay is 24°, and the corresponding friction coefficient is 0.44. Cast-in-place concrete walls on clay are designed based on an AASHTO resistance factor of 0.85 (2016). We estimate the sliding along the clayey soils has sufficient resistance and the eccentricity lies within the required middle 2/3 of the wall (AASHTO 2016).

5.3.2 Settlement

We estimate the settlement performance of the MSE wall will be approximately 0.5 to 1.0 inch over the mix of cohesive and granular soils. The settlement estimates are acceptable for the construction of both the MSE and RCC wall options.

5.4 Global Stability

The retaining walls along IL59 will have total heights of less than 10 feet, will be founded within competent soils with average Q_u values greater than 2.0, and will retain either stiff to hard existing fill or new compacted backfill. Therefore, the wall designs for each of the MSE, RCC, and soldier pile options will be stable with a factor of safety greater than the IDOT requirement of 1.5.

6.0 CONSTRUCTION CONSIDERATIONS

6.1 Site Preparation

Vegetation, surface topsoil, and any existing ditch sediment encountered should be cleared and stripped where the structure will be placed. If unstable or unsuitable materials are exposed during excavation, they should be removed and replaced with compacted structural fill as described in Section 6.3.

6.2 Excavation, Dewatering, and Utilities

Excavations should be performed in accordance with local, state, and federal regulations. The potential effect of ground movements upon nearby utilities should be considered during construction.



Excavations for the construction of the wall should be sloped at no steeper than 1:1.5 (V:H). The back end of the wall will be relatively close to the edge of pavement along IL59; if the pavement is not proposed for replacement, temporary shoring may be necessary.

The borings were encountered damp to moist within the lowest sand and sandy gravel layers. We do not anticipate groundwater concerns during construction of the wall; however, temporary casing should be considered if soldier piles are to be drilled and set into **Layer 3** during periods of heavy precipitation. Precipitation allowed to enter excavations should be immediately removed via sump pump. Any soils allowed to soften under standing water should be removed and replaced with compacted fill as described in Section 6.3.

6.3 Filling and Backfilling

Fill material used to attain final design elevations should be pre-approved, compacted, cohesive or granular soil conforming to IDOT Section 205 (2016). The fill material should be free of organic matter and debris and should be placed in lifts and compacted according to the Standard.

Backfill materials for the RCC wall must be pre-approved by the Resident Engineer. To backfill the wall, we recommend porous granular material conforming to the requirements specified in the IDOT Supplemental Specification for Section 586, *Granular Backfill for Structures* (2017). Backfill material should be placed and compacted in accordance with the Special Provision.

6.4 Earthwork Operations

The required earthwork can be accomplished with conventional construction equipment. Moisture and traffic will cause deterioration of exposed subgrade soils. Precautions should be taken by the Contractor to prevent water erosion of the exposed subgrade. A compacted subgrade will minimize water runoff erosion.

Earth moving operations should be scheduled to not coincide with excessive cold or wet weather (early spring, late fall or winter). Any soil allowed to freeze or soften due to the standing water should be removed. Wet weather can cause problems with subgrade compaction.

It is recommended that an experienced geotechnical engineer be retained to inspect the exposed subgrade, monitor earthwork operations, and provide material inspection services during the construction phase of this project.



7.0 QUALIFICATIONS

The analysis and recommendations submitted in this report are based upon the data obtained from the borings drilled at the locations shown on the boring logs and in Exhibit 3. This report does not reflect any variations that may occur between the borings or elsewhere on the site, variations whose nature and extent may not become evident until the course of construction. In the event that any changes in the design and/or location of the walls are planned, we should be timely informed so that our recommendations can be adjusted accordingly.

It has been a pleasure to assist Collins Engineers, Inc. and the Illinois Department of Transportation on this project. Please call if there are any questions, or if we can be of further service.

Respectfully Submitted,

WANG ENGINEERING, INC.

Mickey L. Snider, P.E. Senior Geotechnical Engineer



Corina T. Farez, P.E., P.G. QA/QC Reviewer



REFERENCES

- BAUER, R.A., CURRY, B.B., GRAESE, A.M., VAIDEN, R.C., SU, W.J., and HASEK, M.J., 1991, Geotechnical Properties of Selected Pleistocene, Silurian, and Ordovician Deposits of Northeastern Illinois: Environmental Geology 139, Illinois State Geological Survey, 69 p.
- CURRY, M.L., 2007, Surficial Geology of Wheeling Quadrangle Lake and Cook Counties, Illinois: Illinois Geological Survey, Illinois Geologic Quadrangle Map, STATEMAP West Chicago-SG, 1:24,000.
- HANSEL, A.K., and JOHNSON, W.H., 1996, Wedron and Mason Groups: Lithostratigraphic Reclassification of the Wisconsin Episode, Lake Michigan Lobe Area: ISGS Bulletin 104: Champaign, Illinois State Geological Survey, 116 p.
- IDOT (2011) All Geotechnical Manual Users Memorandum 10.2 Static Method of Estimating Pile Length
- IDOT (2012) Bridge Manual. Illinois Department of Transportation.
- IDOT (2015) Geotechnical Manual. Illinois Department of Transportation.
- IDOT (2016) *Standard Specifications for Road and Bridge Construction*. Illinois Department of Transportation, 1098 pp.
- IDOT (2017) Supplemental Specifications and Recurring Special Provisions
- ISGS 2017, Coal Mines and Industrial Mineral Mines, DuPage and Cool Counties, ISGS; <u>http://isgs.illinois.edu/sites/isgs/files/maps/coal-maps/mines-series/mines-maps/pdf-files/mines-map-dupage-nwcook.pdf</u>
- LEIGHTON, M.M., EKBLAW, G.E., and HORBERG, L., 1948, Physiographic Divisions of Illinois: The Journal of Geology, v. 56, p. 16-33.



1145 North Main Street Lombard, Illinois 60148 Phone (630) 953-9928 www.wangeng.com

EXHIBITS

Geotechnical · Construction · Environmental Quality Engineering Services Since 1982



Bench Mark: Cut square on southwest corner of concrete base of traffic control box on northeast corner of IL 59 NOISE WALL DESIGN LOADS HIGHWAY CLASSIFICATION and Army Trail Rd. Elevation 807.24. IL Rte. 59 - F.A.P. Rte. 338 AASHTO LRFD Load Combinations: Functional Class: Other Principal Arterial Existing Structure: The existing noise wall structure consists of HP-Piles spaced at 15'-0" with approximately Service I Wind Load = 15 psf 13'-0" to 18'-0" tall noise panel wall. ADT: 37,700 (2016); 42,000 (2040) Strength III Wind Load = 35 psf ADTT: 6,032 (2016); 6,720 (2040) Strength V Wind Load = 20 psf DHV: 4,784 (2015) Traffic to be maintained utilizing staged construction. Design Speed: 45 m.p.h. Posted Speed: 45 m.p.h. Salvage: Existing noise wall panels shall be removed, modified as required, and installed on proposed noise wall. Existing noise wall panels not re-utilized shall be delivered to the IDOT maintenance yard. Two-Way Traffic Directional Distribution: 50%/50% 254'-10¹" Measured Along F.F. of Wall Sta. 505+00.00 Elev. 817.75' - Sta. 505+99.42 -15'x 3' Reused Panel -T/Conc. Facing Sta. 506+97.80 Elev. 817.75' (Тур.) Elev. 804.99' Elev. 815.75' T/Conc. Facing T/Conc. Facing Elev. 802.89 Elev. 800.65' 그 다 그 다 -um -B/Conc. · # Facing · _IL _ L III #= ㅋ = ::= = = #= Elev. 802.91 B/Conc. Facing " Elev. 798.27' B/Conc. Facing Elev. 795.01' ш 11 11 11 11 11 111 III JUL ш jji ш ų. Щ - iii ы ш -ų i ЛГ ١Ų Expansion -Finish Grade Expansion 18'-17" 26'-9" 30'-0" Joint at F.F. of Wall Construction Joint Panel (Typ.) Panel Joint, (Typ.) Panel Exist. Grade ELEVATION at F.F. of Wall * Pile section, spacing, & tip elevation to be determined during final design. RW-2, 802.99 feet RW-4, 798.65 feet STA. 505+84.24, 28.57 RT RW-3, 801.01 feet STA. 507+76.97, 28.60 RT STA. 506+82.70, 29.80 RT RW-01, 805,45 feet 507+00 506+00 STA 504+86.91, 28.94 Stage Construction Line N.B. PGL RW-03 RW = 0.2 $k_{W=01}$ Traffic B.F. of Wall MH Proposed 12" Storm Sewer HH - Back of Curb 8'-0" Proposed Shared-use Path (Typ.) (F) ______ F0 / 2000112/2/2/2002 === Existing & Proposed R.O.W Sta. 506+97.80 Sta. 505+99.42 - E E of Wall Offset 48.01' Rt - Begin Removal -Existing Noise Wall Offset 48.92' Rt. Exist. Noise Wall Sta. 505+00.00 Limits of Existing Noise Wall Removal -Begin Wall Sta. 505+00.00 PLAN Offset 49.67' Rt. USER NAME = DESIGNED - LY REVISED FILE NAME = **GENERAL PLAN AND ELEVATION** STATE OF ILLINOIS CHECKED - JMS COLLINS ENGINEERS REVISED

PLOT SCALE =

PLOT DATE =

DRAWN

CHECKED - JMS

DR

REVISED

REVISED

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION



Bench Mark: Cut square on southwest corner of concrete base of traffic control box on northeast corner of IL 59 and Army Trail Rd. Elevation 807.24.

Existing Structure: The existing noise wall structure consists of HP-Piles spaced at 15'-0" with approximately 13'-0" to 18'-0" tall noise panel wall.

Traffic to be maintained utilizing staged construction.

Salvage: Existing noise wall panels shall be removed, modified as required, and installed on proposed noise wall. Existing noise wall panels not re-utilized shall be delivered to the IDOT maintenance yard.

NOISE WALL DESIGN LOADS

AASHTO LRFD Load Combinations: Service I Wind Load = 15 psf Strength III Wind Load = 35 psf Strength V Wind Load = 20 psf

HIGHWAY CLASSIFICATION

IL. Rte. 59 – F.A.P. Rte. 338 Functional Class: Other Principal Arterial ADT: 37,700 (2016); 42,000 (2040) ADTT: 6,032 (2016); 6,720 (2040) DHV: 4,784 (2015) Design Speed: 45 m.p.h. Posted Speed: 45 m.p.h. Two-Way Traffic Directional Distribution: 50%/50%





SHEET NO. 1 OF 2 SHEETS ILLINOIS FED. AID PROJECT





1145 North Main Street Lombard, Illinois 60148 Phone (630) 953-9928 www.wangeng.com

APPENDIX A

Geotechnical · Construction · Environmental Quality Engineering Services Since 1982

Wangeng@wangeng.com BORING LOG RW- 1145 N Main Street WEI Job No.: 486-23-03 Lombard, IL 60148 Client Collins Engineers, Inc. Project IL Route 59 Retaining Wal Fax: Location Bartlett, Illinois									23-03 , Inc. 19 Wall	Page	1 of 1			
Profile	SOIL AND ROCK	Depth (ft) Sample Type	Sample No.	SPT Values (blw/6 in)	Qu (tsf)	Moisture Content (%)	Profile	Elevation (ft)	SOIL AND ROC DESCRIPTION		Sample Type recovery Sample No	SPT Values (blw/6 in)	Qu (tsf)	Moisture Content (%)
	10-inch thick, CONCRETE 9-inch thick, loose, brown 803.9SANDY GRAVEL BASE COUL Stiff to hard, brown SILTY C trace gravel; damp	RSE/	1	5 5 3	NP	7								
	KL	DR 2	2	11 9 11	NR									
			3	9 12 12	1.00 P	18								
			4	7 11 14	5.33 B	17								
	792.4		5	6 8 8	5.49 B	19								
	Medium dense, yellowish br very fine SAND; moist RE	own, DR 2	6	7 7 6	NP	4								
5/18 			7	8 14 9	NP	10								
WANGENGINC 4862303.GPJ WANGENG GDT 3/61	785.4 Boring terminated at 20.00 f	20 T	8	7 10 11	NP	13								
33.GP	GENE	RAL NOT												
Be ²³⁰	gin Drilling 11-28-2017			-		1-28			While Drilling	¥		5.50 ft		
v v z z	illing Contractor Wang Testil iller K&N Logger								At Completion of Drilling Time After Drilling) <u>₹</u> NA		DRY	•••••	
	iller K&N Logger								Depth to Water		•••••			
	upon completion					-			The stratification lines rep	resent the app	roximate	boundar	у	
>						• • • • • • •		•••••	between soil types; the ac	ual liansilion	may be C	auual.		





Wang	1		BC	DRI	NG	i L(OG F	RW-04				Page	1 of 1
EngineeringWEI Job No.: 486-wangeng@wangeng.com1145 N Main StreetLombard, IL 60148ClientTelephone: (630) 953-9928ProjectFax:LocationBartlett, Illinoi								Inc. g Wall	Datum: No Elevation: North: 192 East: 1018 Station: 50 Offset: 28	798.65 3971.3 3539.49)7+76.9	B ft ft		
BOIL AND ROCK	Depth (ft) Sample Type	recovery Sample No.	SPT Values (blw/6 in)	Qu (tsf)	Moisture Content (%)	Profile	Elevation (ft)	SOIL AND ROC DESCRIPTION		Sample Type recovery Sample No	SPT Values (blw/6 in)	Qu (tsf)	Moisture Content (%)
10-inch thick, CONCRETE 13-inch thick, medium dens brown and gray SANDY 13-inch thick, medium dens brown and gray SANDY BASE COUL Stiff to hard, greenish browr brown SILTY CLAY to SILT	ENT e, RSE/	1	20 15 6	NP	7								
CLAY LOAM, trace to little g		2	7 4 4	NR									
L _L = 55%, P _L = 2 % Gravel = % Sand = % Silt = % Clay =	= 0.3	3	4 4 4	1.80 B	28								
	10	4	8 8 8	6.64 B	16								
		5	6 6 10	5.00 B	18								
	15	6	5 6 9	4.43 B	22								
		7	6 9 12	8.28 B	16								
Begin Drilling 11-28-2017 Drilling Contractor Wang Testin Driller K&N Logger Drilling Method 2.25 IDA HSA; Upon completion		8	8 8 13	3.61 B	21			\a/a==					
GENE					1 20	200	17		R LEVE				
Begin Drilling 11-28-2017 Drilling Contractor Wang Testi	Comple na Service		-		1-28 50 TM			While Drilling At Completion of Drilling	<u>₹</u> ₹		DRY DRY		
Driller K&N Logger								Time After Drilling	- <u>+</u> NA		~!``!	•••••	
										• • • • •			
Drilling Method 2.25 IDA HSA;	140 lb auto	ohan	nmer;	Bori	ng b	ack	filled	Depth to Water		.			

WANGENGINC 4862303.GPJ WANGENG.GDT 3/5/18



WANGENGINC 4862303.GPJ WANGENG.GDT 3/5/18



4862303.GPJ WANGENG.GDT NANGENGINC



4862303.GPJ WANGENG.GDT 3/5/18





1145 North Main Street Lombard, Illinois 60148 Phone (630) 953-9928 www.wangeng.com

APPENDIX B

Geotechnical · Construction · Environmental Quality Engineering Services Since 1982



LAB.GDT SU 4862303.GPJ Ы SIZE GRAIN







and Army Trail Rd. Elevation 807.24.

13'-0" to 18'-0" tall noise panel wall.

Existing noise wall panels not re-utilized shall be delivered to the IDOT maintenance yard.



