STRUCTURE GEOTECHNICAL REPORT INTERSTATE 80 (FAI 80) BRIDGES OVER US ROUTE 30, METRA ROCK ISLAND DISTRICT, AND HICKORY CREEK, IDOT D-91-046-10 SN 099-0068 AND SN 099-0069, PTB 153 SECTION 99-4-1VB-1-R, CONTRACT 60N87 WILL COUNTY, ILLINOIS

for

Ciorba Group, Inc. 5507 North Cumberland Avenue Chicago, IL 60656 (773) 775-4009

> submitted by Wang Engineering, Inc. 1145 North Main Street Lombard, IL 60148 (630) 953-9928

> > June 29, 2011

1. Title and Subtitle		2. Report Date June 29, 2011						
1 2	Structure Geotechnical Report, Interstate 80 over US Route 30, Metra Rock Island District, and Hickory Creek							
Rock Island District, and Hicko	3. Report Type SGR RGR							
4. Route / Section / County		5. IDOT Project Number(s)						
FAI 80 / 99-4-1VB-1-R /Will		Job# D-91-046-10						
	Contract# 60N87							
6. PTB / Item No.	5. Existing Structure Number(s)	6. Proposed Structure Number(s)						
153/030	SN 099-0068 (WB)	SN 099-0068 (WB)						
	SN 099-0069 (EB)	SN 099-0069 (EB)						
7. Prepared by	Contributor(s)	Contact Phone Number						
Wang Engineering, Inc.	Author: Mickey L. Snider, P.E.	(630) 953-9928 x 27						
1145 N Main Street	Project Manager: Liviu Iordache							
Lombard, IL 60148	QA/QC: Jerry W.H. Wang, PhD, P.E.							
9. Prepared for	Design / Structural Engineer	Contact Phone Number						
Ciorba Group, Inc.	Salvatore Di Bernardo, P.E., S.E.	(773) 775-4009						
5507 North Cumberland Ave								
Chicago, IL 60656								
10. Abstract								

Technical Report Documentation Page

The existing, twin nine-span bridges carrying Interstate 80 over US Route 30, the Metra Rock Island District, and Hickory Creek will undergo partial replacement and a full widening into the existing median. The bridges will be removed, replaced, and widened over US 30 and Metra RID between the southwest abutment and Pier 3; between Pier 4 and the northeast abutment the structures will be widened on new substructures. This report provides geotechnical recommendations for the design of proposed bridge foundations and stage construction using temporary soil retention systems.

The existing embankment material consists of medium stiff to hard clay, silty clay, and clay loam fill. Beneath the fill the native soils include sand and gravel overlying shallow, moderately to heavily weathered dolostone bedrock. We recommend no reductions to the predicted 100-year scour depths at the piers to be widened within Hickory Creek. The site classifies in the Seismic Class C.

The profile grade will be increased in the median by approximately 12 to 18 inches, and we do not anticipate settlement concerns. External stability analyses show suitable factors of safety. The proposed abutments could be supported on 15- to 38-foot long H-piles (size HP12x53 or HP14x73); the new piers and pier widenings should be supported on 3.0- to 4.0-foot diameter drilled shafts socketed into the shallow underlying bedrock; required rock socket thicknesses vary from about 4 to 8 feet. We provide geotechnical parameters for pile and shaft analysis under lateral load.

Stage construction should be supported by flexible steel sheet piling, designed according to *Design Guide 3.13.1* of the IDOT *Bridge Manual*. The piers to be constructed within Hickory Creek will require underwater excavation protection but are not deep enough to require cofferdams. The drilled shafts for all piers should include temporary casing installed to the top of bedrock to prevent issues related to groundwater and granular soil conditions.

11. Path to archived file

S:\Netprojects\7751301\Reports\I80atUS30\RPT_Wang_MLS_7751301I80overUS30_110629.pdf



TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0	INTRODUCTION	1
1.1	PROPOSED STRUCTURE	1
1.2	EXISTING STRUCTURE	2
2.0	SITE CONDITIONS AND GEOLOGICAL SETTING	2
2.1	Physiography	
2.2	Surficial Cover	
2.3	BEDROCK	
3.0	METHODS OF INVESTIGATION	
3.1	SUBSURFACE INVESTIGATION	
3.2	LABORATORY TESTING	
4.0	RESULTS OF FIELD AND LABORATORY INVESTIGATIONS	5
4.1	Soil Conditions	
4.2	GROUNDWATER CONDITIONS	
4.3	SCOUR CONSIDERATIONS	
4.4	SEISMIC DESIGN CONSIDERATIONS	7
5.0	FOUNDATION ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	7
5.1	APPROACH EMBANKMENTS AND SLABS	7
5	5.1.1 Settlement	
5	5.1.2 Global Stability	
5.2	STRUCTURE FOUNDATIONS	
5	5.2.1 Driven Piles	
5	5.2.2 Drilled Shafts	
5	5.2.3 Lateral Loading	
5.3	STAGE CONSTRUCTION DESIGN RECOMMENDATIONS	
6.0	CONSTRUCTION CONSIDERATIONS	
6.1	SITE PREPARATION	
6.2	EXCAVATION	
6.3	FILLING AND BACKFILLING	



6.4 6.5	EARTHWORK OPERATIONS	
7.0	QUALIFICATIONS	
REF	FRENCES	

EXHIBITS

1. Site Location Map

2. Site and Regional Geology

3. Boring Location Plan

4. Soil Profile

APPENDIX A

Boring Logs

APPENDIX B

Laboratory Test Results and Bedrock Core Exhibits

APPENDIX C

Global Stability Evaluations



STRUCTURE GEOTECHNICAL REPORT INTERSTATE 80 (FAI 80) BRIDGES OVER US ROUTE 30, METRA ROCK ISLAND DISTRICT, AND HICKORY CREEK SN 099-0068 AND SN 099-0069, PTB 153 SECTION 99-4-1VB-1-R, IDOT D-91-046-10, CONTRACT 60N87 WILL COUNTY, ILLINOIS FOR CIORBA GROUP, INC.

1.0 INTRODUCTION

This report presents the results of our subsurface investigation, laboratory testing, and geotechnical evaluations for the partial replacement and widening of the Interstate 80 (FAI 80) Bridges over US Route 30, the Metra Rock Island District (RID) rail lines, and Hickory Creek in Will County, Illinois. A *Site Location Map* is presented as Exhibit 1.

1.1 Proposed Structure

Wang Engineering, Inc. (Wang) understands Ciorba Group, Inc. (Ciorba) envisions twin, nine-span structures with pile-supported stub abutments and drilled shaft-supported piers; spans 1, 2, and 3 over US 30 and the Metra RID tracks will be removed and replaced with twin structures widened into the existing median, whereas spans 4 through 9 over Hickory Creek will be widened to the inside of the existing structures only. The proposed back-to-back of abutment lengths will measure 660.0 feet; the out-to-out width will measure 150.7 feet. The preliminary abutment design service loads, provided by Ciorba, are 120 kips at the southwest abutment and 150 kips at the northeast abutment; the preliminary design service shaft loads are shown in Table 5, Section 5.2.2.

Relative to the existing substructures, the southwest abutment will be moved back approximately 30 to 40 feet, Pier 1 will be reconstructed to the southwest of the existing one and Pier 2 will be reconstructed to the northeast of the existing. The pier replacements will provide greater clear distance from the centerline of US 30. The profile grade will remain virtually unchanged. The new end and side slopes at the southwest abutment will be graded at 1:2 (V:H). The improvements will be constructed in two stages with traffic maintained at all times; we anticipate that temporary steel sheet piling will be required to facilitate the stage construction. The widening of Piers 6 and 7 will be performed within Hickory Creek and will require underwater structure excavation protection.



The purpose of our investigation was to characterize the site soil and groundwater conditions, perform geotechnical analyses, and provide recommendations for the design and construction of structure foundations and temporary soil retention systems.

1.2 Existing Structure

According to the Bridge Condition Report, provided by Ciorba, the existing structures were built in 1964 as three continuous three-span structures with pile-supported stub abutments and hammerhead pier footings supported on shallow bedrock. The structures have back-to-back lengths of 616.8 and 629.7 feet and variable out-to-out widths. The beams are W33 curved steel and the deck width is 7.5 inches. A median separates the eastbound and westbound lanes along the approach embankments and the existing bridges have an approximately 60-foot gap between them. The structure was widened in 1996.

2.0 SITE CONDITIONS AND GEOLOGICAL SETTING

The site is located in northwest Will County, about 30 miles southwest of Chicago. On the USGS *Mokena 7.5 minute Quadrangle* map the bridge is located in the NE ¹/₄ of Section 17 of Tier35 N, Range 11 E of the 3rd Principal Meridian.

The following review of the 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 western Illinois area in general and Will County in particular. Exhibit 2 illustrates the *Site and Regional Geology*.

2.1 Physiography

The project area is part of the Wheaton Morainal Country, a morainic area of the Great Lake Section including a series of broad parallel morainic ridges, which encircle Lake Michigan. The project area is characterized now by a variety of elongated hills, mounds, basins, sags and valleys. At the bridge site, outlet valleys carved through the moraine reaching the bedrock and are filled with outwash deposits showing a fairly flat relief. Today, a thin glacial drift covers shallow bedrock (McLean and Smith 1995, Hansel and Johnson 1996, Willman et al. 1975). The surface elevation slopes gently from east to



west, from as high as 650 feet to as low as 600 feet. Hickory Creek runs east to west cutting a channel through the West Chicago Moraine as it flows to the Des Plaines River in Joliet.

2.2 Surficial Cover

Quaternary glacigenic deposits unconformably overlie the Paleozoic bedrock. During the Michigan Subepisode (26,000 to 11,000 B.P.) of the Wisconsin glaciation, a glacial lobe extended over northeastern and north central Illinois (Hansel and Johnson 1996). Will County was under the influence of an extrusion of this lobe, the Joliet sublobe, ultimately responsible for the formation of a series of arcuate, end moraine ridges, separated by low-relief till plains, lake plains, and outlet valleys (Johnson and Hansel 1999, Willman 1971).

The investigated area was built on outwash deposits of the Henry Formation of the Mason Group. Specifically, the bridge spans over valley train like outwash deposits, which consist predominantly of stratified sand and gravel with lenses of silt, clay, and occasional organic debris. At the project area the drift thickness is less than 25 feet (Hansel and Johnson, 1996).

2.3 Bedrock

According to Willman et al. (1975), the uppermost bedrock unit in most of the Will County consists of Silurian-age, red to light gray to white, thin- to medium-bedded dolostones of the Joliet Formation. In the project area, the bedrock top waves between 590 and 625 feet (McLean and Smith 1995) and may be encountered between the ground surface and 25 feet below the ground surface (bgs). Bedrock outcrops may be seen in the cuts along the I-80/US 30 ramps.

No underground mines are known in the area. The nearest coal mines are located about 16 miles southwest, in the vicinity of Morris, Grundy County.

Our subsurface investigation results fit into the local geologic context. The borings drilled in the project area revealed that under man-made fill, the native sediments at the project site consist of gravel and sand of the Henry Formation and gray dolostone of the Joliet Formation. The borings encountered the top of the bedrock between 3 and 49 feet bgs.

3.0 METHODS OF INVESTIGATION

The following section outlines the subsurface and laboratory investigations performed by Wang and



others. The additional subsurface information was provided by Ciorba in November 2009.

3.1 Subsurface Investigation

The subsurface investigation performed by Wang consisted of two structure borings, designated as SB-201 and SB-202, drilled in May 2010 between Piers 4 and 5. The borings were drilled from elevations of 622.6 and 617.0 feet to depths of 28.5 to 33.5 feet bgs. The northing and easting coordinates were surveyed with a mapping-grade GPS; the boring elevations, stations, and offsets were measured from design drawings provided by Ciorba. In addition, a series of 10 borings, designated as SB-101 through SB-110, were drilled in December 1994 at each of the substructure locations. The 1994 logs were drilled from elevations of 646.2 to 603.3 feet to depths of 22.0 to 50.0 feet bgs. These borings provided station, offset, and elevation information; northing and easting coordinates were approximated from drawings provided by Ciorba. The boring location data are shown in the *Boring Logs* (Appendix A), and the as-drilled locations are shown in the *Boring Location Plan* (Exhibit 3).

In Borings SB-201 and SB-202, a truck-mounted drill rig, equipped with hollow stem augers, was used to advance and maintain an open borehole. Soil sampling was performed according to AASHTO T 1587, "*Penetration Test and Split Barrel Sampling of Soils*." The soil was sampled at 2.5-foot intervals to the top of bedrock. Soil samples from each interval were placed in sealed jars for further laboratory testing. In both borings the bedrock was cored in two 5-foot runs using a NX-sized barrel. The bedrock cores were classified in the field and returned to the laboratory for testing. Bedrock core exhibits are shown in Appendix B.

The borings provided by Ciorba show sampling at 2.5-foot intervals to the top of bedrock. Bedrock cores were taken in each boring and descriptions of the soil and rock were included.

Field boring logs, prepared and maintained by a Wang engineer, include lithological descriptions, visual-manual soil classifications, results of Rimac and pocket penetrometer unconfined compressive strength tests, and results of Standard Penetration Tests (SPT), recorded as blows per 6 inches of penetration.

Groundwater observations were made during and after drilling operations. The borings were backfilled with soil cuttings after completion. The 1994 logs also include groundwater elevations.



3.2 Laboratory Testing

The soil samples were tested in the laboratory for moisture content (AASHTO T 265). The soils were classified according to the IDH Textural Classification system and field visual-manual descriptions were verified in the laboratory. The laboratory results are shown in the *Boring Logs* (Appendix A).

4.0 RESULTS OF FIELD AND LABORATORY INVESTIGATIONS

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 4). 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 Soil Conditions

In descending order, the general lithologic succession encountered along the I-80 Bridge includes: 1) medium stiff to hard clay, silty clay, and clay loam fill; 2) loose to very dense sand and gravel; and 3) very poor to very good quality dolostone.

(1) Man-made Ground (Fill)

Immediately beneath the surface the borings revealed 3.5 to 38.0 feet of medium stiff to hard, brown and gray clay, silty clay, and clay loam fill; the approach embankments are constructed entirely of fill materials. Less fill was placed along US 30 and the Metra RID, whereas the Hickory Creek streambed is made up of natural deposits (see **Layer 2**). The fill has unconfined compressive strength (Q_u) values of 0.8 to 4.0 tsf with an average of 2.0 tsf; 50% of the samples have Q_u values between 1.5 and 2.5 tsf. The fill has moisture contents of 11 to 27% with an average of 19%; 64% of the samples show moisture content between 18 and 22%.

(2) Loose to Dense Sand and Gravel

Beneath the fill and within Hickory Creek, at elevations of approximately 620.7 to 604.4 feet, the borings advanced through 3.0 to 12.5 feet of loose to dense, brown and gray, sand and gravel. The sand and gravel has SPT (N)-values between 6 blows/foot and spoon refusal at the top of bedrock. The N-values of the material not achieving spoon refusal range from 5 to 57 blows/foot and average 25 blows/foot.



(3) Very Poor to Very Good Quality dolostone

At elevations of 608.4 to 594.1 feet, the borings encountered very poor to very good, strong, heavily to moderately fractured dolostone bedrock with some clay and silt partings within the jointing. The dolostone has an average rock quality designation (RQD) value of 46%. In Boring SB-105, adjacent to Pier 4, the 3 cores (19 feet) indicated an RQD of 0%; coring in the other locations indicated the rock generally has fair to good quality. The rock also increases in quality after the initial core run, with several borings showing 100% RQD about 10 to 12 feet below the top of bedrock. Three uniaxial compressive strength tests were performed on intact rock samples from Borings SB-201 and SB-202. These tests show compressive strength values of approximately 8,700 to 13,500 psi.

4.2 Groundwater Conditions

Groundwater was encountered while drilling between elevation of 600.4 and 608.2 feet (43 feet bgs at the embankments and 0.9 to 13.5 feet bgs along the piers). The average groundwater elevation was measured at 604.7, which corresponds relatively well to the water surface elevation in Hickory Creek. Our analyses account for a water table elevation of 604.7 feet.

4.3 Scour Considerations

Based on the results of a hydraulic report dated August 1995 and the preliminary GPE provided by Ciorba, Hickory Creek has a design high water elevation (DHWE) of 610.84 feet and an estimated water surface elevation (EWSE) of 605.9 feet. For the 100-yr flood, the hydraulic report estimates 4 feet contraction scour and 7 feet of pier scour.

The subsurface investigation showed the streambed is made up of primarily of loose to medium dense sand and gravel (**Layer 2**). We recommend no reductions to the predicted scour depths be made for Piers 6 and 7; thus design scour elevations will be established at the top of bedrock. At the remaining piers, the DHWE either does not reach the elevation of the ground surface at the front face (Piers 1 through 4), or the piers are protected by concrete slopewalls (Piers 5 and 8). For these piers the design scour elevations should be established at the ground surface along either side of the pier. At the abutments, the design scour elevations should be established at the base of the required pile encasements (IDOT, 2008). The design scour elevations to be shown on the plans are summarized in Table 1.



Table 1: Design Scour Elevations for SN 099-0068 and SN 099-0069										
Design Scour	Pier 5	Pier 6	6 Pier 7 Pier							
Elevation (feet)	613.6	601.2	598.0	614.5						

4.4 Seismic Design Considerations

Wang estimates the sand and gravel deposit overlying the bedrock has a factor of safety (FOS) against liquefaction greater than the AASHTO required value of 1.1. For design based on the 2002 AASHTO *Specifications for Road and Bridge Design*, the horizontal bedrock acceleration coefficient is 4.0%, with a 90% probability of not being exceeded in 50 years (AASHTO, 2002). The Site Coefficient (S) is 1.0, corresponding the Soil Type I; the structure is located in Seismic Performance Category A (AASHTO, 2002).

5.0 FOUNDATION ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Geotechnical evaluations and recommendations for the approach embankments, approach slabs, and structure foundations are included in the following sections. Wang concurs that the proposed combination of driven pile foundations at the abutments and drilled shafts at the piers shown in the preliminary GPE are appropriate for the support of the bridge substructures.

The abutment foundations should be supported on steel H-piles (IDOT 2010). Given the overall bridge length, shallow foundations and concrete-filled metal shell piles are not appropriate for stub abutment support. The pier foundations should consist of 3.0 to 4.0-foot diameter drilled shafts socketed into the underlying bedrock. Shallow foundations would require excavations as deep as 10.0 feet to reach the top of bedrock, and driven steel piles would not have sufficient overburden to fix the pile tip prior to encountering bedrock.

5.1 Approach Embankments and Slabs

Wang has performed settlement and global stability analyses for the approach embankments and slabs based on the soil conditions encountered in the borings and the preliminary geometry presented on the GPE plan. We do not anticipate excessive settlements, and the global stability meets the IDOT-required FOS.



5.1.1 Settlement

The relocated southwest abutment is proposed within a cut section and there is no significant proposed raise in profile; therefore we do not anticipate any settlement concerns. Both abutments will be widened to the inside of the existing twin structures. The profile grade in the existing median ditches along the approach embankment will be raised by approximately 12 to 18 inches; it will also not present a settlement concern.

5.1.2 Global Stability

The global stability of the southwest end slope was analyzed based on the soil profile described in Section 4.1 and the information provided in the preliminary GPE. The slope of the proposed approach embankment is anticipated at 1:2 (V:H) and the maximum slope height, from the top of pavement to the base of the slope, will measure approximately 29.0 feet. The slopes are considered structure-supporting cuts; therefore, the minimum required FOS for both short and long-term conditions is 1.5 (IDOT 2009). The analyses were performed with *Slide 5.0*, and evaluation exhibits are shown in Appendix C. For the undrained (short-term) condition, Wang estimates the slopes have an FOS of 2.6 (Appendix C-1); for the drained (long-term) condition, Wang estimates the slopes have an FOS of 1.5 (Appendix C-2). Both conditions meet the IDOT-required FOS.

5.2 Structure Foundations

Wang recommends supporting the abutments on steel H-piles and the piers on drilled shafts socketed into bedrock.

5.2.1 Driven Piles

Information provided by Ciorba indicates the bridge will be designed based on Allowable Stress Design (ASD); however, Wang understands all piles designed for projects with letting dates after April 2010 will be designed for pile load testing via the Washington State DOT method based on the methods and empirical equations presented in *AGMU Memorandum 10.2 – Geotechnical Pile Design* (IDOT, 2009). In AGMU 10.2, IDOT specifies the maximum nominal required bearing (R_{NMAX}) for each pile (IDOT 2009). To adjust this method to the use of ASD, Wang will assess the nominal (ultimate) required bearing with the AGMU 10.2 method and apply a FOS of 3.0 to obtain the allowable resistance available (R_A) to match the service loading provided by Ciorba. The service design loads are 120 kips at the southwest abutment (360 kips ultimate) and 150 kips at the northeast abutment (450 kips ultimate). The R_A , R_N , estimated pile tip elevations, and pile lengths for HP12x53 and HP14x73 steel H-piles are summarized in Tables 3 (HP12x53) and 4 (HP14x73). The designer should note the HP12x53 does not provide enough ultimate capacity (450 kips) to achieve a service



design load of 150 kips; therefore, if HP12x53 piles are planned for the northeast abutment the design load will have to be decreased to 140 kips maximum. The lengths shown in the tables include a 1-foot pile embedment into the abutments. In addition, all H-piles should include a 3-foot pile encasement.

The R_F estimates are governed by the relationship $R_F = \phi_G R_N - \phi_G (DD_R + S_C + L_{iq})I_G - (\gamma_p)(\lambda_{IS})DD_L$ (IDOT 2009). We do not anticipate any load or geotechnical losses due to settlement-induced downdrag (see Section 5.1), scour (see Section 4.3), or liquefaction (see Section 4.4).

Structure Surplice Capital Elevation Ele	Table 3: Estimated Pile Lengths and Tip Elevations for HP12x53 Steel H-Piles									
Unit Elevations (feet)Rearing, R_N (kips)Losd LossAvailable, $Available,Pile LengthPile LengthElevation(feet)SouthwestAbutment(SB-101)636.83000.00.010019618.3SouthwestAbutment(SB-101)636.83600.00.012026611.5SouthwestAbutment(SB-101)3000.00.014028609.0NortheastAbutment(SB-101)636.93600.00.010030607.9NortheastAbutment(SB-101)636.93600.00.012036602.4StructureUnitPile(Reported Pile Cap Base(feet)Allowable(ResLoss)Allowable(AllowableAllowableAllowable(ResistanceAvailable,Pile LengthPile LengthPile LengthPile Cap Base(feet)Allowable(kips)Allowable(kips)Allowable(kips)Notheast(kips)Ra(k$			-			Allowable	Total	Estimated		
	Structure							-		
(feet)(kips)(kips)(kips)(kips)(feet)(feet)Southwest Abutment (SB-101)636.83000.00.010019618.3Southwest Abutment (SB-101)3600.00.012026611.54200.00.014028609.0Northeast Abutment (SB-100)3600.00.010030607.9Northeast Abutment (SB-100)3600.00.012036602.473600.00.014038599.9873600.00.014038599.98Required Nominal ElevationsAllowable LoasAllowable Available Available RATotal Pile Cap Base (kips)Estimated Pile Cap Base (kips)For Pile (kips)Estimated Pile Cap Base (kips)Ra (kips)Ra (kips)Ra (kips)Ra (kips)FeetSouthwest Abutment (SB-101)636.83000.00.010015622.3Southwest Abutment (SB-101)64.00.00.010024611.54800.00.016028609.0Northeast Abutment636.93000.010024613.9	Unit	Cap Base	Bearing,	Loss	Load Loss	Available,	Pile Length	Elevation		
Southwest Aburment (SB-101)3000.00.010019618.33600.00.012026611.54200.00.014028609.0Northeast Aburment (SB-100)3600.00.010030607.9Northeast (SB-110)3600.00.012036602.4Structure Unit636.93600.00.014038599.9Structure UnitFile (Cap Base (feet)Allowable (kips)Allowable (kips)Allowable (kips)Allowable (kips)Total (Resistance (Kips)Estimated Pile Tip ElevationSouthwest Aburment (SB-101)Rs (AllowableAllowable (Kips)Nominal (Kips)Kap (Kips)Kap (Kips)Fotal (Kips)Estimated Pile Tip ElevationSouthwest Aburment (SB-101)636.83000.00.010015622.3Southwest Aburment (SB-101)3600.00.010015622.3Southwest Aburment (SB-101)3600.00.014026611.54200.00.014028609.0615.550000.010014028609.050000.016028609.0611.5500050000.010010024613.9500050000.010010024613.9 <td></td> <td>Elevations</td> <td>R_N</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>R_A</td> <td></td> <td></td>		Elevations	R_N			R _A				
Southwest Abutment (SB-101) 636.8 360 0.0 0.0 120 26 611.5 Northeast Abutment (SB-10) 420 0.0 0.0 140 28 609.0 Northeast Abutment (SB-10) 636.9 360 0.0 0.0 100 30 602.4 Structure (SB-10) 420 0.0 0.0 140 38 599.9 Structure Unit Frie Cap Base Required Norminal (feet) Allowable Norminal Geotechnical Geotechnical (kips) Allowable Allowable Load Loss Allowable Available, Navilable, Northeast Abutment Total Pile Length Estimated Pile Tip Elevation Southwest Abutment (SB-101) R_N R_N R_A (feet) (feet) Southwest Abutment (SB-101) $A10$ 0.0 0.0 100 15 622.3 Southwest Abutment (SB-101) 420 0.0 0.0 140 26 611.5 Southwest Abutment (SB-101) 300 0.0 0.0 140 26 611.5		(feet)	(kips)	(kips)	(kips)	(kips)	(feet)	(feet)		
Abutment (SB-101) 636.8 360 0.0 0.0 120 26 611.5 (SB-101) 420 0.0 0.0 140 28 609.0 Northeast Abutment (SB-110) 430 0.0 0.0 100 30 607.9 Northeast Abutment (SB-110) 636.9 360 0.0 0.0 120 36 602.4 Structure Unit 636.9 360 0.0 0.0 140 38 599.9 Structure Unit File Cap Base Required Nominal Bearing, (feet) Allowable Nominal Coetechnical Geotechnical Coetechnical	Southwest		300	0.0	0.0	100	19	618.3		
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Abutment	636.8	360	0.0	0.0	120	26	611.5		
$ \begin{array}{c} \text{Northeast} \\ \text{Abutment} \\ \text{(SB-110)} \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{c} 636.9 \\ \hline 360 \\ \text{(SB-110)} \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{c} 360 \\ \hline 420 \\ \hline 420 \\ \hline 420 \\ 0.0 \\ 0$	(52 101)		420	0.0	0.0	140	28	609.0		
Abutment (SB-110) 636.9 360 0.0 0.0 120 36 602.4 (SB-110) 420 0.0 0.0 140 38 599.9 Table 4: Extrated Pile Lengths and Tip Elevations for HP14x73 Steel H-Piles Structure Pile Cap Base Elevations Required Allowable Geotechnical Bearing, Loss Allowable Allowable, Pile Length Pile Length Elevation Pile Length Pile Tip Elevation Elevations (feet) R_N $Loss$ R_A (kips) (feet) (feet) Southwest Abutment (SB-101) R_{360} 0.0 0.0 100 15 622.3 Southwest Abutment (SB-101) 636.8 360 0.0 0.0 100 15 622.3 Northeast Abutment (SB-101) 636.9 300 0.0 0.0 160 28 609.0 <td>Northcost</td> <td></td> <td>300</td> <td>0.0</td> <td>0.0</td> <td>100</td> <td>30</td> <td>607.9</td>	Northcost		300	0.0	0.0	100	30	607.9		
4200.00.014038599.9Table 4: Estimated Pile Lengths and Tip Elevations for HP14x73 Steel H-PilesStructure PileRequired Allowable Allowable Allowable Cap BaseAllowable Bearing, LossAllowable Ceotechnical DetectionAllowable Pile Length Pile Length Pile Length ElevationUnitCap Base R_N $Kips$ $Kips$ $Kips$ $Kips$ $Kips$ Elevations R_N $Kips$ $(kips)$ $(kips)$ $(feet)$ $(feet)$ $(feet)$ $(kips)$ $(kips)$ 0.0 100 15 622.3 Southwest Abutment (SB-101) 636.8 360 0.0 0.0 140 26 611.5 Northeast Abutment 636.9 300 0.0 0.0 100 24 613.9	Abutment	636.9	360	360 0.0 0.0 120 36						
Structure UnitPile Cap Base (feet)Required Nominal Bearing,Allowable Geotechnical LossAllowable Geotechnical Load LossAllowable Resistance Available,Total Estimated Pile LengthEstimated Pile Tip ElevationSouthwest Abutment (SB-101)(feet) R_N K_N K_P K_P K_P Northeast Abutment636.9 300 0.0 0.0 100 150 622.3 Northeast Abutment 300 0.0 0.0 140 26 611.5 800 0.0 0.0 160 28 609.0	(5B-110)		420	0.0	0.0	140	38	599.9		
Structure UnitPile Cap Base Elevations (feet)Nominal Bearing,Geotechnical LossGeotechnical Load LossResistance Available,Estimated Pile LengthPile Tip ElevationSouthwest Abutment (SB-101)(feet) R_N R_N R_A R_A R_A R_A Nominal (BS-101) 300 0.0 0.0 100 15 622.3 Northeast Abutment 636.9 300 0.0 0.0 140 26 611.5 Northeast Abutment 300 0.0 0.0 100 120 28 609.0		Table 4: Es	timated Pile I	Lengths and Tip	Elevations for H	HP14x73 Stee	l H-Piles			
UnitCap Base Elevations (feet)Bearing, R_N LossLoad LossAvailable, R_A Pile LengthElevation(feet) R_N R_N R_A (kips)(kips)(feet)(feet)Southwest Abutment (SB-101)3600.00.010015622.3Southwest Abutment (SB-101)3600.00.01201961.54200.00.014026611.54800.00.016028609.0Northeast Abutment636.93000.00.010024613.9			Required	Allowable	Allowable	Allowable	Total	Estimated		
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		Pile		Geotechnical				Pile Tip		
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Unit	Cap Base	Bearing,	Loss	Load Loss	Available,	Pile Length	Elevation		
Southwest Abutment (SB-101) 300 0.0 0.0 100 15 622.3 360 0.0 0.0 100 15 622.3 Abutment (SB-101) 636.8 360 0.0 0.0 120 19 61.5 420 0.0 0.0 140 26 611.5 480 0.0 0.0 160 28 609.0 Northeast Abutment 636.9 300 0.0 0.0 100 24 613.9		Elevations	R _N			R _A				
Southwest Abutment (SB-101) 636.8 360 0.0 0.0 120 19 61.5 420 0.0 0.0 140 26 611.5 480 0.0 0.0 160 28 609.0 Northeast Abutment 300 0.0 0.0 100 24 613.9		(feet)	(kips)	(kips)	(kips)	(kips)	(feet)	(feet)		
Abutment (SB-101) 636.8 420 0.0 0.0 140 26 611.5 480 0.0 0.0 160 28 609.0 Northeast Abutment 636.9 300 0.0 0.0 100 24 613.9			300	0.0	0.0	100	15	622.3		
(SB-101) 420 0.0 0.0 140 26 611.5 480 0.0 0.0 160 28 609.0 Northeast Abutment 300 0.0 0.0 100 24 613.9		636.8	360	0.0	0.0	120	19	61.5		
Northeast 300 0.0 0.0 100 24 613.9 Abutment 636.9 -		050.8	420	0.0	0.0	140	26	611.5		
Abutment 636.9			480	0.0	0.0	160	28	609.0		
		(2())	300	0.0	0.0	100	24	613.9		
		636.9 -	360	0.0	0.0	120	30	607.9		



420	0.0	0.0	150	38	599.9
480	0.0	0.0	180	38	599.9

5.2.2 Drilled Shafts

The foundations for new Piers 1, 2, and 3 and the widened portions of Piers 4 through 8 should be supported on drilled shafts socketed into the underlying bedrock. The drilled shafts are analyzed using the methodology described in the AASHTO *Standard Specifications for Bridge Design* (2002), which indicates the shafts should be designed for a minimum FOS of 2.5 for shafts socketed in rock. Rock socketed shafts should be designed for side friction only, unless sufficient settlement is anticipated to mobilize the end bearing (AASHTO 2002); we do not anticipate settlements large enough to consider end bearing.

The R_F , R_N , and estimated rock socket thickness required for 3.0-, 3.5-, and 4.0-foot diameter drilled shafts are summarized in Table 5. The table also includes the anticipated design loads provided by Ciorba. The drilled shafts will require temporary casing to protect from groundwater infiltration, which is discussed in Section 5.3.

	Table 5: Estimated Rock Socket Thicknesses and Tip Elevations for Drilled Shafts									
Structure Unit	Anticipa re Top of Rock Shaft Elevation Load		Shaft Diameter	Ultimate Shaft Resistance, R _N	Allowable Resistance Available, R _F	Total Socket Thickness	Estimated Shaft Tip Elevation			
	(feet)	(kips)	(feet)	(kips)	(kips)	(feet)	(feet)			
			3.0	975	390	5.8	600.6			
Pier 1 (SB-102)	606.4	390	3.5	975	390	4.9	601.5			
			4.0	975	390	4.3	602.1			
	601.2	410	3.0	1,025	410	6.4	594.7			
Pier 2 (SB-103)			3.5	1,025	410	5.6	595.5			
				1,025	410	5.0	596.1			
		605.7 400	3.0	1,000	400	7.2	598.5			
Pier 3 (SB-104)	605.7		3.5	1,000	400	6.2	599.5			
			4.0	1,000	400	5.4	600.3			



		-	3.0	1,000	400	7.2	600.5
Pier 4 (SB-105)	607.7	400	3.5	1,000	400	6.2	601.5
			4.0	1,000	400	5.4	602.3
			3.0	1,000	400	5.4	588.1
Pier 5 (SB-202)	593.5	400	3.5	1,000	400	4.6	588.9
			4.0	1,000	400	4.0	589.5
	601.2	410	3.0	1,025	410	7.4	593.8
Pier 6 (SB-107)			3.5	1,025	410	6.3	594.9
			4.0	1,025	410	5.5	595.7
			3.0	950	380	5.8	590.1
Pier 7 (SB-108)	595.9	380	3.5	950	380	4.9	591.0
			4.0	950	380	4.3	591.6
			3.0	950	380	5.8	593.0
Pier 8 (SB-109)	598.8	380	3.5	950	380	4.9	593.9
、 /			4.0	950	380	4.3	594.5

5.2.3 Lateral Loading

Lateral loads on piles and shafts should be analyzed for maximum moments and lateral deflections. Recommended lateral soil modulus and strain parameters required for analysis via the p-y curve method are included in Table 6.

Table 6:	Recommende	d Soil Parame	ters for Late	ral Load Analysis	
		Undrained	Estimated	Estimated Lateral	Estimated Soil
Soil Turno (Louon)	Unit	Shear	Friction	Soil Modulus	Strain
Soil Type (Layer)	Weight, y	Strength, c _u	Angle, Φ	Parameter, k	Parameter, ε_{50}
	(pcf)	(psf)	(°)	(pci)	(%)
M Stiff to hard CLAY and CLAY LOAM (1)	120	1800	0	800	0.5
Loose to dense SAND and GRAVEL (2)	63	0	32	60	

Table 6: Recommended Soil Parameters for Lateral Load Analysis



Soil Type (Layer)	Unit Weight, γ (pcf)	Weight, γ Strength, c_u		Estimated Lateral Soil Modulus Parameter, k (pci)	Estimated Soil Strain Parameter, ε ₅₀ (%)
Rock Type (Layer)	Total Unit Weight, γ (pcf)	Young's Modulus (ksi)	Uniaxial Comp. Strength (ksi)	RQD (%)	Lateral Rock Modulus Parameter
V Good to Fair Quality Dolostone (3)	130	1,100	7.0	50	0.0005
Fair to V Poor Quality Dolostone (3)	130	480	7.0	10	0.0005

5.3 Stage Construction Design Recommendations

Wang understands the partial replacement and widening of the I-80 Bridges will be performed in stages with I-80 remaining open to traffic. Stage one will include the construction of the new bridge portions within the existing 60-foot wide median for the full length of the improvement. Stage two will involve removing and replacing the existing substructures between the southwest abutment and Pier 3. The location of the new southeast abutment shown on the preliminary GPE suggests complete removal of the existing abutment; partial removal of the existing H-piles will be required to establish the proposed end slope. To accommodate the stage construction, flexible cantilever steel sheet pile walls may be required along the stage-line behind the existing southwest abutment and along Piers 1 and 2 to accommodate substructure removal. Temporary soil retention with steel sheet piling is a feasible and effect method at this location, and the sheeting should be designed based on the charts included in *Design Guide 3.13.1* of the IDOT *Bridge Manual* (2009). Wang assumes that all required cut sections will be 1:2.5 (V:H), and the geometry should be checked for stability prior to construction.

6.0 CONSTRUCTION CONSIDERATIONS

6.1 Site Preparation

All vegetation, surface topsoil, existing pavement, and debris should be cleared and stripped where foundations and structural fills will be placed. The exposed subgrade should be proofrolled. To aid in locating unstable and unsuitable materials, the proofrolling should be observed by a qualified engineer. Any unstable or unsuitable materials should be removed and replaced with compacted structural fill as described in Section 6.3.



6.2 Excavation

Foundation 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.

6.3 Filling and Backfilling

Fill material and to attain the final design elevations should be structural fill material. Coarse aggregate of IDOT gradation CA-6 or pre-approved, compacted, cohesive or granular soil conforming to IDOT Section 204 would be acceptable as structural fill (IDOT, 2010). The fill material should be free of organic matter and debris. Fill should be placed in lifts and compacted according to IDOT Section 205, *Embankment* (IDOT, 2010).

All backfill materials must be pre-approved by the site engineer. To backfill the abutments and piers we recommend porous granular material, such as crushed stone or crushed gravel that conforms to the gradation requirements specified in IDOT Articles 1004.01 or 1004.05 (IDOT, 2010). Backfill material should be placed and compacted in accordance with the IDOT Section 205, *Embankment* (IDOT, 2010). Estimated design parameters for granular structural backfill materials are presented in Table 8.

Table 8: Estimated Granular Backfill Parameters								
Soil Description	Porous Granular Material							
	Backfill							
Unit Weight	125 lbs/ft ³							
Angle of Effective Internal Friction	32 degrees							
Active Earth Pressure Coefficient	0.31							
Passive Earth Pressure Coefficient	3.26							
At-Rest Earth Pressure Coefficient	0.5							

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.

6.5 Pile Installation

The driven piles shall be furnished and installed according to the requirements of IDOT Section 512, *Piling* (IDOT 2010). Wang recommends that at a minimum of one test pile be performed at each substructure location. The test piles shall be driven to 110 percent of the nominal required bearing indicated in Section 5.2.1, Tables 3, 4, and 5. Since hard driving is expected near the termination depth, the piles should be installed with metal shoes. The steel H-piles shall be according to AASHTO M270M, Grade 50.

6.6 Drilled Shafts

The drilled shaft installation along Piers 6 and 7 will be performed within Hickory Creek. Due to the water level, the installation will require underwater structure excavation protection; however, the EWSE is not high enough to warrant cofferdam protection. In addition, shafts drilled outside Hickory Creek will likely encounter groundwater within granular soils that will cause caving and running issues. Therefore, we recommend the drilled shaft locations be protected with temporary casing installed to the top of bedrock elevation at each location. The casing can be removed after the placement of concrete.

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 bridge are planned, we should be timely informed so that our recommendations can be adjusted accordingly.



It has been a pleasure to assist Ciorba Group, 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 Jerry W.H. Wang, Ph.D., P.E. QA/QC Reviewer



REFERENCES

- AASHTO (2007) *LRFD Bridge Design Specifications*. American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials, Washington, D.C.
- AASHTO (2008) *LRFD Bridge Design Specifications, Interim Revisions*. American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials, Washington, D.C.
- BRAUN, 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. Illinois State Geological Society Department of Energy and Natrual Resources, Champaign, Illinois
- 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. Illinois State Geological Survey, Champaign, 116 pp.
- IDOT (1999) Geotechnical Manual. Illinois Department of Transportation.
- IDOT (2010) *Standard Specifications for Road and Bridge Construction*. Illinois Department of Transportation, 1098 pp.
- IDOT (2009) Bridge Manual. Illinois Department of Transportation.
- JOHNSON, W.H. AND HANSEL, A.K. (1999) Wisconsin Episode glacial landscape of central Illinois: A product of subglacial deformation process? Glacial Processes Past and Present (Eds D.M. Mickelson and J.W. Attig), GSA Special Paper 337, pp. 121-135. Geological Society of America.
- LEIGHTON, M.M., EKBLAW, G.E., and HORBERG, L. (1948) *Physiographic Divisions of Illinois*. The Journal of Geology, v. 56, p. 16-33.
- MCLEAN, M.M. AND SMITH, E.C. (1995) Topography of the Bedrock Surface in Will and Southern Cook Counties, Illinois. Illinois State Geological Survey, Champaign.
- WILLMAN, H.B. (1971) Summary of the Geology of the Chicago Area. ISGS Circular C460. Illinois State Geological Survey, Urbana, 77 pp.
- WILLMAN, H.B., FRYE, J.C., SIMON, J.A., CLEGG, K.E., SWANN, D.H., ATHERTON, E., COLLINSON, C., LINEBACK, J.A. AND BUSCHBACH, T.C. (1975) Handbook of Illinois Stratigraphy. Illinois State Geological Survey, Bulletin 95, Urbana, IL.



EXHIBITS

Geotechnical · Construction · Environmental Quality Engineering Services Since 1982









EI 11X17 7751301.GPJ WANGENG.GDT 3/2/11



APPENDIX A

 $s:\label{eq:linear} s:\label{eq:linear} s:\l$





VANGENGINC 7751301.GPJ WANGENG.







VANGENGINC 7751301.GPJ WANGENG.GDT





WANGENGINC 7751301.GPJ WANGENG.GDT 3/2/1



7751301.GPJ WANGENG.GDT NANGENGINC

1145 N Lombar Telepho	Main Street rd, IL 60148 one: 630 953-9928 80 953-9938	Project		N	/El Jo Cior -80 fr	bb No ba G om U	.: 775- roup, li	nc. o US 45	Datum: N Elevation: North: 176 East: 107 Station: 6 Offset: 85	605.701 68217.17 7975.28 76+85	′ ft	Page	1 of 1
Profile Elevation (ft)	SOIL AND ROCK DESCRIPTION	Depth (ft) Sample Type	Sample No.	SPT Values (blw/6 in) Qu	(tsf) Moisture	Content (%) Profile	Elevation (ft)	SOIL AND ROC DESCRIPTION	0.7	Sample Type recovery Sample No.	SPT Values (blw/6 in)	Qu (tsf)	Moisture Content (%)
	Soft, dark brown and black SILTY CLAY with occasiona SAND seams TOPS		1		.50 3: >	3 7 7 7 7 7 7	583.2 BC	pring terminated at 22.5	- - D ft				
	Brown GRAVEL, COBBLES fractured DOLOMITE Run #1 4.5' to 6.5' Recovery=100%, RQD=0%	and 5	2		.50 3: >	3			- 25_ -	-			
	Run #2 6.5' to 8.5' Recovery=100%, RQD=0% Run #3 8.5' to 17.5'		4						- - - -	-			
	Recovery=100%, RQD=67% Light gray DOLOMITE, weathered to tan/buffcolor to some fractures filled with silt between 4.5' and 7.5', occas	- 10_ - • 17', - sional -							- 30_ - -				
	clay partings between 10' an Heavily fractured from 4.5' to Moderately fractured from 10 12'	- 10' - -	5										
	Lightly fractured from 12' to 2 Run #4 17.5' to 22.5' Recovery=100%, RQD=100	-	-						-				
Begin Di	rilling 12-20-1994	20 RAL NOT Complete	e Drilli				94	While Drilling	40_ ER LEVE ∑	4.	TA 00 ft SHED		
Drilling C Driller Drilling N	Drilling Contractor TSC Drill Rig Driller Logger Checked by A. Bohac Drilling Method Boring log provided by Ciorba Group and IDOT.							At Completion of Drilling Time After Drilling Depth to Water The stratification lines rep between soil types; the ac	NA NA resent the app	 	boundar		


																Page	1 of 1
	W/	Wang Engineering				BC	RI	NG	L	JGS	SB-109	Datum: N	GVD				
w	angeng@wa	angeng.com					WE	Job	No.	: 775-1	13-01	Elevation:		30 ft			
1145 N Main Street Client Ciorba Group,								oup, Ir	1C.	North: 170 East: 107							
	ombard, IL 6	60148 30 953-9928	Project			F	AI-80) froi	m U	S 30 to	US 45	Station: 6					
	ax: 630 953		Location	n		•••••		Wi	II Co	ounty		Offset: 35	R				
				L av	1	1			1	i			a)	1			-
Profile	Elevation (ff)	SOIL AND ROCK DESCRIPTION	Depth	Sample Type	Sample No.	SPT Values (blw/6 in)	Qu (tsf)	Moisture Content (%)	Profile	Elevation (ft)	SOIL AND ROC DESCRIPTION	0.5	Sample Type	Sample No.	SPT Values (blw/6 in)	Qu (tsf)	Moisture Content (%)
		e, brown and gray SILT	Y						4								
0 C		D and GRAVEL with sional COBBLES and S	шт _	<u> </u>					\square			-					
<u>،</u> رو	00000		, -	//		6											
0.0 0			-	ΗŇ	1	10	NP		Ζ,	581.3	ring terminated at 22.0	0.ft					
ەڭ «				\vdash		25					Ting terminated at 22.0		-				
	600.3 Stiff. (gray CLAY	-	-								-	1				
		J - J · ·		1/									1				
	598.8		-	1X	2	45	1.60 B	21				-	1				
\square	Run #	#1 5' to 7'	5	╧		50/1	ļВ					25	1				
Z,	Reco	very=100%,RQD=21%										-					
Ζ́-			-		3							-					
Ζ́-	1			┛	_								4				
Ζ́-	Pun f	≠2 7' to 9'	-									-	-				
Z,		very=100%, RQD=33%	, . D										-				
$\mathbb{Z}_{\mathcal{T}}$			-		4							-	1				
$\mathbb{Z}_{\mathcal{T}}$													1				
$\mathbb{Z}_{\mathcal{T}}$	1	≠3 9' to 17'	-	11								-	1				
$\mathbb{Z}_{\mathcal{T}}$	Reco	very=100%, RQD=43%	, 10									30					
$\mathbb{Z}_{\mathcal{T}}$																	
$\mathbb{Z}'_{\mathcal{T}}$		gray DOLOMITE,	-									-	4				
$\mathbb{Z}_{\mathcal{T}}$	weath	nered to tan/buff color to	0 8.5'	┛									4				
$\mathbb{Z}_{\mathcal{T}}$	Heavi	ily fractured from 5' to 1	2'									-	-				
Z,		-	-										1				
Z'_{τ}		erate to lightly fractured	-		5							-	1				
$\mathbb{Z}_{\mathcal{T}}$	below	/12											1				
Z,			-									-	1				
ΖŹ,	1		15_									35_	1				
$\mathbb{Z}_{\mathcal{T}}$	1			┛									4				
Ζ́,	1		-	┨┃								-	4				
Ζ́-	1			┨┃									-				
Ζ́-	Run #	#4 17' to 22'	-	╉┫								-	1				
ĘΖŹ	-	very=100%, RQD=100	%	┨┃									1				
	1		-									-	1				
	1												1				
й Ц Т Т	1		-		6							-	1				
	1		20_	┦╹	ľ							40_	4				
WANGENGINC 7751301.6PJ WANG	GENERAL NOTES								WATE	ER LEVE	LD	AT	Ά		L		
Be	gin Drilling	12-21-1994		mplete				12-21	-199	94	While Drilling	<u> </u>			0 ft		
Dri	lling Contra	ctor TS	C		[At Completion of Drilling	g ¥	V	VAS	SHED)	
Dri	ller										Time After Drilling	NA					
Dri	lling Method	Boring log prov	vided b	y Cie	orb	a Gro	oup a	nd II	DOT			Z NA		-1 -			
									The stratification lines rep between soil types: the ac	present the app tual transition	proxim <u>may b</u>	ate b <u>e gra</u>	oundar	y			



				BC					SB-110 -13-01	Datum: N		ft	Page	2 of 2
1 La	145 N Main Street ombard, IL 60148 elephone: 630 953-9928 ax: 630 953-9938				Al-8	0 froi	m U	S 30 t	Inc. o US 45	North: 176 East: 107 Station: 6 Offset: 0 I	7945.74 78+62			
Profile	SOIL AND ROCK	Depth (ft) Samnla Trina	Sample No.	SPT Values (blw/6 in)	Qu (tsf)	Moisture Content (%)	Profile	Elevation (ft)	SOIL AND ROC DESCRIPTION		Sample Type	SPT Values (blw/6 in)	Qu (tsf)	Moisture Content (%)
			17	, 11 8 10	2.10 B	22								
	Loose, brown SILTY SAND trace GRAVEL	with	18	2 3 4	NP									
	Medium dense, brown SILT SAND and GRAVEL	Y	19	11 13 15	NP									
	Fractured and weathered DOLOMITE WEATHERED BEDRO HARD DRILL 596.2 Boring terminated at 50.00 f	ING 50	≤ 20) 19 <u>0</u> /3	NP									
		-												
		_ _ _ 55_												
		-												
)⊤⊏q	 \$			L		١٨/٨٣	R LEVE				
Be Dr Dr	gin Drilling 12-15-1994	Comp	lete Dr	illing Drill Rig Ch	9 ecked	by .	A. B	ohac	While Drilling At Completion of Drilling Time After Drilling	⊻ ⊻ VA VA	4:	3.00 ft 3.00 ft		



APPENDIX B

 $s:\label{eq:linear} s:\label{eq:linear} s:\l$



Boring SB-01: Run #1, 18.5' to 23.5', RECOVERY=90%, RQD=8% Run #2, 23.5' to 28.5', RECOVERY=100%, RQD=75%





Boring SB-02: Run #1, 23.5' to 28.5', RECOVERY=100%, RQD=5% Run #2, 28.5' to 33.5', RECOVERY=100%, RQD=83%







Rock Core Breaks

Project: Interstate 80 Bridges over US Route 30, Metra RID, and Hickory Creek

Client: Ciorba Group, Inc.

WEI Job No.: 775-13-01

IDOT D-91-041-93

Section 99-4-1 VB-1-R

SN 099-0068 and SN 099-0069

				Length		Length		Length			Total	Total			
Field Sample ID	Lab Specimen ID	Break Date	Location	Total Core	Before Capping	After Capping	Diameter	Pressure	Pressure (psi)	Break Type	Tested By	Area (in ²)			
SB-201, Run #2 23.5' to 28.5'	8577	3/2/2011	I-80 at US 30	Core	5.43	5.66	2.07	35890	10650	3	RG	3.37			
SB-202, Run #1 23.5' to 28.5'	8578	3/2/2011	I-80 at US 30		6.02	6.25	2.05	44660	13530	3	RG	3.30			
SB-202, Run #2 28.5' to 33.5'	8579	3/2/2011	I-80 at US 30		5.12	5.45	2.05	28900	8760	3	RG	3.30			



ROCK CORE LOG

Page 1_of 1

Date 03/02/2011

ROUTE FAI 80 DESCRIPTION	N Structure Boring		LOG	GED BY	Bra	ndon Wilsor	
SECTION 99-4-1VB-1-R	LOCATION US Route 30, Metra R	ID SEC.	<u>17</u> TV	VP. <u>36</u>	N	RNG. 11E	<u> </u>
COUNTY WILL STRUCT. NO. 099-0068/099-0069	CORING BARREL TYPE & SIZE <u>N</u>	WD4 2,985x2.06	60	R E C	R	CORE	S T R
Station 673+32.40 BORING NO. SB-201 Station 675+49.88 Offset 15.93 LT Ground Surface Elev. 622.55		<u>2.1</u> in D <u>04.0</u> ft E <u>04.0</u> ft P T H (ft	C O R E	0 V E R Y (%)	Q D (%)	T I M E (min/ft)	E N G T H (tsf)
Medium strong, slightly weathered to DOLOSTONE	fresh, very poor quality, brown to gray	<u>Run 1</u> 18	8.5 1	90	8	2.1	
Strong, fresh, good quality brown to g	gray DOLOSTONE	Run 2 23		100	75	1.9	

Color pictures of the cores Yes

Cores will be stored for examination until

The "Strength" column represents the uniaxial compressive strength of the core sample (ASTM D-2938)



ROCK CORE LOG

Page 1_of 1

Date 03/02/2011

SECTION 99-4-1VB-1-R LOCATION US Route 30, Metra RID S COUNTY WILL CORING METHOD Conventional 5' run STRUCT. NO. 099-0068/099-0069 CORING BARREL TYPE & SIZE NWD4 2,985 Station 673+32.40 Core Diameter 2.1 in BORING NO. SB-202 Begin Core Elev. 604.0 ft Station 675+84.23 offset 13.31 RT ft Ground Surface Elev. 617.0 ft	5x2.060 D E P	tw 0	R E C O	R	RNG. <u>11E</u> CORE	PM
STRUCT. NO. 099-0068/099-0069 CORING BARREL TYPE & SIZE NWD4 2,985 Station 673+32.40 Core Diameter 2.1 in BORING NO. SB-202 Begin Core Elev. 604.0 ft BORING NO. SB-202 Begin Core Elev. 604.0 ft Ground Surface Elev. 617.0 ft 617.0 ft	D E P		E C O		CORE	
BORING NO. SB-202 Begin Core Elev. 604.0 ft Station 675+84.23 604.0 ft Offset 13.31 RT 617.0 ft	Р			Q	т	R E
	T H (ft)	R E (#)	V E R Y (%)	Q D (%)	I M E (min/ft)	N G T H (tsf)
Strong, slightly weathered, fair quality , brown to gray DOLOSTONE <u>Run 1</u>	23.5	1	100	59	2.8	()
Strong fresh, good quality brown to gray DOLOSTONE		2	100	83	3.1	

Color pictures of the cores Yes

Cores will be stored for examination until

The "Strength" column represents the uniaxial compressive strength of the core sample (ASTM D-2938)



APPENDIX C

 $s:\label{eq:linear} s:\label{eq:linear} s:\l$



FOR CIORBA GROUP, INC.	
------------------------	--

775-13-01

