STRUCTURE GEOTECHNICAL REPORT I-80 RECONSTRUCTION FROM RIDGE ROAD TO HOUBOLT ROAD I-55 RAMP AA RETAINING WALL SN 099-W1002 WILL COUNTY, ILLINOIS

For

Stantec 350 North Orleans Street, Suite 1301 Chicago, IL 60654

> Submitted by Wang Engineering, Inc.

> 1145 North Main Street

Lombard, IL 60148

Original Report: October 19, 2023 Revised Report: NA

Technical Report Documentation Page

1. Title and Subtitle Structure Geotechnical Report	2. Original Date: October 19, 2023 Revised Date: NA								
I-55 Ramp AA Retaining Wall		3. Report Type ⊠ SGR □ RGR ⊠ Draft □ Final □ Revised							
4. Route / Section / County/ Distri F.A.I 55 / FAOI 80 21 DEMO		S. IDOT Project No. / Contract No. D-91-038-22 / 62R26							
6. PTB / Item No. 194 / 010	PTB / Item No.7. Existing Structure Number(s)								
9. Prepared by Wang Engineering, Inc. 1145 N Main Street Lombard, IL 60148	SN 099-W1002 Contact (630) 785-6220 ahamad@wangeng.com								
10. Prepared for Stantec 350 North Orleans Street Suite 1301 Chicago, IL, 60654	Design Engineer Stantec	Contacts (312) 262-2245 Dave.Pieniazek@stantec.com							
11. Abstract									
 240.0-foot long, extending constructed about 23.8 feet height of 10.0 feet. Thi construction of the propose A topsoil thickness of 2 to proposed wall alignment, th to silty clay and silty clay load clay and silty clay load to s very dense weathered bedrogroundwater level was mea The proposed retaining wal Earth (MSE) and Reinforce into the existing embankmed such as drilled soldier pile v support, thus would be easied. 	A new retaining wall is proposed along I-55 Ramp AA in Will County, Illinois. The wall will be about 240.0-foot long, extending from Station 13+72.08 to Station 16+06.08. The face of the wall will be constructed about 23.8 feet west of the Ramp AA centerline. The wall will have a maximum exposed height of 10.0 feet. This report provides geotechnical recommendations for the design and construction of the proposed retaining wall. A topsoil thickness of 2 to 12 inches was noted along or near the proposed wall alignment. Along the proposed wall alignment, the foundation soils consist primarily of up to 7.0 feet of very stiff to hard clay to silty clay and silty clay loam to clay loam fill followed by 10.0 to 12.5 feet of stiff to hard clay to silty clay and silty clay loam to clay loam fill followed by 10.0 to 12.5 feet of stiff to hard clay loam and very dense weathered bedrock. Dolostone bedrock was encountered at 572 to 570 feet elevation. The groundwater level was measured at elevations ranging from 582 to 571 feet.								
Drilling for soldier pile insta feet and additional excavation	allation might encounter hard drilling c on efforts might be needed.	conditions below an elevation of 571							
12. Path to archived file									
N:\ WANGLegacy\SHARED\Netprojects\2553901\Rep	ports\SGRs\Retaining Walls\Ramp AA RW SN 099W1002\RPT Wang NSI	3 AZH 2553901 I55RampAARWSN099W1002SGR V01 20231019.doc							

Geotechnical · Construction · Environmental Quality Engineering Services Since 1982



TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0	INTRODUCTION	1
1.1	EXISTING STRUCTURE AND GROUND CONDITIONS	1
1.2	PROPOSED STRUCTURE	2
2.0	METHODS OF INVESTIGATION	2
2.1	FIELD INVESTIGATION	2
2.2	LABORATORY TESTING	3
3.0	INVESTIGATION RESULTS	3
3.1	LITHOLOGICAL PROFILE	4
3.2	GROUNDWATER CONDITIONS	5
4.0	FOUNDATION ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	6
4.1	SEISMIC DESIGN CONSIDERATIONS	7
4.2	SOLDIER-PILE AND LAGGING WALL	7
4.3	Settlement	9
4.4	GLOBAL STABILITY	9
5.0	CONSTRUCTION CONSIDERATIONS	10
5.0 5.1	CONSTRUCTION CONSIDERATIONS	
		10
5.1	SITE PREPARATION	10 10
5.1 5.2	SITE PREPARATION Excavation, Dewatering, and Utilities	10 10 11
5.1 5.2 5.3	SITE PREPARATION Excavation, Dewatering, and Utilities Filling and Backfilling.	10 10 11 11
5.1 5.2 5.3 5.4 6.0	SITE PREPARATION Excavation, Dewatering, and Utilities Filling and Backfilling Earthwork Operations	10 10 11 11
5.1 5.2 5.3 5.4 6.0 REF	SITE PREPARATION Excavation, Dewatering, and Utilities Filling and Backfilling Earthwork Operations QUALIFICATIONS	10 10 11 11
5.1 5.2 5.3 5.4 6.0 REF EXH	SITE PREPARATION Excavation, Dewatering, and Utilities Filling and Backfilling Earthwork Operations QUALIFICATIONS ERENCES	10 10 11 11
5.1 5.2 5.3 5.4 6.0 REF EXH 1.	SITE PREPARATION Excavation, Dewatering, and Utilities Filling and Backfilling Earthwork Operations QUALIFICATIONS ERENCES IIBITS	10 10 11 11
5.1 5.2 5.3 5.4 6.0 REF EXE 1. 2.	SITE PREPARATION Excavation, Dewatering, and Utilities Filling and Backfilling Earthwork Operations QUALIFICATIONS ERENCES IIBITS SITE LOCATION MAP	10 10 11 11
5.1 5.2 5.3 5.4 6.0 REF EXH 1. 2. 3.	SITE PREPARATION	10 10 11 11
5.1 5.2 5.3 5.4 6.0 REF EXH 1. 2. 3. 4.	SITE PREPARATION	10 10 11 11
5.1 5.2 5.3 5.4 6.0 REF EXH 1. 2. 3. 4. APP	SITE PREPARATION Excavation, Dewatering, and Utilities Filling and Backfilling Earthwork Operations QUALIFICATIONS ERENCES IIBITS SITE LOCATION MAP SITE AND REGIONAL GEOLOGY BORING LOCATION PLAN SOIL PROFILE	10 10 11 11

LABORATORY TEST RESULTS



APPENDIX C BEDROCK CORE PHOTOGRAPHS APPENDIX D GLOBAL STABILITY ANALYSIS APPENDIX E GENERAL PLAN AND ELEVATION DRAWING APPENDIX F CROSS-SECTIONS

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Drained Geotechnical Parameters for Design of Soldier-Pile Walls	. 8
Table 2: Recommended Soil Parameters for Lateral Load Analysis of Soldier Pile Walls	. 9
Table 3: Recommended Bedrock Parameters for Lateral Load Analysis of Soldier Pile Walls	. 9
Table 4: Results of Global Stability Analysis	10



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

STRUCTURE GEOTECHNICAL REPORT I-80 RECONSTRUCTION FROM RIDGE ROAD TO HOUBOLT ROAD I-55 RAMP AA RETAINING WALL SN 099-W1002 WILL COUNTY, ILLINOIS FOR STANTEC

1.0 INTRODUCTION

This report presents the results of our subsurface investigation, laboratory testing, geotechnical evaluations, and recommendations in support of the design and construction of a new retaining wall proposed along the new Ramp AA at I-55 south of Interstate 80 (I-80) in Will County, Illinois. The project area is located in west central Will County, extending along the proposed Ramp AA alignment, within Troy Township. On the USGS *Channahon Quadrangle 7.5 Minute Series* map, the project is located in the SE ¹/₄ of Section 28, Tier 35 N, Range 9 E of the Third Principal Meridian. A *Site Location Map* is presented as Exhibit 1.

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 wall. This retaining wall will be constructed as part of Construction Contract INT-2.

1.1 Existing Structure and Ground Conditions

There is no existing structure at the proposed retaining wall site. The site surface elevation is generally flat gently sloping westward toward DuPage River and steeper eastward toward Rock Run Creek. The proposed retaining wall is about halfway between the two valleys. DuPage River runs south about 0.5 miles west of the new retaining wall and Rock Run Creek runs south about 0.7 miles east of the retaining wall. The ground surface elevation is about 577 to 597 feet along the proposed retaining wall.

In the project area (see Exhibit 2), up to 10-feet of mainly cohesive man-made ground, roadway embankment, is placed over up to 20 feet of overburden. The overburden is made up of low to moderate plasticity, medium to high strength, and low to moderate moisture content silty clayey diamicton resting over granular, very dense, low compressibility silty loam diamicton with lenses of sand which unconformably covers the bedrock (Bauer et al. 1991, Hansel and Johnson 1996, Leighton et al. 1948, Willman et al. 1971). The bedrock is made up of shaly dolostone. Top of bedrock is



mapped at about 572 to 583 feet elevation. The site is located just north of the inactive Sandwich Fault Zone (Kolata 2005). The shallow bedrock is highly to moderately weathered and may show the presence of cavities more likely filled with fine sediment. There are no records of mining activity within the proposed wall site. Neither the overburden nor the upper bedrock is known to include significant sources of water supply (Woller and Sanderson 1983).

1.2 Proposed Structure

Based on the *GPE* drawing prepared by Stantec and dated October 4, 2023, Wang understands the proposed retaining wall will measure about 240.0 feet in length, extending along Ramp AA from Station 13+72.08 to Station 16+06.08. The front face of the wall will be constructed at a distance of about 28.0 feet west of the proposed Ramp AA centerline. The wall will support the new 26.0-foot wide Ramp AA to be constructed southwest of the I-80/I-55 interchange. A drilled soldier-pile wall type installed into the bedrock is currently shown on the *GPE* sheets. Based on the drawings and *Cross-Sections*, we estimate the wall will have a maximum exposed height of approximately 10.0 feet near Station 15+18.33. The *GPE* drawing is included as Appendix E, whereas the *Cross-Sections* are included as Appendix F.

2.0 METHODS OF INVESTIGATION

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

2.1 Field Investigation

The subsurface investigation consisted of six retaining wall borings, designated as AA-RWB-01 to AA-RWB-06 and one subgrade/stability boring, designated as 55AA-SGB-02, drilled by Wang in December of 2022. Boring 55AA-SGB-02 was included to supplement our analysis. The borings were drilled from elevations of 596.6 to 591.3 feet and were advanced to depths of 21.5 to 34.0 feet bgs. The as-drilled northings and eastings were acquired with a mapping-grade GPS unit. Stations, offsets, and elevations were provided by Stantec. Boring location data are presented in the *Boring Logs* (Appendix A) and the as-drilled boring locations are shown in the *Boring Location Plan* (Exhibit 3).

An ATV-mounted drilling rig, equipped with hollow stem augers, was used to advance and maintain open boreholes. Soil sampling was performed according to AASHTO T206, *"Penetration Test and Split Barrel Sampling of Soils."* The soil in the retaining wall borings was sampled at 2.5-foot intervals to 30.0 feet bgs and at 5.0-foot intervals thereafter to the boring termination depth or top of bedrock whereas the soil in the subgrade/stability boring was sampled continuously to 10.0 feet bgs and at 2.5-



foot intervals thereafter to the boring termination depth. Bedrock cores were obtained from Borings AA-RWB-01, AA-RWB-03, and AA-RWB-05 in 10-foot runs with an NWD4-sized core barrel. Soil samples collected from each sampling interval were placed in sealed jars, and rock cores were placed into boxes, and transported to the laboratory for further examination and testing.

Field boring logs, prepared and maintained by a Wang field engineer, included lithological descriptions, visual-manual soil (IDH Textural) 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. Bedrock cores were measured for recovery and rock quality designation (RQD), described, and photographed.

Groundwater levels were measured while drilling and at completion of each of the borings. Prior to being backfilled, Borings 55AA-SGB-02, AA-RWB-02, and AA-RWB-04 were left open to record 24-to 72-hour water level readings. A groundwater monitoring piezometer (AA-PZ-01) was installed near Boring AA-RWB-01 with the screen set between elevations of 583.6 and 573.6 feet (11.8 to 21.8 feet bgs) to monitor the water level elevations over a longer period of time. Each borehole location was backfilled upon completion and, where necessary, the pavement surface was restored as much as possible to its original condition.

2.2 Laboratory Testing

Soil samples were tested in the laboratory for moisture content (AASHTO T265). Atterberg limits (AASHTO T89 and T90) and particle size (AASHTO T88) analyses were performed on selected samples. Unconfined compressive strength tests were performed on selected bedrock cores. Field visual descriptions of the 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 in the *Laboratory Test Results* (Appendix B).

3.0 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 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.



Our subsurface investigation results fit into the local geologic context. The borings drilled in the project area revealed the native sediments consists of silty clay to silty clay loam diamicton (Unit 2) with occasional lenses of silt and sand, over silty loam to silty clay loam diamicton (Unit 3), resting over weathered bedrock (Unit 4). The sand and silt lenses in Unit 2 are water-bearing with seasonal fluctuation. Top of dolostone bedrock was encountered at elevations of 572 to 583 feet (5.0 to 22.0 feet bgs) as predicted based on geologic data.

3.1 Lithological Profile

The borings were drilled along the proposed Ramp AA alignment and sampled 2 to 12 inches of silty clay topsoil at the surface. In descending order, the general lithologic succession encountered beneath the topsoil includes: 1) man-made ground (fill); 2) stiff to hard clay to silty clay and silty clay loam to silty loam; 3) dense to very dense silty loam to loam; 4) very dense weathered bedrock; and 5) strong, very poor to poor quality dolostone.

1) Man-made ground (fill)

Beneath the topsoil, the borings encountered up to 7.0 feet of cohesive fill. The cohesive fill consists of very stiff to hard, black, brown, and gray clay to silty clay and silty clay loam to clay loam with unconfined compressive strength (Q_u) values of 2.3 to 7.5 tsf and moisture content (MC) values of 16 to 24%. Laboratory index testing on a sample from the fill layer showed liquid limit (LL) and plastic limit (PL) values of 48 and 19%, respectively.

A 4-foot thick layer of granular fill was sampled in Boring AA-RWB-03 directly underneath the cohesive fill. This granular fill layer consists of medium dense, brown, and gray gravelly loam to sandy loam with a SPT N-value (N) of 16 blows per foot and an MC of 7%.

2) Stiff to hard clay to silty clay and silty clay loam to silty loam

Beneath the fill, at elevations of 591 to 586 feet, the borings advanced through 10.0 to 12.5 feet of stiff to hard, brown, gray, and orange clay to silty clay and silty clay loam to silty loam. This layer is characterized by Q_u values of 1.1 to more than 10.2 tsf and MC values of 13 to 23%. Laboratory index testing on samples from this layer showed liquid limit LL and PL values of 18 to 59% and 12 to 20%, respectively.

An approximately 2-foot thick layer of medium stiff brown and gray silty clay to silty clay loam was sampled in Boring AA-RWB-05 at an elevation of 585 feet. This layer has a Q_u value of 0.9 tsf and an MC of 20%.



An intermittent 2- to 18-inch thick wet to saturated silty to silty loam and sandy loam to sandy gravel layer was encountered within this unit at elevations of 582 to 579 feet in Borings 55AA-SGB-02, AA-RWB-01, AA-RWB-05, and AA-RWB-06. This layer is considered saturated.

3) Dense to very dense silty loam to loam

At depths of 15.5 to 20.5 feet bgs, or elevations of about 576 to 575 feet, the borings augured through 3.0 to 5.0 feet of dense to very dense, gray, moist to damp silty loam to loam and clay loam. This soil unit has N values of 42 blows per foot to more than 50 blows per 4 inches and MC values of 8 to 13%. Auger refusal indicating the apparent top of bedrock was noted within this layer at depths of 25.0 feet bgs (elevations of 570 feet) in Boring AA-RWB-04. Additionally, dolostone chips and/or fragments were noted at depths of 15.5 to 20.5 feet bgs (elevations of 576 to 575 feet) in Borings AA-RWB-03 to AA-RWB-06.

A 2.5- to 5.0-foot thick layer of stiff gray clay loam was sampled within the silty loam at elevations of 576 to 575 feet in Borings AA-RWB-02 and AA-RWB-05. This layer has Q_u values of 1.5 to 2.7 tsf and MC values of 10 to 16%.

4) Very dense weathered bedrock

At elevations of 574 to 571 feet, the borings advanced through up to 1.5 feet of very dense, gray, saturated weathered bedrock. This soil unit has N values of 50 blows per 4 inches to 50 blows per 2 inches and MC values of 11 to 12%. Auger refusal indicating the apparent top of bedrock was noted within this layer at depths of 21.5 to 24.0 feet bgs (elevations of 573 to 571 feet) in Borings 55AA-SGB-02, AA-RWB-02, and AA-RWB-06.

5) Strong, very poor to poor quality dolostone

At elevations of 572 to 570 feet (23.0 to 24.0 feet bgs), Borings AA-RWB-01, AA-RWB-03, and AA-RWB-05 cored strong, very poor to poor quality, highly to slightly weathered dolostone bedrock. The rock quality designation (RQD) ranges from 16 to 19% and uniaxial compressive strength testing revealed a Q_u value of 13,673 psi. The bedrock core data and pictures are shown in the *Bedrock Core Photographs* (Appendix C).

3.2 Groundwater Conditions

Groundwater was encountered while drilling at elevations of 582 to 571 feet (11.5 to 24.0 feet bgs). At the completion of drilling, the groundwater level was observed at elevations of 582 to 577 feet (11.0 to 20.0 feet bgs). At the end of drilling, Borings 55AA-SGB-02, AA-RWB-02, and AA-RWB-04 were



left open to measure 24- to 72-hour groundwater levels. The 24- to 72-hour groundwater level was recorded as either dry due to borehole cave-in or at an elevation of 582 feet (13.0 feet bgs). It should be noted that groundwater levels might change with seasonal rainfall patterns and long-term climate fluctuations or may be influenced by local site conditions.

A groundwater monitoring piezometer (AA-PZ-01) was installed along the proposed Ramp AA alignment near Boring AA-RWB-01. The piezometer is screened between elevations of 583.6 to 573.6 feet within the saturated granular layers. A summary of the groundwater monitoring data recorded between January and October of 2023 is shown in Figure 1.



Figure 1: Groundwater Monitoring Data at AA-PZ-01

The information from the piezometer shows groundwater levels correlating to the information contained in the boring logs. The average groundwater elevation is approximately 585 feet. The maximum recorded groundwater elevation was 587 feet.

4.0 FOUNDATION ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The retaining wall will support the new 26.0-foot wide Ramp AA proposed southwest of the I-80 and I-55 interchange. Based on the *GPE* and *Cross-Sections* (Appendixes E and F), the wall will have a total length of 240.0 feet and a maximum exposed height of 10.0 feet near Station 15+18.33. The proposed wall is a cut wall which will support the new Ramp AA roadway embankments.



Fill wall types, such as Mechanically Stabilized Earth (MSE) and Reinforced Concrete Cantilever (RCC) walls would require additional large open cut excavations into the existing embankment, temporary soil retention systems, and will impact the existing roadway. The construction of these wall types would likely also require more backfilling thus longer construction time. In our opinion, non-gravity wall types such as a sheet pile or soldier pile type wall would be more appropriate considering the soil conditions, constructability, and cost. A driven sheet pile wall type will not be feasible due to potential difficulty of driving the sheet piles in cohesive soils with unconfined compressive strength values of greater than 4.5 tsf. Considering the presence of shallow bedrock, we anticipate a soldier pile socketed into bedrock will likely be the most suitable wall type at this location as proposed by the designer and shown on the GPE. However, the final wall type should be selected based on a wall-type study including cost and construction considerations. Recommendations for the design and construction of the proposed wall type are discussed in the following sections.

4.1 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).

4.2 Soldier-Pile and Lagging Wall

A soldier-pile wall type could be considered at this location. If soldier piles are designed to support the wall, they could be installed by setting them within prebored holes with diameters sized in accordance with IDOT criteria. The wall 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 AASHTO LRFD guidelines (AASHTO 2020).

Generally, both granular soils and overconsolidated clayey soils, such as the stiff to hard silty clay to silty clay loam encountered in the borings will exhibit lower overall shear strength in the long-term condition. Therefore, in accordance with AASHTO (2020), the lateral earth pressure analysis should be performed for walls in the long-term (drained) condition using the soil parameters recommended in Table 1. Elevations provided in Table 1 are based on the average layer elevations across the soil profile and may vary from one boring location to another. The active and passive earth pressure coefficients are provided for a backslope of 1:3 (V: H) behind the wall and straight backfill in front of the wall.

The design of the wall should ignore 3.0 feet of soil in front of the wall measured from the finished ground surface elevation in providing passive pressure due to excavations required for installation



of concrete facing, drainage systems, and frost-heave conditions. In developing the design lateral pressure, the pressure due to construction equipment surcharge loads should be added to the lateral earth pressure. Drainage behind the wall should be in accordance with IDOT guidelines (IDOT 2012). The water pressures should be added to the earth pressure if drainage is not provided.

Elevation Panga (fast)	Unit Weight,	Drained Shear S	Strength Properties	Earth Pressure Coefficients		
Elevation Range (feet) Soil Description	γ (pcf)	Cohesion (psf)	Friction Angle (°)	Active Pressure ⁽²⁾ (1V:3H)	Passive Pressure (Straight)	
Existing Grade to EL 586 ⁽¹⁾ Hard SILTY CLAY to CLAY LOAM FILL	120	100	30	0.43		
EL 592 to 586 (AA-RWB-03) GRAVELLY LOAM to SANDY LOAM FILL	120	0	30	0.43		
EL 586 to 580 Hard SILTY CLAY	120	100	30	0.43	3.00	
EL 580 to 575 Stiff to V Stiff SILTY LOAM	58 ⁽³⁾	0	30	0.43	3.00	
EL 575 to 572 ⁽⁴⁾ V Dense SILTY LOAM to CLAY LOAM	58 ⁽³⁾	0	33	0.37	3.39	

Table 1: Drained Geotechnical Parameters for Design of Soldier-Pile Walls Borings AA-RWB-01 to AA-RWB-05

(1) Proposed bottom of fascia panel; (2) Earth pressure coefficients for 1:3 (V: H) back slope; (3) Submerged unit weight; (4) Approximate top of bedrock

The lateral deformation of the wall should be designed for movement and moment fixity at the base of the pile. The roadway and utilities should not be impacted by the lateral movement of the wall. Therefore, the design of the soldier pile wall should establish lateral movement limits. The evaluations should be performed using the recommended soil parameters shown in Tables 2 and 3, via the p-y curve (COM624) method. Elevations provided in Tables 2 and 3 are based on the average layer elevations across the profile and may vary from one boring location to another.



Borings AA-RWB-01 to AA-RWB-05									
Elevation Range (feet) Soil Type (Layer)	Unit Weight, γ (pcf)	Undrained Shear Strength, c _u (psf)	Estimated Friction Angle, Φ (°)	Estimated Lateral Soil Modulus Parameter, k (pci)	Estimated Soil Strain Parameter, ϵ_{50} (%)				
Existing Grade to EL 586 Hard SI CLAY to CLAY LOAM FILL	120	3000	0	1000	0.5				
EL 592 to 586 (AA-RWB-03) GRAVELLY LOAM to SANDY LOAM FILL	120	0	30	30					
EL 586 to 580 Hard SI CLAY	120	4000	0	2000	0.4				
EL 580 to 575 Stiff to V Stiff SILTY LOAM	58 ⁽²⁾	1500	0	500	0.7				
EL 575 to 572 ⁽³⁾ V Dense SILTY LOAM to CLAY LOAM	58(2)	0	33	125					

Table 2: Recommended Soil Parameters for Lateral Load Analysis of Soldier Pile Walls Borings AA-RWB-01 to AA-RWB-05

(1) Proposed bottom of fascia panel; (2) Submerged unit weight; (3) Approximate top of bedrock

Table 3: Recommended Bedrock Parameters for Lateral Load Analysis of Soldier Pile Walls (Borings AA-RWB-01, AA-RWB-03, and AA-RWB-05)

Bedrock	Total Unit Weight, γ (pcf)	Modulus of Rock Mass (ksi)	Poisson's Ratio, µ	Uniaxial Compressive Strength (psi)	RQD (%)	Strain Factor
Dolostone	140	500	0.3	13,673	16 to 19	0.0005

4.3 Settlement

Based on the information provided by Stantec, we understand the existing grade at the wall location will be lowered to accommodate the new Ramp AA construction. As such, we do not anticipate the placement of new fill loads or surcharge at the proposed retaining wall location and long-term settlements of less than 1.0 inch are anticipated.

4.4 Global Stability

The global stability of the proposed wall was analyzed based on the soil profile described in Section 3.1 and the information provided in the design drawings and cross-sections. The stability was analyzed at the critical section near Station 15+00 where the maximum exposed height is about 10.0 feet. The



minimum required factor of safety (FOS) is 1.7 in both short-term (undrained) and long-term (drained) conditions (IDOT 2020a).

Details of the global stability analysis with critical failure surfaces and results are presented in Appendix D. The short-term and long-term analyses do not consider the resistance from the distance measured from the proposed finished grade to the bottom of the fascia panel at the front face of the wall. We estimate the wall will have an adequate FOS of 6.5 (Appendix D-1) in the undrained condition. Global stability evaluations were performed to estimate the minimum pile tip elevation required to achieve an FOS of 1.7 in the drained condition. The embedded portion of the cantilevered piles will provide resistance against the slope instability above the tip of the piles. The results of our analysis are summarized in Table 4. We recommend that the wall tip elevations be installed at or deeper than the minimum elevation shown in Table 4 to provide long-term global stability FOS values of at least 1.7 as shown in Appendix D-2. It should be noted that typically, the lateral earth pressure and deformation analyses will determine the minimum embedment depth for cantilevered pile walls. Therefore, the designer should perform other analyses including lateral earth pressure and deflection analyses to determine the required design pile embedment. We understand the designer proposes soldier piles installed in the bedrock.

Table 4: Results of Global S	Stability Analysis
------------------------------	--------------------

			Exposed	Short-tern	n (Undrained) Condition	Long-term (Drained) Condition		
	Station	Reference Boring(s)	Wall Height (feet)	FOS	Minimum Tip Elevation (feet)	FOS	Minimum Tip Elevation (feet)	
	15+00	AA-RWB-03	10.0	6.5	-/-	1.7	586	

5.0 CONSTRUCTION CONSIDERATIONS

5.1 Site Preparation

Vegetation, surface topsoil, pavement, and debris 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 5.3.

5.2 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 1:2 (V: H). Any slope



that cannot be graded at 1:2 (V:H) should be properly shored. Dewatering may be necessary if groundwater perched within the granular layers is encountered.

For cantilevered pile walls, it should be noted that higher N-values of 54 to more than 50 blows per 3 inches, dolostone chips, and possible cobbles were noted in the borings at elevations of 576 to 571 feet (18.0 to 23.0 feet bgs) and should be anticipated during pile drilling. Excavation may be needed due to the possible presence of cobbles.

Groundwater was encountered while drilling at elevations of 582 to 571 feet (11.5 to 24.0 feet bgs). At the completion of drilling, the groundwater was observed at elevations of 582 to 577 feet (11.0 to 20.0 feet bgs). If drilled soldier piles are designed, temporary casing and wet installation methods will be needed for drilling and setting into the granular layers and/or bedrock below an elevation of 580 feet. Additionally, perched or temporary water may be encountered during times of heavy precipitation while excavating within the upper fill soils and will require dewatering efforts. Water that does accumulate in open excavations by seepage or runoff should be immediately removed by sump pump. Any soils allowed to soften under standing water should be removed and replaced with compacted fill as described in Section 5.3.

5.3 Filling and Backfilling

Fill material used to attain final design elevations should be pre-approved, compacted, cohesive or granular soil conforming to Section 204, *Borrow and Furnished Excavation* (IDOT 2022). The fill material should be free of organic matter and debris and should be placed in lifts and compacted according to Section 205, *Embankment* (IDOT 2022). Backfill materials must be pre-approved by the Resident Engineer.

5.4 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.

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

It has been a pleasure to assist Stantec 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.

Azza Hamad, P.E. Senior Geotechnical Engineer Nesam Balakumaran, P.E. Geotechnical Project Engineer

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



REFERENCES

- AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF STATE HIGHWAY TRANSPORTATION OFFICIALS (2020) "AASHTO LRFD Bridge Design Specifications" United States Depart of Transportation, Washington, D.C.
- 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.
- 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 p.
- IDOT (2012) Bridge Manual. Illinois Department of Transportation.
- IDOT (2022) Standard Specifications for Road and Bridge Construction. Illinois Department of Transportation.
- IDOT (2020) Geotechnical Manual. Illinois Department of Transportation.
- KOLATA, D.R. (2005) *Bedrock Geology of Illinois:* Illinois Sate Geological Survey, Illinois Map 14, 1:500,000.
- LEIGHTON, M.M., EKBLAW, G.E., and HORBERG, L. (1948) "*Physiographic Divisions of Illinois*." The Journal of Geology, v. 56. p. 16-33.
- WILLMAN, H.B. (1971) Surficial Deposits of Illinois: Illinois State Geological Survey, ISGS, OFS 2000-7, 1:500,000.
- WOLLER, D.M. AND SANDERSON, E.W. (1983) Public groundwater supplies in Will County. Bulletin (Illinois State Water Survey) no. 60-29.



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

EXHIBITS

Geotechnical · Construction · Environmental Quality Engineering Services Since 1982







10/4/2023 1:26:13 PM



El 11X17 2553901.GPJ WANGENG.GDT 10/16/23



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

APPENDIX A

Geotechnical Construction Environmental Quality Engineering Services Since 1982



2553901.GPJ WANGENG.GDT





101 2553901.GPJ WANGENG.GDT



IGENGINC 2553901.GPJ WANGENG.GDT 10/16/23



NGENGINC 2553901.GPJ WANGENG.GDT 10/16/23





2553901.GPJ WANGENG.GDT 10/16/23 NANGENGINC



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

APPENDIX B

Geotechnical · Construction · Environmental Quality Engineering Services Since 1982



2 <u>v</u> 55200 Н SIZE GRAIN



AB <u>v</u> d C 2553901 E SIZE GRAIN



2553901.GPJ US LAB.GDT ATTERBERG LIMITS IDH



Unconfined Compressive Strength of Intact Rock Core Specimens

Project: I-80

Client: Stantec

WEI Job No.: KE225039

Field Sample ID	Run #	Depth (ft)	Location Ramp AA Retaining	Sample Description	Before Capping	Capping	. /	Total Load (lbs)	Total Pressure (psi)	Fracture Type*	Break Date	Tested By	
AA-RWB-01	1	30.5	Wall	Dolostone	4.01	NA	2.04	44690	13673	3	1/3/23	KJ	3.27

* Fracture Types:

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.

Prepared by:

Checked by: _____



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

APPENDIX C

Geotechnical · Construction · Environmental Quality Engineering Services Since 1982
Run #1



255-39-01

FOR STANTEC



255-39-01

FOR STANTEC

Run #1



Run #1 TOP Qu: 13,700 psi BOTTOM 6 inches

> Boring AA-RWB-08: Run #1, 8.0 to 18.0 feet, RECOVERY=100%, RQD=21%





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

APPENDIX D

Geotechnical · Construction · Environmental Quality Engineering Services Since 1982







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

APPENDIX E

Geotechnical · Construction · Environmental Quality Engineering Services Since 1982



10/11/2023 1:30:55 PM

	F.A.I. RTE	SECTION FAOI 80 21 DEMO			COUNTY	TOTAL SHEETS	SHEET NO.
	55				WILL	2	1
					CONTRACT NO. 62R26		
SHEETS	ILLINOIS FED. A				D PROJECT		



10/11/2023 1:31:04 PM



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

APPENDIX F

Geotechnical · Construction · Environmental Quality Engineering Services Since 1982

FINAL SURVEY NOTE BOOK

ORIGINAL SURVEY NOTE BOOK



