

То:	Fawad Aqueel	Attn:	Veselin Velichkov
From:	Stephen Jones	By:	Giancarlo Gierbolini
Subject:	Structure Geotechnical Re	eport*	11. 11
Date:	February 8, 2024	F	- f a

FAU 2503 (Illinois Route 25)
north of Illinois Route 64
Kane
NA
62T09

Enclosed is the Structure Geotechnical Report (SGR) prepared by IDOT District One Geotechnical Unit's consultant, Wang Engineering, dated February 8, 2024, for the above-referenced project. The report provides geotechnical recommendations for the proposed improvements to Illinois Route 25 (IL 25) north of the crossing with IL 64 in Kane County.

The proposed improvements include the replacement of a section of the existing retaining wall located on the east side of the roadway. The existing retaining wall has a maximum height of 12 feet and consists of a shallow bearing, cast in place T-wall. A section of the existing wall, approximately 100 feet long has failed and will be replaced with a new wall.

The report provides the results of the field investigation, laboratory test results, and analysis and recommendations pertaining to the proposed improvements.

If you have any questions regarding this report, please contact Robert Claussen, P.E. at (847)705-4735 or Giancarlo Gierbolini, P.E. at (847) 705-4003.

Cc: IDOT Soils Engineer

STRUCTURE GEOTECHNICAL REPORT RETAINING WALL IMPROVEMENTS ALONG NORTHBOUND NORTH 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue Illinois Route 25 Station 9+28.15 to 11+23.80 St. Charles, Kane County, Illinois

For

IDOT District One 201 West Center Court Schaumburg, IL 60196

Submitted by

Wang Engineering, Inc., A Terracon Company 1145 North Main Street Lombard, IL 60148

> Original Report: February 8, 2024 Revised Report: NA

Wang No. KE235460 IL 25 Retaining Wall Repairs SGR

### **Technical Report Documentation Page**

Structure Geotechnical Rep	2. Original Date: February 8, 2024 Revised Date: NA					
IL Route 25 Retaining Wal		<b>3. Report Type</b> ⊠ SGR □ RGR ⊠ Draft □ Final □ Revised				
4. Route / Section / County		5. IDOT Contract				
106 / NA / Kane		62T10				
6. PTB / Item No.	7. Existing Structure Number(s)	8. Proposed Structure Number(s)				
NA / NA	NA	ŇA				
9. Prepared by	Contributor(s)	Contact				
Wang Engineering, Inc.	Authors: Nesam S. Balakumaran, PE (WI)	(630) 785-9928 ext. 1036				
1145 N Main Street	Mohammed Kothawala, PE, DGE	mkothawala@wangeng.com				
Lombard, IL 60148	QC/QA: Corina T. Farez, PE, PG					
	PM: Mohammed Kothawala, PE, DGE					
10. Prepared for	Design Engineer	Contacts				
IDOT District One	Robert Claussen, P.E.	(847) 705-4735				
201 West Center Court	(IDOT District One)	Robert.Claussen@illinois.gov				
Schaumburg, IL, 60196	S.M. (Kaz) Kazi, PE, SE	(312) 291-6565				
	(Delta Engineering Group, LLC)	<u>smkazi@deg-america.com</u>				
crack and horizontal tran	g wall along northbound 5 <sup>th</sup> Avenue/IL Rou Islation in 2 out of 4 wall segments. The exis					
proposed improvements	9+28.15 to Station 11+23.80 and has a maximic include backfill and drainage along the wall ment. This report provides geotechnical reco	num total height of 11.5 feet. The Segment 2 full replacement, and				
proposed improvements Segment 3 stem replace construction of proposed Beneath the surface, the stiff to hard silty clay to gravel interbedded with 724 feet or 23 to 25.5 fee	9+28.15 to Station 11+23.80 and has a maximic include backfill and drainage along the wall ment. This report provides geotechnical record retaining wall repairs. a general lithologic profile includes up to 10 posity clay loam. Deeper foundation soils in stiff to hard silty clay. Groundwater was energy below grade.	num total height of 11.5 feet. The Segment 2 full replacement, and ommendations for the design and feet of cohesive fill followed by clude loose to dense silt to sandy countered at elevations of 723 to				
<ul> <li>proposed improvements</li> <li>Segment 3 stem replace</li> <li>construction of proposed</li> <li>Beneath the surface, the</li> <li>stiff to hard silty clay to</li> <li>gravel interbedded with</li> <li>724 feet or 23 to 25.5 fee</li> <li>For the foundation soil b</li> <li>resistance of 4,900 psf ba</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>2+28.15 to Station 11+23.80 and has a maximic include backfill and drainage along the wall ment. This report provides geotechnical reconstruction will repairs.</li> <li>a general lithologic profile includes up to 10 posity clay loam. Deeper foundation soils in stiff to hard silty clay. Groundwater was enderty of the second seco</li></ul>	num total height of 11.5 feet. The Segment 2 full replacement, and ommendations for the design and feet of cohesive fill followed by clude loose to dense silt to sandy countered at elevations of 723 to nate a maximum factored bearing 5 (AASHTO 2020). The Segment				

The proposed improvements will likely involve excavation of up to 12.0 feet behind the wall. Due to the presence of hard clayey soils with  $Q_u$  values greater than 4.5 tsf, we estimate temporary sheet piling designed using the charts included in the *IDOT Design Guide-Simplified Temporary Sheet Piling Design Charts* will not be feasible and we recommend the pay item, Temporary Soil Retention System for shoring.

Backfill and drainage improvement materials must be according to *IDOT Standard Specifications*, *Section 586, Granular Backfill for Structures* (IDOT 2022).

### 12. Path to archived file



# TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0	INTRODUCTION1
1.1	EXISTING STRUCTURE AND GROUND CONDITIONS
1.2	PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS
2.0	METHODS OF INVESTIGATION
2.1	FIELD INVESTIGATION
2.2	LABORATORY TESTING
3.0	INVESTIGATION RESULTS
3.1	LITHOLOGICAL PROFILE
3.2	GROUNDWATER CONDITIONS
4.0	FOUNDATION ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 4
4.1	GLOBAL STABILITY
5.0	CONSTRUCTION CONSIDERATIONS
5.1	SITE PREPARATION
5.2	EXCAVATION, DEWATERING, AND UTILITIES
5.3	FILLING AND BACKFILLING
5.4	EARTHWORK OPERATIONS
6.0	QUALIFICATIONS
REF	ERENCES
	IIBITS
	SITE LOCATION MAP
	SITE AND REGIONAL GEOLOGY
	BORING LOCATION PLAN
	Soil Profile
	ENDIX A
	oring Logs ENDIX B
	ABORATORY TEST RESULTS
	ENDIX C
	LOBAL STABILITY ANALYSIS
APP	ENDIX D

GENERAL PLAN AND ELEVATION DRAWING



STRUCTURE GEOTECHNICAL REPORT RETAINING WALL IMPROVEMENTS ALONG NORTHBOUND NORTH 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue Illinois Route 25 Station 9+30.18 to 11+23.80 St. Charles, Kane County, Illinois For IDOT District One

### **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 the proposed improvements to an existing retaining wall along northbound North 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue, IL Route 25 (IL 25) in St. Charles, Kane County, Illinois. On the USGS *Lake Geneva Quadrangle 7.5 Minute Series* map, the project site is located in the SE<sup>1</sup>/<sub>4</sub> of Section 27, Tier 39 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 improvements.

### 1.1 Existing Structure and Ground Conditions

Based on the *General Plan and Elevation* (GPE) drawing provided by Delta Engineering Group, LLC. (Delta), the existing retaining wall was constructed in 1968 as a cast-in-place concrete T-type wall. The existing wall is approximately 272-foot long parallel to the IL 25 alignment and consists of 4 segments separated by expansion joints. The wall retains the IL 25 roadway embankment and sidewalk. The residential property has three 8 to 36-inch diameter tall trees in the proximity of Segments 1 and 2.

As per Gannett Fleming drawings dated August 16, 2023, we understand Segment 2 experienced a crack through stem and a horizontal translation of 37.5 inches. In addition, the wall horizontal translation was also observed between Segments 3 and 4 expansion joints.



### **1.2** Proposed Improvements

Based on the *GPE* drawing dated January 29, 2024, Wang Engineering Inc., a Terracon Company (Wang) understands proposed retaining wall repairs include backfill and drainage improvements to all four wall segments and stem and/or foundation improvements to Segments 2 and 3. The details of each segment improvements are provided below:

- Segment 1 is 52'-10" long and will remain in place. The designer proposes granular backfill and drainage improvements behind the wall;
- Segment 2 is 50' long and has experienced major crack and translation. The designer proposes two improvement options. One option is to replace the footing and stem and provide new drainage and granular backfill behind the wall. If the footing is found to be in good conditions during the construction, the second option will only call for stem replacement with new drainage and granular backfill behind the wall;
- Segment 3 is 50' long and has a staircase to enter the residential property from the roadway sidewalk. The proposed improvement includes stem replacement with granular backfill and drainage improvements;
- Segment 4 is 50' long. The proposed improvement includes granular backfill and drainage improvements.

To complete the proposed wall repairs, a temporary soil retention system (TSRS) will be required. As per GPE, the TSRS will remain in place after completing the retaining wall improvements.

### 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 two retaining wall borings, designated as RWB-01 to RWB-02 and three hand auger borings, designated as HA-01 to HA-03, drilled by Wang on January 25 and 26, 2024. Borings RWB-01 and RWB-02 were drilled from sidewalk near Segments 2 and 3, respectively. Hand auger borings HA-01 to HA-03 were drilled 4 to 6 feet away from Segment 2 at the wall front face. The borings were drilled from elevations of 740.3 to 748.4 feet and were advanced to depths of 5.5 to 40.0 feet below ground surface (bgs). The as-drilled northings and eastings were acquired with a mapping-grade GPS unit. Elevations were provided by Delta. 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 2).

A truck-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 feet and 5 feet intervals thereafter. Jackhammer drive Geoprobe samplers were used to continuously sample the soil in the hand auger borings. Soil samples collected from each sampling interval were placed in sealed jars and transported to the laboratory in Lombard, Illinois, 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.

Groundwater levels were measured while drilling and at completion of each of the borings. For safety considerations, each borehole was backfilled upon completion with soil cuttings and/or bentonite chips, and surface was restored as close as possible to its original condition.

### 2.2 Laboratory Testing

Soil samples were tested in the laboratory for moisture content (AASHTO T265). Laboratory unit weight tests were performed on selected clayey soil samples. 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 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.



### 3.1 Lithological Profile

At the surface, Borings RWB-01 and RWB-02 drilled on the sidewalk encountered 4 inches of concrete over gravelly loam and gravelly clay loam base. Hand auger borings advanced at front face of the wall encountered 6 to 12 inches of silty clay topsoil. In descending order, the general lithologic succession encountered beneath the sidewalk pavement or topsoil includes: 1) man-made ground (fill); 2) very stiff to hard silty clay to clay loam; and 3) loose to dense silt to sandy gravel.

### 1) Man-made ground (fill)

Beneath the surface, the borings advanced through up to 10 feet of medium stiff to very stiff, brown to black silty clay. This layer is characterized by unconfined compressive strength ( $Q_u$ ) values of 0.5 to 3.5 tsf and moisture content values of 13 to 26%.

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

At elevations of 729.1 to 737.8 feet, the borings augured through up to 6 feet of stiff to hard, brown silty clay to silty clay loam. This soil unit has  $Q_u$  values of 1.0 to 7.2 tsf and moisture content values of 13 to 15%.

### 3) Loose to dense silt to sandy gravel

At elevations of 730.4 to 731.4 feet, the borings encountered loose to dense, brow to gray silt to sandy gravel interbedded with stiff to hard silty clay. This granular unit has SPT values of 5 to 46 blows per foot and moisture content values of 3 to 18%. The interbedded silty clay has Qu values of 1.2 to 6.1 tsf with moisture content values of 12 to 23%

### 3.2 Groundwater Conditions

Groundwater was encountered while drilling at elevations of 723 to 724 feet (23 to 25.5 feet bgs) in Borings RWB-01 and RWB-02. At the completion of drilling, the groundwater level was observed at elevations of 710 to 716 feet (32 to 37 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.

### 4.0 FOUNDATION ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The condition of the existing footing is unknown for the Segment 2 wall. It is possible that the footing may have been also distorted. We recommend removing exiting footing and stem completely and construct a new segment as per Option 1 shown on GPE sheets 2 of 3 ated January 29, 2024.



Recommendations for the design and construction of the proposed Segment 2 are discussed in the following sections.

Segment 2 will be also constructed as a T-type wall to match with the other segments. A T-type wall foundation should be established at a minimum depth of 4.0 feet below the finished grade at the front face of the wall (IDOT 2022). Based on the existing drawings of original IL 25 construction in 1968, we estimate the bottom of existing footing for Segment 2 is at approximate elevation 737.8 feet. We recommend the new footing should be established at the same elevation as exiting footing. We also recommend providing a layer of compacted 6 inches of crushed stone CA-6 gradation bellow the footing base by over excavating soil. The CA-6 layer should extend 1-foot outside the foundation layout. The subgrade at the base of excavation should be tested by Dynamic Cone Penetrometer (DCP) to determine adequacy for the bearing resistance. Following the foundation soils improvement, Segment 2 foundation soils will have a maximum factored bearing resistance of 4,900 ksf based on a maximum nominal bearing resistance of 9,000 ksf using resistance factor of 0.55 (AASHTO 2020). The long-term settlement is estimated to be about 0.5 inches. The footing size should be checked to resist sliding and overturning.

The estimated friction angle between the Segment 2 concrete base and the CA-6 aggregate is 26°, and the corresponding nominal friction coefficient is 0.48. Gravity retaining walls are designed based on an AASTHO geotechnical sliding resistance factor of 1.0.

We recommend a linearly increasing unfactored equivalent fluid pressure of 40 pcf per foot of depth below grade behind the wall with drainable backfill considering unit weight of 120 pcf and internal friction of 30 degree. We recommend providing drainage and backfill behind the wall as per IDOT 2023 Bridge Manual, Figure 3.11.2.3-2 since pipe underdrain will be provided. Drainable backfill should be *Granular Backfill for Structures* as per Section 586 of IDOT Standard Specifications. *Geocomposite Wall Drain* should be as per Section 591 of IDOT Standard Specifications.

### 4.1 Global Stability

The global stability of the Segment 2 wall was analyzed based on the soil profile encountered in HA-02 and RWB-01, and the information provided in the *GPE*. The analysis will be updated as needed once final cross-sections are received. The minimum required FOS for both short (undrained) and long-term (drained) conditions is 1.5 (IDOT 2020). Our analysis indicates that the wall has adequate FOS. *Slide2* exhibits employing the Bishop Simplified method of analysis are shown in Appendix C.



### 5.0 CONSTRUCTION CONSIDERATIONS

### 5.1 Site Preparation

Trees, surface topsoil, pavement, and debris should be cleared and stripped where the Segment 2 foundations will be placed. If unstable or unsuitable materials are exposed during excavation, they should be removed and replaced with compacted granular 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 structures, roadways, and 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.

The proposed improvements will likely involve excavation of up to 12.0 feet behind the wall and stem and foundation demolition along Segment 2. Temporary support system will be required since the ground cannot be sloped at 1:2 (V:H). Due to the presence of hard clayey soils with Q<sub>u</sub> values greater than 4.5 tsf, we estimate temporary sheet piling, designed using the charts included in the *IDOT Design Guide-Simplified Temporary Sheet Piling Design Charts* will not be feasible and we recommend the pay item, *Temporary Soil Retention System* for shoring. If the temporary soil retention system is left in place following the proposed retaining wall improvements, we recommend cut the top of the TSRS about 2-foot below proposed roadway subgrade level.

Groundwater was encountered while drilling and at the completion of drilling at elevations of 710 to 724 feet, about 4 to 18 feet below the Segment 2 footing level. Therefore, we do not anticipate special 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 (except backfill for drainage behind the wall and below the footings) 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 improvement materials must be according to Section 586, *Granular Backfill for Structures* (IDOT 2022).



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

It has been a pleasure to assist the IDOT District One on this project. Please call if there are any questions, or if we can be of further service.

Respectfully Submitted,

# WANG ENGINEERING, INC.

Mohammed Kothawala, P.E., D.GE. Project Manager/Senior Engineer Nesam Balakumaran, P.E. (WI) Project Geotechnical 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.
- IDOT (2023) 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.



# **EXHIBITS**







# 11X17 KE235460.GPJ WANGENG.GDT 2/1/24



# **APPENDIX A**

wangeng@wangeng.com 1145 N Main Street Lombard, IL, 60148 Telephone: 630 953 9928 Fax: 630 953 9938	Client Project Location			WEI _ 25	Job IDO Retai	No. T Di inin	: KE23 strict 1 g Wall	I	Datum: N Elevation North: 19 East: 990 Station: Offset:	740.3 12471	32 ft .50 ft		Page 1	of 1
eligitication SOIL AND ROCK	Depth (ft) Sample Type	<i>recovery</i> Sample No.	SPT Values (blw/6 in)	Qu (tsf)	Moisture Content (%)	Profile	Elevation (ft)	SOIL AND ROC DESCRIPTION		Sample Type	Sample No.	(blw/6 in)	Qu (tsf)	Moisture Content (%)
8-inch thick, brown SILTY C 739.7	OIL rk	1	PUSH PU	0.50 P	26									
		2	S H P	0.50 P	14									
PROBE REFUS Boring terminated at 5.50 ft		3		3.50 P	15									
	20							1						
GENE Begin Drilling 01-25-2024 Drilling Contractor Wang Testin Driller K&G Logger Drilling Method 1" ID HSA; borir	ng Services F. Boz	ete Dri S D ga	illing Drill Rig Che	) ecked	by J	. Be		While Drilling At Completion of Drillin Time After Drilling Depth to Water	NA NA sent the appro		Dry Dry	<b>y</b> <b>y</b>	••••••	

1 Lo	Wang EngineeringBORING LOG HA-02ungeng@wangeng.comWEI Job No.: KE23546045 N Main Street mbard, IL, 60148 lephone: 630 953 9938ClientIDOT District 1ProjectIL 25 Retaining Wall Repair 						Page 1 of 1 Datum: NAVD 88 Elevation: 741.28 ft North: 1912481.84 ft East: 990766.33 ft Station: Offset:								
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 (%)
	Soft, dark brown SILTY CL/ trace gravel			1	P U S H	0.25 P	22								
	737.8 Stiff, brown SILTY CLAY LO little gravel	- - - - - - - -		2	P U S H	0.25 P	19								
	PROBE REFUS Boring terminated at 5.50 ft			3	P ⊃ ∽ →	1.00 P	20								
		-													
		- - 10													
		-													
		-													
		15 													
11/2 1/1/2		-													
UNANGENGING RESSAULUCY WANGENG.GUI 2/1/24 i.u a a b i.u a	CENE	20	ОТ								RLEVE				
Be Dri	egin Drilling 01-25-2024 illing Contractor Wang Testir	Com n <b>g Servi</b> o	nplet <b>ces</b>	e Dr	illing Drill Riç					While Drilling At Completion of Drillir	 ⊊		Dry Dry		
Dri Dri	iller K&G Logger illing Method 1" ID HSA; bori									Time After Drilling Depth to Water	esent the appro	ximate b			

1   L	145 N M ombard elephon	BORING LOG HA-03 WEI Job No.: KE235460 WEI Job No.: KE235460 Client IDOT District 1 Project IL 25 Retaining Wall Repair Location Kane County, IL							5460 I Repair	Page 1 of 1 Datum: NAVD 88 Elevation: 741.31 ft North: 1912488.22 ft East: 990763.84 ft Offset:				1 of 1	
Profile	Elevation (ft)	SOIL AND RO DESCRIPTIO		recovery Sample No.	SPT Values (blw/6 in)	Qu (tsf)	Moisture Content (%)	Profile	Elevation (ft)	SOIL AND ROC DESCRIPTION		Sample Type	Sample No. SPT Values	(bitwood in ) Qu (tsf)	Moisture Content (%)
	Cl 740.3 Mi br gr 737.3 Ve LC	2-inch thick, dark brow LAY	n SILTY	1 2 3 4	PUSH PUSH PUSH PUSH	0.50 P 2.50 P 2.00 P	25 19 14								
		CE.	 NERAL NO	 TE9							R LEVE				
Dr Dr	iller		Compl sting Service ger F. Boz	ete Di s :ga	rilling Drill Ri Ch	g 	by J	. Be	nsen	WATE       While Drilling       At Completion of Drillin       Time After Drilling       Depth to Water       The stratification lines represented	⊈ g <b>⊈</b> NA NA	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Dry Dry	у	







# **APPENDIX B**

### **DENSITY-UNIT WEIGHT DETERMINATION** D 7263

### **Client: IDOT District 1** Project: IL 25 Retaining Wall Repair WEI Job No: KE235460

### Analyst name: MC Test date: 1/31/2024

	RWB-01 SS#7	RWB-01 SS#13	RWB-02 SS#5	RWB-02 SS#6
Water content determination	(16-17.5ft)	(33.5-35ft)	(11-12.5ft)	(13.5-15ft)
Mass of tare and wet soil (g) $W_w =$	141.71	162.86	138.41	178.53
Mass of tare and dry soil (g) $W_d =$	117.91	135.02	122.24	156.85
Mass of tare (g) $W_t =$	11.17	11.30	11.18	11.12
Water content w =	22%	23%	15%	15%
Density–Unit Weight		1.400	1 0/20	1 272
Diameter measurements (in) $D_1 =$	1.416	1.403	1.373	1.373
$D_2 =$	1.430	1.402	1.384	1.386
$D_3 =$	1.435	1.411	1.404	1.363
Average diameter (in) D =	1.427	1.405	1.387	1.374
Height measurements (in) $H_1 =$	2.371	2.784	2.402	3.110
$H_2 =$	2.368	2.786	2.405	3.117
$H_3 =$	2.369	2.804	2.381	3.117
Average height (in) H =	2.369	2.791	2.396	3.115
Total weight (g) $W =$	130.540	151.560	127.230	167.410

131.26

107.33

Prepared by: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: 2/5/2024 Checked by: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: 2/5/2024

Bulk Unit Weight (pcf) g =

**Dry Unit Weight (pcf)**  $g_d =$ 

133.91

116.89

133.38

108.88

138.12

120.23

### **DENSITY-UNIT WEIGHT DETERMINATION** D 7263

**Client: IDOT District 1** Project: IL 25 Retaining Wall Repair WEI Job No: KE235460

Analyst name: MC Test date: 1/31/2024

Water content determination	RWB-02 SS#14 (38.5-40ft)		
Mass of tare and wet soil (g) $W_w =$	160.10		
Mass of tare and dry soil (g) $W_d =$	145.93		
Mass of tare (g) $W_t =$	11.26		
Water content w =	11%		

Density-Unit Weight

Density-Onit Weight			
Diameter measurements (in) $D_1 =$	1.392		
D <sub>2</sub> =	1.375		
D <sub>3</sub> =	1.398		
Average diameter (in) D =	1.388		
Height measurements (in) $H_1 =$	2.638		
$H_2 =$	2.636		
H <sub>3</sub> =	2.635		
Average height (in) H =	2.636		
Total <b>weight</b> (g) W =	148.840	 	
Bulk Unit Weight (pcf) g =	142.10		

Dry Unit Weight (pcf)  $g_d = 128.57$ 

 Prepared by:
 M
 Date:
 2/5/2024

 Checked by:
 ////////////
 Date:
 2/5/2024

WANG ENGINEERING, INC. 



# **APPENDIX C**



### Undrained Analysis, Segment 2, Ref Borings: HA-02 and RWB-01

Layer ID	Description	Total Unit Weight (pcf)	Undrained Cohesion (psf)	Undrained Friction Angle (degrees)
	Granular Fill	(pcr) 125	0	<u>(degrees)</u> 32
2	Stiff to V Stiff Silty Clay - Fill	120	1300	0
3	V Stiff Lean Clay Loam	120	2700	0
4	Hard Silty Clay	120	4500	0
5	M Dense Sand	120	0	30
6	Stiff Silty Clay	120	1200	0
7	M Dense Sand	120	0	30

GLOBAL STABILITY: IL ROUTE 25 RETAINING WALL IMPROVEMENTS, ST. CHARLES, KANE COUNTY, ILLINOIS									
SCALE: GRAPHICAL	DRAWN BY: N. BALAKUMARAN CHECKED BY: M. Kothawala								
×	A Fierracon Company	1145 N. Main Street Lombard, IL 60148 www.wangeng.com							
FOR IDOT DISTRICT ONE KE235460									

60



### Drained Analysis, Segment 2, Ref Borings: HA-02 and RWB-01

Layer ID	Description	Total Unit Weight (pcf)	Drained Cohesion (psf)	Drained Friction Angle
1	Creative Fill	(pcf)		(degrees)
I	Granular Fill	125	0	32
2	Stiff to V Stiff Silty Clay - Fill	120	100	30
3	V Stiff Lean Clay Loam	120	100	30
4	Hard Silty Clay	120	110	31
5	M Dense Sand	120	0	30
6	Stiff Silty Clay	120	100	30
7	M Dense Sand	120	0	30

GLOBAL STABILITY: IL ROUTE 25 RETAINING WALL IMPROVEMENTS, ST. CHARLES, KANE COUNTY, ILLINOIS							
SCALE: GRAPHICAL	DRAWN BY: N. BALAKUMARAN CHECKED BY: M. Kothawala						
SCALE: GRAPHICAL APPENDIX C-2		1145 N. Main Stree Lombard, IL 6014 www.wangeng.cor					
FOR IDOT DIS	KE235460						



# **APPENDIX D**

Bench Mark: Square cut in N. end of Bridge wall ±200' S. of broken Retaining Wall El. 755.16. "X" in Southwest W. side IL 25 ±300' S. of Park Ave. opposite of broken Retaining Wall El. 747.05,

### Existing Structure:

The retaining wall was constructed in 1968 under F.A.S. Route 106, 39 Ext. R-VB, Section 32-CS and is a cast-in-place concrete T-wall and approximately 272 feet long which is parallel with the IL Route 25 alignment, compromised of 4 segments which are separated by expansion joints. The wall retains the IL Route 25 embankment and the side adjacent to a residential property located at 404 North 5th Avenue, St. Charles, IL 60174. A permanent construction easement of eight (8) feet wide into residential property is noted in the Agreement recorded with Kane County.

Traffic is to be maintained utilizing staged construction. The road shall remain open to at least one lane of traffic in each direction at all times.

### Salvage: No Salvage



- 1. Upon excavation the footing of segment 2 wall must be evaluated for its condition. If the footing is in good shape then replace the stem only as detailed in the cross section as option 2 on sheet 2. If the the footing is damaged then replace the footing and stem wall as detailed in the cross section as option 1 on sheet 2.
- 2. Since the staircase is in good condition, replace only the adjacent portions of stem wall leaving 10'-0" of the existing stem wall.

SCALE:

SHEET

OF

SHEET



REVISED

LOT DATE = \$DATE\$

DATE

01/29/2024

### CURVE DATA

EXIST. CURVE IL25 E 3 PI STA. = 14+05.19  $\Delta = 11^{\circ} 09' 41'' (RT)$  $D = 5^{\circ} 27' 11''$ R = 1,050.71'T = 102.67'L = 204.68'E = 5.00'e = \_\_\_\_ T.R. = S.E. RUN =P.C. STA. = 13+02.53P.T. STA. = 15+07.21

### HIGHWAY CLASSIFICATION

Rte. Functional Class: ADT: (20); (20 ADTT: (20); (20) DHV: Design Speed: m.p.h. Posted Speed: m.p.h. -Way Traffic Directional Distribution:

DESIGN SPECIFICATIONS 2020 AASHTO LRFD Bridge Design Specifications, 19th Edition

DESIGN STRESSES FIELD UNITS

f'c = 3,500 psi (Substructure)  $f_{y} = 60,000 \text{ psi (Reinforcement)}$ 

Exist. Footing

Core exist. 5" dia. hole in exist. drainage structure and outlet pipe underdrain

-1.1% Limit of Structure

FROFILE GRADE (Along Sidewalk reconstruction)

> Proposed Structure



GENERAL PLAN & ELEVATION RETAINING WALL ALONG NB NORTH FIFTH AVE. ILLINOIS ROUTE 25 (SECTION KANE COUNTY STATION 9+28.15 TO 11+23.80

		F.A.S. RTE	SECT	FION		COUNTY	TOTAL SHEETS	SHEET NO.	
			106	5		KANE	3	1	
_							CONTRACT	NO. 62	2T10
5	STA.	TO STA.			ILLINOIS	FED. A	ID PROJECT		



		SEC	FION		COUNTY	TOTAL SHEETS	SHEET NO.
	106			KANE	3	2	
					CONTRACT	NO. 62	2T10
TO STA TO STA			ILLINOIS	FED. AI	D PROJECT		





DELTA ENGINEERING GROUP, LLC DOSULTA ENGINEERING GROUP, LLC DOSULTA ENGINEERING MANAGES, SURVYOR 111 W JACKSON BUVD, SUITE 910	USER NAME = \$USER\$	DESIGNED - NS	REVISED -							
		DRAWN - RM	REVISED -	STATE OF ILLINOIS						
л Ш	D E G CHICAGO, IL 60604 T 312.377.7700, F 312.427 6145	PLOT SCALE = \$SCALE\$	CHECKED - SMK	REVISED -	DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION					
Ē	1 312.377.7700, P 312.427 6145	PLOT DATE = \$DATE\$	DATE - 01/29/2024	REVISED -		SCALE:	SHEET	OF	SHEETS	ST/

						~	
					CONTRACT	NO.	6
STA	TO STA		ILLINOIS	FED. A	ID PROJECT		_