STRUCTURE GEOTECHNICAL REPORT CIRCLE INTERCHANGE RECONSTRUCTION RETAINING WALL 48 (PROPOSED SN 016-1835) F.A.I ROUTE 94, (I-90/94 SB TO I-290 EB) STATION 1403+78.00 TO STATION 1404+89.01 SECTION 2014-013 R&B-R IDOT D-91-227-13, PTB 163/ITEM 001 COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS

> For AECOM 303 East Wacker Drive Chicago, IL 60601 (312) 938-0300

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

> Original: August 22, 2017 Revised: NA

Technical Report Documentation Page

1. Title and Subtitle	2. Report Date			
Structure Geotechnical R	Original: August 22, 2017			
Circle Interchange Recon	Revised: N/A			
Retaining Wall 48, F.A.I.	3. Report Type SGR 🗌 RGR			
Station 1403+78.00 to Sta	\Box Draft \boxtimes Final \Box Revised			
4. Route / Section / County	5. IDOT Job No./Contract			
FAI 94/2014-013R&B -R	D-91-259-12/60X93			
6. PTB / Item No.	7. Existing Structure Number(s)	8. Proposed Structure Number(s)		
163/001	No existing wall	016-1835		
9. Prepared by	Contributor(s)	Author Phone Number/Email Address		
Wang Engineering, Inc.	Author: Metin W. Seyhun, P.E.	(630) 953-9928 Ext 1018		
1145 N Main Street	QC/QA: Mohammed Kothawala, P.E., D.GE.	mseyhun@wangeng.com		
Lombard, IL 60148	PIC: Corina T. Farez, P.E., P.G.			
10. Prepared for	Structural Engineer	Contact Phone Number		
AECOM	Matt Santeford, P.E., S.E.	(847) 407-5235		
303 East Wacker Drive	TranSystems			
Chicago, IL 60601				
11 Abstract				

11. Abstract

A 245.27-foot long, 21.57 feet maximum retained height new retaining wall will be constructed to retain the proposed SE Ramp north approach structure. The Mechanically Stabilized Earth (MSE) will wrap around the approach roadway and abutment portions. This report provides geotechnical recommendations for the design and construction of the proposed retaining wall.

Beneath the pavement or topsoil, the subsurface soils consists of up to 10 feet of primarily cohesive fill, up to 10 feet medium stiff to very stiff clay crust, up to 40 feet of very soft to medium stiff silty clay, 25 feet of very stiff to hard clay loam, and 32 feet of hard silty clay loam or dense to very dense silt to silty loam extending to the boring termination depths. Bedrock was encountered at elevations of about 481 to 485 feet. Groundwater may be encountered within the fill layers at the upper 4 to 10 feet, during times of heavy precipitation.

Based on the encountered subsoil conditions and the wall height, the proposed MSE wall is feasible with preloading or ground improvement. In addition, the MSE wall will require Class III LCCF materials to have sufficient foundation bearing resistance. We estimate the wall will have a maximum factored bearing resistance of 2,900 psf using a geotechnical resistance factor of 0.65. The wall will have sufficient resistance against sliding. Global stability analyses show adequate factors of safety.

The long-term consolidation settlement of foundation soils is estimated to be 2.1 inches near Station 1404+81 and 0.9 inches near Station 1404+50. We estimate the soil will achieve 50% of primary consolidation settlement in 12 months and 90% of primary consolidation in 56 months. To reduce settlements to acceptable range of 1-inch for the roadway, we recommend either with preloading for 12 months or a ground improvement by use of aggregate columns. The design and construction of aggregate columns should be as per IDOT Special Provision GBSP No. 71 Aggregate Column Ground Improvement.

12. Path to archived file

S:\Netprojects\11000401\Reports\SGRs\Walls\1835 Wall 48\Draft SGR Wall 48\RPT_Wang_MWS_11000401SGRFinalWall48Final_20170822.doc



TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0	INTRODUCTION	
1.1	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	
1.2	PROPOSED STRUCTURE	2
1.3	EXISTING STRUCTURE	
2.0	SITE CONDITIONS AND GEOLOGICAL SETTING	2
2.1	Physiography	
2.2	Surficial Cover	
2.3	BEDROCK	
3.0	METHODS OF INVESTIGATION	4
3.1	SUBSURFACE INVESTIGATION	4
3.2	VANE SHEAR TESTS	5
3.3	LABORATORY TESTING	5
4.0	RESULTS OF FIELD AND LABORATORY INVESTIGATIONS	6
4.1	SOIL CONDITIONS	6
4.2	GROUNDWATER CONDITIONS	
4.3	SEISMIC DESIGN CONSIDERATIONS	9
5.0	ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	9
5.1	RETAINING WALL TYPE EVALUATION	9
5.2	BEARING RESISTANCE AND EXTERNAL STABILITY ANALYSES	
5.3	SETTLEMENT ANALYSES	
5.4	GLOBAL STABILITY ANALYSES	
6.0	CONSTRUCTION CONSIDERATIONS	
6.1	EXCAVATION	
6.2	DEWATERING	
6.3	FILLING AND BACKFILLING	
6.4	WALL CONSTRUCTION	
6.5	CONSTRUCTION MONITORING	
6.6	AGGREGATE COLUMN INSTALLATION AND EXISTING 84-INCH STORM SEWER	
7.0	QUALIFICATIONS	



EXHIBITS

- 1. Site Location Map
- 2. Site and Regional Geology
- 3. Boring Location Plan
- 4. Subsurface Soil Data Profile

APPENDIX A

Boring Logs and Rock Core Photographs

APPENDIX B

Laboratory Test Results

APPENDIX C

Global Stability Analysis Results

APPENDIX D

Type Size Location Plan



STRUCTURE GEOTECHNICAL REPORT CIRCLE INTERCHANGE RECONSTRUCTION RETAINING WALL 48 (PROPOSED SN 016-1835) F.A.I. ROUTE 94 (I-90/94 SB TO I-290 EB) STATION 1403+84.96 TO STATION 1404+89.01 IDOT D-91-227-13/PTB 163-001 COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS FOR AECOM

1.0 INTRODUCTION

This report presents the results of Wang Engineering, Inc. (Wang) subsurface investigation, laboratory testing, and geotechnical engineering evaluations for the proposed wall SN 016-1835 (Retaining Wall 48) along F.A.I Route 94 (I-90/94 SB to I-290 EB) in the City of Chicago, Cook County, Illinois. A *Site Location Map* is presented as Exhibit 1.

The purpose of our investigation was to characterize the site soil and groundwater conditions, perform geotechnical engineering analyses, and provide recommendations for the design and construction of the new wall structure.

1.1 Project Description

The Circle Interchange is over 50 years old and has significant congestion and safety problems. The project is aiming to improve safety and mobility as well as upgrade the mainline and interchange facilities. The project will also improve other modes of transportation such as transit, pedestrians and bicyclists within the same corridor.

The Circle Interchange Reconstruction project is along Interstate 90/94 (I-90/94) from south of Roosevelt Road to north of Lake Street, along Interstate 290 (I-290) from Loomis Street to the Circle Interchange; and along Congress Parkway from the Circle Interchange to Canal Street/Old Post Office. The routes typically have three lanes of traffic in each direction with mostly one lane ramp at interchanges. Locally, the north leg is known as the Kennedy Expressway, the south leg as the Dan Ryan Expressway and the west leg as the Eisenhower Expressway. Within the project area, there are



several cross street bridges over I-90/94 and I-290 considered for reconstruction. Along I-90/94, from south to north, the cross street overpasses include Taylor Street, Van Buren Street, Jackson Boulevard, and Adams Street. Along I-290, from west to east, the cross street overpasses include Morgan Street, Peoria Street, and Halsted Street.

The proposed improvements include additional through lanes in each direction on I-90/94. The horizontal alignment and vertical profiles throughout the interchange will be improved. A new two-lane flyover, Ramp NW (Flyover) will be constructed for I-90/94 northbound to I-290 westbound traffic. Cross street bridges, Morgan Street, Harrison Street, Halsted Street, Peoria Street, Taylor Street, Adams Street, Jackson Boulevard, and Van Buren Street will be reconstructed. Various existing ramps will be reconstructed and up to fifty new retaining walls will be constructed.

1.2 Proposed Structure

Based on the TSL plan dated August 15, 2017 provided by TranSystems, Wang understands the proposed Mechanically Stabilized Earth (MSE) retaining wall (SN 016-1835) will be required to retain the SE Ramp Bridge (SN 016-1714) north approach roadway as well as north abutment. The 245.27-foot wall begins at Station 1403+78.00, offset 6.16 feet right on west side of SE Ramp, wraps the proposed SE Ramp Bridge north abutment, and ends at Station 1403+78.00, 22.81 feet left on east side of SE Ramp. The wall will have a maximum retained height of 21.57 feet. The maximum wall height measured from the top of levelling pad to the top of Coping/Finished Grade at B.F. of wall will be 25.07 feet. The wall height increases gradually from 3.5 to 25.07 feet over the length of approximately 111 feet. There will be a 3.5-foot concrete parapet on top of the wall. The TSL plan is included in the *Type Size Location Plan* (Appendix D).

1.3 Existing Structure

There is no existing retaining wall structure due to a new alignment of Ramp SE Bridge.

2.0 SITE CONDITIONS AND GEOLOGICAL SETTING

The site is located within the City of Chicago at the I-90/94 and I-290 Circle Interchange. On the USGS *Chicago Loop 7.5 Minute Series* map, the bridge is located in the NE¹/₄ of Section 16, Tier 39 N, Range 14 E of the Third Principal Meridian.



The following review of published geologic data, with emphasis on factors that might influence the design and construction of the proposed engineering works, is meant to place the project area within a geological framework and confirm the dependability and consistency of the present subsurface investigation results. For the study of the regional geologic framework, Wang considered northeastern Illinois in general and Cook County in particular. Exhibit 2 illustrates the *Site and Regional Geology*.

2.1 Physiography

The wall is situated within the Chicago Lake Plain Physiographic Subsection. The area is characterized by a flat surface that slopes gently toward the lake, largely made of groundmoraine till covered by thin and discontinuous lacustrine silt and clay. The ground elevation along the wall ranges from 595 feet at the south end to 582 feet at the north end.

2.2 Surficial Cover

The project area was shaped during the Wisconsinan-age glaciation, and more than 75-foot thick drift covers the bedrock (Leetaru et al. 2004). The glacial cover is made up of clay and silt of the Equality Formation of the Mason Group and diamictons of the Wadsworth and Lemont Formations of the Wedron Group (Hansel and Johnson 1996). The Equality Formation is made up of bedded silt and clay, locally laminated, with lenses and/or thin beds of sand and gravel. The Wadsworth Formation consists of relatively homogenous, massive, gray till with clay to silty clay matrix, with dolostone and shale clasts and occasional lenses of sorted and stratified silt. The Wadsworth Formation is underlain by the pebbly silty clay loam to silty loam diamicton of the Yorkville Member of the Lemont Formation, known informally as the Chicago "hardpan."

From a geotechnical viewpoint, the Equality Formation is characterized by low strength, medium to high plasticity, and medium to high moisture content, whereas the Wadsworth Formation is characterized by low plasticity, medium to low moisture content, medium to very stiff consistency, poor permeability, and low compressibility. The Yorkville Member (hardpan) is characterized by low plasticity, high blow counts, and low moisture content (Bauer et al. 1991; Peck and Reed 1954).

2.3 Bedrock

In the project area, the glacigenic deposits unconformably rest over approximately 350-foot thick Silurian-age dolostone (Leetaru et al 2004). The top of bedrock may be encountered at 475 to 500 feet elevation or 75 to 100 feet below ground surface (bgs) or more. The Silurian dolostone dips gently



eastward at a pace of 15 feet per mile. Only inactive faults are known in the area, and the seismic risk is minimal (Leetaru et al. 2004; Willman 1971). There are no records of mining activity in the area, but deep tunnel excavations are known to exist.

Our subsurface investigation results fit into the local geologic context. The borings drilled in the project area revealed the native sediments consist of clay to silty clay diamicton of the Wadsworth Formation resting on top of more competent silty clay loam diamicton (hardpan) of the Lemont Formation, which in turn is underlain by bedrock. Sound dolostone bedrock was sampled at depths of 98 to 107 feet bgs, corresponding to 481.3 to 484.5 feet elevations, within the range predicted based on published geological data.

3.0 METHODS OF INVESTIGATION

The following sections outline the subsurface and laboratory investigations. All elevations in this report are based on NAVD 1988.

3.1 Subsurface Investigation

Since no specific subsurface investigation was carried out for the proposed Wall 48, Wang has referenced three structure borings, designated as 1714-B-01, 1714-B-02, and 1705-B-10 drilled for the SE and NW Ramps structures in October 2013.

In addition, Wang considered Piezometer 1703-PZ-01 located about 550 feet east of Wall 48. The piezometer was installed in accordance with ASTM D 5092, "*Standard Practice for Design and Installation of Groundwater Monitoring Wells in Aquifers.*"

The as-drilled boring locations were surveyed by Dynasty Group, Inc. and station and offset information for each boring were provided by AECOM. The station and offset referenced the wall alignment. Boring location data are presented in the *Boring Logs* (Appendix A). The as-drilled boring locations are shown in the *Boring Location Plan* (Exhibit 3).

A truck-mounted drilling rig equipped with hollow stem augers, was used to advance and maintain an open borehole to 10 feet depth after that mud rotary was used to the boring termination depth.



Soil sampling was performed according to AASHTO T 206, "*Penetration Test and Split Barrel Sampling of Soils*." The soil was sampled at 2.5-foot intervals to 30 feet bgs and at 5-foot intervals to boring termination depths. Soil samples collected from each sampling interval were placed in sealed jars and transported to Wang Geotechnical Laboratory in Lombard, Illinois for further examination and laboratory testing.

Field boring logs, prepared and maintained by a Wang engineer or geologist, include lithological descriptions, visual-manual soil/rock classifications, results of Rimac and pocket penetrometer unconfined compressive strength tests, results of Standard Penetration Tests (SPT) recorded as blows per 6 inches of penetration. The SPT N value, shown on the soil profile, is the sum of the second and third blows per 6 inches. The soils were described and classified according to Illinois Division of Highways (IDH) Textural Classification system. The field logs were finalized by an experienced engineering geologist after verifying the field visual classifications and laboratory test results.

Groundwater observations were made during to a depth of 10 feet before using rotary wash method. Due to safety considerations, boreholes were backfilled with grout immediately upon completion. Groundwater levels in the piezometer were recorded autonomously at defined intervals by digital pressure loggers suspended within the water column. Barometric affects are compensated by a second in-air pressure logger installed in the riser pipe. Data is retrieved from loggers periodically, downloaded to computer for analysis.

3.2 Vane Shear Tests

Wang performed vane shear tests in Borings 1705-B-10 to determine in-situ shear strength of very soft to soft silty clay. In addition, vane shear test in Boring VST-06 was also considered. Boring VST-06 is located approximately 600 feet east of wall. Vane shear test was performed using calibrated RocTest vane shear equipment. Tests were performed in undisturbed and remolded conditions. The sensitivity shown on the borings is the ratio of shear strength in undisturbed and remolded conditions. In general, the vane shear values for soft clays were significantly higher than the corresponding values from unconfined compressive strength tests using the RIMAC apparatus. Vane shear test results were used for analyses.

3.3 Laboratory Testing

The soil samples were tested in the laboratory for moisture content (AASHTO T265). Atterberg limits (AASHTO T 89/T 90) and particle size analyses (AASHTO T 88) tests were performed on



selected soil samples representing the main soil layers encountered during the investigation. Field visual descriptions of the soil samples were verified in the laboratory. Laboratory test results are shown in the *Boring Logs* (Appendix A), in the *Soil Profile* (Exhibit 4), and in the *Laboratory Test Results* (Appendix B).

The soil samples will be retained in our laboratory for 60 days following approval this report. After that time, soil samples will be discarded unless a specific written request is received as to their disposition.

4.0 RESULTS OF FIELD AND LABORATORY INVESTIGATIONS

Detailed descriptions of the soil conditions encountered during our 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

Boring 1714-B-02 drilled at the existing westbound I-290 shoulder encountered 4 inches of asphalt over 8 inches of concrete. Borings 1714-B-01 and 1705-B-10 revealed 3 to 12 inches of brown to dark brown loamy topsoil. In descending order, the general lithologic succession encountered beneath the pavement structure or topsoil includes: 1) man-made ground (fill); 2) medium stiff to very stiff silty clay; 3) very soft to medium stiff clay to silty clay; 4) very stiff to hard clay to silty clay loam; 5) hard silty clay loam and dense to very dense silt to silty loam; and 6) strong dolostone.

1) Man-made ground (fill)

Underneath the topsoil or pavement structure, the borings encountered 4 to 10 feet of fill materials. Granular fill consists of medium dense, brown sand and loam with crushed stone and brick fragments. Cohesive fill includes very stiff to hard, brown and gray silty clay to silty clay loam and clay loam. The granular fill layer has N-values of 11 to 17 blows per foot and moisture content values of 8 to10%. The cohesive fill layer has unconfined compressive strength (Qu) values ranging from 2.6 to more than 4.5 tsf and moisture content values between 16 and 20%.



2) Medium stiff to very stiff silty clay to silty loam

Beneath the fill, at elevations of 577 to 583 feet, the borings encountered 3 to 10 thick of medium stiff to very stiff, gray silty clay to silty loam. This layer has Qu values ranging from 1.0 to 3.5 tsf and moisture content values between 16 and 24%. Laboratory index testing on a sample from this layer shows liquid limit (L_L) and plastic limit (P_L) values of 24% and 15%, respectively. This layer is commonly known as the "crust."

3) Very soft to medium stiff clay to silty clay

At elevations of 573 to 580 feet (8 to 20 feet bgs), the borings revealed up to 40 feet of very soft to medium stiff, gray clay to silty clay with Qu values of 0.08 to 0.98 tsf with an average of 0.36 tsf and moisture content values of 19 to 36% averaging 24%. As discussed in Section 4.2, undrained shear strength values from vane shear tests are generally higher than Rimac tests. The vane shear tests results are shown in Borings 1714-B-10 and VST-06, and range from 0.6 to greater than 2.6 tsf. Laboratory index testing results show L_L values of 33 to 35% and P_L values of 17 to 18%. According to the AASHTO soil classification, the subgrade soils belong mainly to the A-6 group. This layer is commonly known as the "Chicago Blue Clay."

The long-term consolidation properties of this clay to silty clay layer were obtained from nearby structure Borings 02-RWB-06ST, 1705-B-05A, and 08-ST-01 located about 750 to 1500 feet away from the Wall 48. The resulting soil parameters are summarized in Table 1 and the laboratory test results are attached in Appendix B. These parameters are used to estimate the primary consolidation settlement for the wall.

Table 1: Summary of Consolidation Testing							
	Test	Test					Moisture
Boring ID	Depth	Elevation	C _C C _S		e _O	OCR/ P'c	Content
	(feet)	(feet)				(psf)	(%)
02-RWB-06ST	18 to 20	562.6	0.240	0.038	0.747	1.6/3292	26
1705-B-05A	25 to 27	554.2	0.223	0.045	0.738	1.2/2886	26
08-ST-01	39 to 41	545.4	0.219	0.051	0.713	1.1/3586	25



4) Very Stiff to hard clay to silty clay loam

At elevations of 536 to 542 feet (47 to 52 feet bgs), the borings advanced through up to 25 feet of very stiff to hard clay to silty clay loam. The clay to silty clay has Qu values of 1.3 to 7.2 tsf with an average of 3.7 tsf and moisture content values of 11 to 27% averaging 19%. Laboratory index testing on a sample from this cohesive layer shows a L_L value of 35% and a P_L value of 17%. The borings encountered 2 to 5 feet of medium dense silt and sand layers with an N value of 13 blows per foot.

(5) Hard silty clay loam and very dense silt to silty loam

At elevations of 516 to 521 feet (67 to 77 feet bgs) the borings encountered up to 32 feet of hard silty clay loam to silty loam, dense to very dense silt to silty loam and very dense gravelly sand resting top of bedrock. This layer has Qu values of 4.4 and 10.3 tsf, moisture content values of 9 to 24%, and N values of 40 to over 50 blows per foot. Numerous sampler refusal and hard drilling conditions were recorded within this layer.

(6) Strong dolostone

The borings encountered strong bedrock at elevations of 481.3 to 484.5 feet or 98 to 107 feet bgs. Based on the 10-foot rock core obtained from borings, the measured RQD values are 50 to 86% in Borings 1705-B-10 and 1714-B-02, corresponding fair to good rock quality. *Bedrock core photographs* are shown in Appendix A.

4.2 Groundwater Conditions

Groundwater was not observed during or after drilling in borings due to the mud rotary drilling from 10 feet bgs. A Piezometer 1703-PZ-01 was installed for the nearby structure about 550 feet east of the proposed retaining wall 48 on November 12, 2014. The screen was placed with the top and bottom of piezometer screen elevations at 507.2 and 487.2 feet (75 to 95 feet bgs), respectively. A summary of the monitoring data between November 2014 and March 2017 is shown in Figure 1.





Figure 1: Summary of Groundwater Monitoring Data

The data shows groundwater that is under excess pressure head. The average hydrostatic elevation within the aquifer is about 553 feet. However, the excess pressure will not impact the proposed Wall 48 construction since the MSE wall is proposed.

Although groundwater was not observed within upper fill layers, we anticipate perched water may be encountered during times of heavy precipitation. Therefore, the design and construction of the wall should consider the perched water between elevation 582 and 587 feet within the fill layers.

4.3 Seismic Design Considerations

The retaining wall is located in Seismic Performance Zone (SPZ) 1 and is not required to be designed for seismic forces as per 2012 IDOT *Bridge Manual* (IDOT 2012).

5.0 ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Retaining Wall Type Evaluation

Based on the TSL plan, the proposed Retaining Wall 48 is a fill wall supporting the north approach of the SE Ramp Bridge. The wall will have a maximum retained height of approximately 21.57 feet. The maximum wall height measured from the top of levelling pad to the top of Coping/Finished Grade at B.F. of wall will be 25.07 feet.



Consideration was given in using standard cast-in-place concrete cantilever (T-type) with spread footings, however, it was ruled out due to low bearing resistance and excessive settlements of foundation soils. They would need to be supported on driven piles or drilled shafts. Driven piles are not considered due to noise and vibration concerns so drilled shafts placed on hardpan could be used. The proposed MSE wall is a feasible option but will require preloading or ground improvement with lightweight fill to satisfy the maximum 1-inch settlement criterion due to the roadway.

The following sections present the results of our geotechnical engineering analyses and recommendations for the MSE wall design and construction.

5.2 Bearing Resistance and External Stability Analyses

The MSE retaining wall base should be established a minimum of 3.5 feet below the finished grade at the front face of the wall. Based on the TSL plan, the proposed MSE wall base elevations varied between 577.84 and 592.25 feet. Based on our boring data, the foundation soils at the MSE wall base elevations includes about 6 to 19 feet of medium stiff to hard fill and native clayey soils followed by up to 40 feet of soft to medium stiff clay to silty clay. We estimate the foundation soils will have a nominal bearing resistance of 4,500 psf and a factored bearing resistance of 2,900 psf based on a geotechnical resistance factor of 0.65 (AASHTO 2014).

We assumed a reinforcement length equal to 70 percent of the total wall height or a minimum of 8 feet. We note that there will be an overlap in reinforcement between Stations 1404+89 and 1404+50 due to the proposed ramp roadway width of 29.2 feet. At the highest portion of the wall near Station 1404+81, the wall will apply a maximum factored bearing pressure of 6,700 psf with a regular MSE wall fill material (unit weight is 125 pcf) which exceeds the factored bearing resistance available. To reduce the applied wall pressure, we have considered Class III Lightweight Cellular Concrete Fill (LCCF) with unit weight of 42 pcf. We estimate the wall with Class III LCCF will apply a maximum equivalent factored bearing pressure of 2,600 psf, thus the foundation soils will have sufficient bearing resistance to support the wall. For further analyses, we have considered Class III LCCF as MSE wall fill material and embankment fill between the MSE walls.

The estimated friction angle between an MSE wall base and underlying cohesive soil is 30°, and the corresponding friction coefficient is 0.58. MSE retaining walls are designed based on a geotechnical sliding resistance factor of 1.0 for soil-on-soil contact (AASHTO 2014). The resistance load against



failure by sliding was calculated to be more than factored horizontal load without passive pressure in front of the wall; therefore the wall will be stable against sliding.

For the overturning/eccentricity, our analyses show the location of the resultant of reaction forces was found to be within middle two-thirds of the base width.

5.3 Settlement Analyses

We performed settlement analyses using data from Boring 1714-B-02 since it is more conservative and closest to the maximum height of the wall near Station 1404+81. We estimate the wall with Class III LCCF fill material will apply a maximum service pressure of 1,400 psf. In addition, we also performed settlement analysis near Station 1404+50 with a maximum service pressure of 850 psf. We calculated the corresponding long-term settlement of cohesive foundation soils using IDOT *Spreadsheet for Cohesive Soils* dated December 9, 2014 as well as hand calculations using consolidation properties obtained from laboratory test results.

Our settlement analyses indicate the walls will undergo about 2.1 inches of long-term settlement from the underlying cohesive soils near Station 1404+81 and about 0.9 inches near Station 1404+50, thus settlement governs the design. We estimate the soil will achieve 50% of primary consolidation settlement in 12 months and 90% of primary consolidation in 56 months. To reduce settlements to acceptable range of 1-inch for the roadway, we recommend either with preloading for 12 months or ground improvement by use of aggregate columns.

If at least 12 months is available after construction of ramp embankment and MSE Wall 48 without face panels before pavement placement, then the preloading is a viable option to reach the acceptable settlement for the roadway; however, it is our understanding that the required preloading period of 12 months may not be available due to construction constraints.

The installation of aggregate columns will create a composite material of lower overall compressibility and higher shear strength than the native soil thus increasing bearing capacity. Aggregate columns will also increase time rate of settlement, reduce total and differential settlements, and improve slope stability (FHWA 1983). The specialty contractor should design for the equivalent uniform service pressure of 1,400 psf at the proposed MSE wall base elevations. The estimated equivalent uniform service pressure includes a uniform surcharge of 250 psf and considers Class III LCCF (unit weight of 42 pcf) for the MSE wall reinforced zone and horizontal grade behind the wall.



A factor of safety of 2.5 should be considered. Based on our settlement analyses, we estimate ground improvement will be required between Stations 1404+50 and 1404+89. The design and construction of aggregate columns should be as per IDOT Special Provision GBSP No. 71 Aggregate Column Ground Improvement.

Removal and replacement with lightweight fill in lieu of the aggregate columns under the MSE wall was also considered but was found to require over 10 feet of deep replacement to reduce settlements to maximum 1-inch, making it not feasible.

5.4 Global Stability Analyses

Global stability analysis of the MSE walls was performed based on the soil conditions encountered along the abutment for the end wall. The global stability was analyzed using Slide Version 6.0 for both short-term (undrained) and long-term (drained) soil conditions as reported in Appendix C. The minimum required FOS against global instability according to IDOT is 1.5 for both conditions considering Class III MSE wall fill material. We estimate the wall has minimum undrained and drained FOS values of 1.9 and 3.7, respectively. The FOS meets the required minimum FOS of 1.5. Details of the global stability analysis are presented in Appendix C.

6.0 CONSTRUCTION CONSIDERATIONS

6.1 Excavation

Any required excavations should be performed in accordance with local, state, and federal regulations including current OSHA regulations. The potential effect of ground movements upon nearby structures and utilities should be considered during construction. Any open excavation to a depth of 4 feet should have a slope of 1:1.5 (V:H) for cohesive soils and 1:2 (V:H) for granular soils or flatter.

6.2 Dewatering

Based on the results of our investigation and proposed excavation for the wall, perched water is likely to be encountered during construction during times of heavy precipitation which should be removed through conventional sump and pump methods.

6.3 Filling and Backfilling

All fill and backfill materials will be as per IDOT *Standard Specification for Road and Bridge Construction* (IDOT 2016).



6.4 Wall Construction

The wall should be constructed as per IDOT *Standard Specification for Road and Bridge Construction* (IDOT 2016) and IDOT special provisions for *Mechanically Stabilized Earth Retaining Walls* (IDOT 2015). Class III LCCF should be as per IDOT District One special provision.

6.5 Construction Monitoring

There is no need for special construction monitoring for the retaining wall except normally required by the IDOT *Standard Specification for Road and Bridge Construction* (IDOT 2016).

6.6 Aggregate Column Installation and Existing 84-inch Storm Sewer

Aggregate columns for the MSE wall ground improvements may be installed before or after the installation of the abutment drilled shafts to bedrock. If the aggregate columns are installed before the drilled shafts, precautions must be taken to ensure that the installed aggregate columns are not disturbed during the subsequent shaft installations – depending on the final layout of the aggregate columns and drilled shafts, casing of the drilled shafts may be needed throughout the aggregate column depths to prevent lateral relaxation of the aggregate. If aggregate columns are installed afterwards, drilled shafts must be designed to incorporate the additional lateral stresses induced by the aggregate column installation.

The east end of the MSE wall 48 ground improvements are very close to the existing 84-inch storm sewer tunnel. Precautions must be taken in order not to overstress the existing tunnel walls during the aggregate column installation. The Contractor should submit a plan for protecting and monitoring the sewer tunnel during the aggregate column installations.



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 Retaining Wall 48 (SN016-1835) are planned, we should be timely informed so that our recommendations can be adjusted accordingly.

It has been a pleasure to assist AECOM 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.

Metin W. Seyhun, P.E. Senior Geotechnical Engineer

Bala

Nesam S. Balakumaran Project Geotechnical Engineer

Corina T. Farez, P.E., P. Vice President



REFERENCES

- AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF STATE HIGHWAY TRANSPORTATION OFFICIALS (2014) *LRFD Bridge Design Specifications*. United States Department 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, 69 p.
- 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, IL. 116 p.
- LEETARU, H.E., SARGENT, M.L., AND KOLATA, D.R, 2004, *Geologic Atlas of Cook County for Planning Purposes*, ISGS, Champaign, IL
- ILLINOIS DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION (2015) *Geotechnical Manual*. IDOT Bureau of Materials and Physical Research, Springfield, IL.
- ILLINOIS DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION (2016) *Standard Specifications for Road and Bridge Construction.* IDOT Division of Highways, Springfield, IL.
- ILLINOIS DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION (2012) *Bridge Manual*. IDOT Bureau of Bridges and Structures, Springfield, IL.
- WILLMAN, H.B., 1971, Summary of the Geology of the Chicago Area, ISGS Circular C460: Urbana, Illinois State Geological Survey, p. 77.
- PECK, R.B., and REED, W.C., 1954, *Engineering Properties of Chicago Subsoils*: University of Illinois Engineering Experiment Station Bulletin No. 423: Urbana, University of Illinois, 62 p.
- FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION (1983) *Design and Construction of Stone Columns Vol 1*. US Department of Transportation Report No. FHWA/RD-83/026, McLean, Virginia.



EXHIBITS







HIGHWAY CLASSIFICATION

Ramp SE Functional Class: Interstate ADTT: 123 (2012); 134 (2040) DHV: 440 (2040) Design Speed: 25 m.p.h. Posted Speed: 25 m.p.h. One-Way Traffic Directional Distribution: 100%

CURVE DATA

(Ramp SE) P-CIR-SE-2 P.I. Sta. = 1415+83.08 $\Delta = 157^{\circ}44'18''(LT)$ $D = 24^{\circ}48'12''$ R = 231.00' T = 1174.08 L = 635.96E = 965.59 e = 5.6% T.R. = NAS.E. Run = 128' P.C. Sta. = 1404+09.00 P.T. Sta. = 1410+44.95

CURVE DATA

(Ramp NW) P-CIR-NW-6 P.I. Sta. = 1831+44.22 ⊿ = 88°30′25" (LT) $D = 10^{\circ}36'37'$ R = 540.00'T = 526.11' L = 834.16 E = 213.92 e = 5.4% T.R. = NAS.E. Run = 66' P.C. Sta. = 1826+18.11 P.T. Sta. = 1834+52.27

Ramp NW Functional Class: Interstate ADT: 4.600 (2010); 5.000 (2040) ADT: 32.500 (2012); 36.000 (2040) ADTT: 2,483 (2012); 2,750 (2040) DHV: 2,790 (2040) Design Speed: 35 m.p.h. Posted Speed: 35 m.p.h. One-Way Traffic Directional Distribution: 100%

DESIGN SPECIFICATIONS

2014 AASHTO LRFD Bridge Design Specifications 7th Edition with 2015 and 2016 Interim Specifications

DESIGN STRESSES FIELD UNITS

f'c = 3,500 psi fy = 60,000 psi (Reinforcement)

PRECAST UNITS

f'c = 4,500 psi

WALL DEFLECTION CRITERIA:

Maximum total lateral wall deflection at top of wall: _ inch.

LEGEND

Electric	———— E ———		
Prop. Storm Sewer			
Exist. Storm Sewer			
Light Pole	X		
Soil Boring	•		



GENERAL PLAN AND ELEVATION RETAINING WALL 48 ALONG F.A.I. 94 (I-90/94 SB TO I-290 EB) SECTION 2014-013 R&B-R COOK COUNTY STATION 1403+84.96 TO STATION 1404+89.01 STRUCTURE NO. 016-1835

		F.A.I. RTE.	SECTION	COUNTY	TOTAL SHEETS	SHEET NO.
		0094	2014-013 R&B-R	СООК	2	1
				CONTRACT	NO.	60X93
2	SHEETS	ILLINOIS FED. AID PROJECT				



EI 11X17 11000401.GPJ WANGENG.GDT 5/26/17



APPENDIX A



VANGENGINC 11000401.GPJ WANGENG.GDT





Checked by **C. Marin**

Time After Drilling

Depth to Water

NA

NA

V

The stratification lines represent the approximate boundary

between soil types; the actual transition may be gradual

VANGENGINC 11000401.GPJ WANGENG.GDT 5/30/17

Driller

Drilling Method

R&J

backfilled upon completion

Logger

A. Tomaras

2.25" SSA to 10', mud rotary thereafter, boring

Page 3 of 3





VANGENGINC 11000401.GPJ WANGENG.GDT 5/30/17



BORING LOG 1714-B-01

WEI Job No.: 1100-04-01

Page 2 of 3

wangeng@wangeng.com 1145 N Main Street Lombard, IL 60148 Telephone: 630 953-9928 Fax: 630 953-9938

 Client
 AECOM

 Project
 Circle Interchange Reconstruction

 Location
 Section 17, T39N, R14E of 3rd PM

Datum: NAVD 88 Elevation: 593.22 ft North: 1898191.77 ft East: 1171304.89 ft Station: 1403+82.49 Offset: 0.9133 LT





BORING LOG 1714-B-01

WEI Job No.: 1100-04-01

Page 3 of 3

wangeng@wangeng.com 1145 N Main Street Lombard, IL 60148 Telephone: 630 953-9928 Fax: 630 953-9938

Client AECOM Project Circle Interchange Reconstruction Location Section 17, T39N, R14E of 3rd PM

Datum: NAVD 88 Elevation: 593.22 ft North: 1898191.77 ft East: 1171304.89 ft Station: 1403+82.49 Offset: 0.9133 LT





WANGENGINC 11000401.GPJ WANGENG.GDT 5/30/17



between soil types; the actual transition may be gradual

VANGENGINC 11000401.GPJ WANGENG.GDT

backfilled upon completion



between soil types; the actual transition may be gradual

WANGENGINC 11000401.GPJ WANGENG.GDT

backfilled upon completion




Telephone: 630 953-9928 Fax: 630 953-9938 Location							BORING LOG V WEI Job No.: 1100-0 AECOM Circle Interchange Recon Section 17, T39N, R14E c				Datum: NAVD 88 Elevation: 585.69 ft North: 1898109.29 ft East: 1171902.18 ft Station: 5213+64.18				2 of 2		
Profile	Elevation (ff)	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	0.3	Sample Type	Sample No.	SPT Values (blw/6 in)	Qu (tsf)	Moisture Content (%)
		In-Situ Vane Shear, 40.5 S _{u undis} = 906.4 S _{u remold} = 524.2 Sensitivity =	4 psf [—] 2 psf [—]		13	VS											
		In-Situ Vane Shear, 43.0 S _{u undis} = 677.7 S _{u remold} = 393.7 Sensitivity = ring terminated at 43.50 f	1 psf 1 psf / - = 1.7 / -		14	<u>Vs</u>											
			- - 50_ -	-													
			-	-													
			 - 55 -	•													
			-														
Be	gin Drillir	ng 12-09-2015		nplete	Dril	ling		12-14			While Drilling	ER LEVE	Ro	tary	y was		
Dr	illing Con iller illing Metl back	R&N Logger	F. B 0', mud	ozg	a	Ch	ecked	by	4. Ki	R [85%] urnia	Time After Drilling	NA V NA					e



BORING LOG 1703-PZ-01

WEI Job No.: 1100-04-01

Page 1 of 3

wangeng@wangeng.com 1145 N Main Street Lombard, IL 60148 Telephone: 630 953-9928 Fax: 630 953-9938

WANGENGINC 11000401.GPJ WANGENG.GDT 5/30/17

 Client
 AECOM

 Project
 Circle Interchange Reconstruction

 Location
 Section 17, T39N, R14E of 3rd PM

Datum: NAVD 88 Elevation: 582.49 ft North: 1898127.96 ft East: 1171807.47 ft Station: 1104+74.81 Offset: 3.30157 RT

Profile	SOIL AND ROCK DESCRIPTION	Depth (ft)	Sample Type	Sample No.	SPT Values (blw/6 in)	Qu (tsf)	Moisture Content (%)	Profile	Elevation (ft)	SOIL AND ROCK DESCRIPTION	Depth (ft)	Sample Type	Sample No.	SPT Values (blw/6 in)	Qu (tsf)	Moisture Content (%)
	Drilled without sampling	_							In B To To So	zometer Data: Installed in Nov. 12, 2014 entonite Seal 70 to 72 feet fop of Sand Pack at 72 feet fop of Screen at 75.3 feet creen Length 20 feet ottom of Screen at 95.3 fee	-	-				
		5									- - 25_ -	-				
											- - - -	-				
		10							pi	iezometer stabilized water readii reading during development (11/20/201	ng	-				
		_ _ 15								32.00 feet b reading date: 12/05/20 31.10 feet b	14 =	-				
											-	-				
	GENERAL	20	ΟΤΙ	ES						WATER	40		AT	Ā		
			nplete		-		1-12			While Drilling	<u>¥</u>	ما:		8 ? a har	obel	
	lling Contractor Wang Testing Se ller P&P Logger S							-	- 1	-						
	Driller P&P Logger S. Woods Checked byCLM (-Coord) Time After Drilling NA Drilling Method 4.25" HSA, monitoring water well Depth to Water Y NA The stratification lines represent the approximate boundary															



BORING LOG 1703-PZ-01

WEI Job No.: 1100-04-01

Page 2 of 3

wangeng@wangeng.com 1145 N Main Street Lombard, IL 60148 Telephone: 630 953-9928 Fax: 630 953-9938

 Client
 AECOM

 Project
 Circle Interchange Reconstruction

 Location
 Section 17, T39N, R14E of 3rd PM

Datum: NAVD 88 Elevation: 582.49 ft North: 1898127.96 ft East: 1171807.47 ft Station: 1104+74.81 Offset: 3.30157 RT

Profile	Elevation (ft)	SOIL AND ROCK DESCRIPTION	Depth (ft) Sample Type recovery	Sample No. SPT Values	(blw/6 in) Qu (tsf)	Moisture Content (%)	Profile	Elevation (ft)	SOIL AND ROCK DESCRIPTION	Depth (ft)	Sample Type	Sample No.	(blw/6 in)	Qu (tsf)	Moisture Content (%)
			-							-	-				
										-					
			-							-	-				
			45 _ _							65_ - -	-				
			-							-	-				
			-							-					
			50 					In	zometer Data: Istalled in Nov. 12, 2014 entonite Seal 70 to 72 fee	70_ 					
								To	op of Sand Pack at 72 fee op of Screen at 75.3 feet creen Length 20 feet ottom of Screen at 95.3 fe	-	-				
			-							-	-				
			55							75	-				
11/			-							-	-				
VANGENGING T1000401.6PJ WANGENG.GDI \$3071 J. J. B. B. J.			-							-					
			60							- 80					
1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1.			AL NOTE	ES					WATEF		LD				
Be	egin Drillii		Complete	-		11-12			While Drilling	<u> </u>		78]
E Dr	illing Cor						-	-	At Completion of Drilling	Σ mι	ud ir	n the	bore	ehole	.
Dr	iller	P&P Logger	S. Wood			by CL	М (-	Coord)		NA	· · · · ·				
Dr Dr	illing Met	hod 4.25" HSA, monit	oring wate	er we	II				Depth to Water The stratification lines represent between soil types; the actual	NA sent the app transition	proxima may b	ate bou e gradu	undary		



BORING LOG 1703-PZ-01

WEI Job No.: 1100-04-01

Page 3 of 3

wangeng@wangeng.com 1145 N Main Street Lombard, IL 60148 Telephone: 630 953-9928 Fax: 630 953-9938

AECOM Client Project **Circle Interchange Reconstruction** Section 17, T39N, R14E of 3rd PM Location

Datum: NAVD 88 Elevation: 582.49 ft North: 1898127.96 ft East: 1171807.47 ft Station: 1104+74.81 Offset: 3.30157 RT

							_							
Profile	Elevation (ft)	SOIL AND ROCK DESCRIPTION	Depth (ft) Sample Type recovery	SPT Values	(DIW/0 III) Qu (tsf)	Moisture Content (%)	Profile	Elevation (ft)	SOIL AND ROO DESCRIPTIO		Sample Type	SPT Values (blw/6 in)	Qu (tsf)	Moisture Content (%)
			_											
			-											
			-											
			-											
			-											
			-											
			85											
			-											
			-											
			-											
			-											
		'ery dense, gray SILTY LOAM,	90											
		ace gravel	1X I	1 40 42		13								
		Dr	y/	18/										
			-											
			-											
			-											
			95											
				2 10 23		20								
				-5 <u>0</u> /										
			-											
30/17														
01														
D.G.		Delectore frequenci		3 15		14								
ANGE	100 F	Dolostone fragments		30	2		1							
×⊥⊥ G	<u>482.5</u>	oring terminated at 100.00 ft						I						
MANGENGINC 11000401.GPJ WANGENG.GDT 5/30/17 D D D M	egin Dril		AL NOTE Complete [1	11-12	2.201	14		ER LEVE ⊊		AIA 78 ?		
D 1001	-	ontractor Wang Testing		-					•					9
	riller	P&P Logger	S. Woods				-	Coord)						
D NGEN	rilling M	ethod 4.25" HSA, monito	oring wate	r wel	l				Depth to Water The stratification lines re	V NA		- h 1		
WA			Drilling Method 4.25" HSA, monitoring water well											



APPENDIX B





AR GDT <u>v</u> 11000401.GPJ Ы SIZE GRAIN



US_LAB.GDT ATTERBERG_LIMITS IDH 11000401.GPJ



5/30/17 WANGENG.GDT GPJ HO

SINCE 1982

Telephone: 630 953-9928 Fax: 630 953-9938

Location: Section 17, T39N, R14E of 3rd PM Number: 1100-04-01



ONE-DIMENSIONAL CONSOLIDATION TEST AASHTO T 216 / ASTM D 2435

Project: Circle Interch Client: AECOM Soil Sample ID: Boring 02-RW	0	Tested by: M. Snider Prepared by: M. Snider Test date: 7/30/2013	
Sample Description: Gray LEAN C	, ,		
Initial sample height =	1.001 in	Ring diameter =	2.495 in
Initial sample mass =	161.06 g	Ring mass =	109.95 g
Initial water content =	26.27%	Initial sample and ring mass =	271.01 g
Initial dry unit weight =	99.30 pcf	Tare mass =	14.22 g
Initial void ratio =	0.747	Final ring and sample mass =	263.63 g
Initial degree of saturation =	97.79%	Mass of wet sample and tare =	167.62 g
		Mass of dry sample and tare =	141.77 g
Final sample mass =	153.40 g	Initial dial reading =	0.01000 in
Final dry sample mass =	127.55 g	Final dial reading =	0.13366 in
Final water content =	20.27%	LL=	35 %
Final dry unit weight =	113.30 pcf	PL=	17 %
Final void ratio =	0.531	% Sand=	16.6 %
Final degree of saturation =	100.00%	% Silt=	51.4 %
Estimated specific gravity =	2.78	% Clay=	28.8 %
		In-Situ Vertical Effective Stress =	2100 psf

Compression and Swelling Indices

	Compres	ssion and Sw	eming malces					
	Compressio	n index $C_c =$	0.208			Prec	onsolidation	pressure,s _o
	Field co	prrected $C_c =$	0.240			Casagrand	e Method =	3292
	Swellin	index $C_s =$	0.038		Over-Consol	idation Rati	io (OCR) =	1.57
Load number	Vertical stress	Dial reading	System deflection	Vertical strain	Void ratio	C_v	Cae	Elapsed time
	psf	in	in	%		ft²/day	%	min
1	100.0	0.01159	0.00010	0.17	0.744	N/A	N/A	1440
2	200.0	0.01313	0.00023	0.34	0.741	0.1560	0.08	1140
3	500.0	0.01977	0.00058	1.03	0.729	0.1392	0.10	1440
4	1000.0	0.02748	0.00090	1.84	0.715	0.1326	0.08	1380
5	2000.0	0.03883	0.00135	3.01	0.694	0.1464	0.17	1320
6	4000.0	0.06033	0.00193	5.22	0.656	0.1196	0.33	960
7	8000.0	0.08974	0.00253	8.22	0.603	0.0960	0.39	1440
8	16000.0	0.12525	0.00324	11.84	0.540	0.1022	0.43	1440
9	32000.0	0.15997	0.00413	15.39	0.478	0.1600	0.42	1440
10	8000.0	0.15965	0.00295	15.24	0.481	N/A	N/A	480
11	2000.0	0.14762	0.00198	13.95	0.503	N/A	N/A	2820

Prepared by: _____ Date: _____

12.64

Checked by: _____

0.13528

11

500.0

Date: _____

N/A

N/A

1440

0.526



0.00123



Sample 02-RWB-06ST, ST#2, 18' to 20' Experiment 0.80 ٠ 0.78 — — — Swelling line 0.76 ٠ ٠ - · - · VCL 0.74 0.72 Casagrande Preconsolidation ٠ 0.70 Field Correction 0.68 0.66 0.64 • 0.62 **Void ratio** 0.60 **0.58** • 0.56 • 0.54 0.52 • 0.50 0.48 • 0.46 0.44 • 0.42 0.40 100 1000 10000 100000 Vertical stress (psf)







CONSOLIDATION COEFFICIENT (Cv) vs. VERTICAL STRESS Sample 02-RWB-06ST, ST#2, 18' to 20' 0.18 0.16 0.14 0.12 C_v (ff²/day) 80'0 (ff²/day) 0.06 0.04 0.02 0.00 100 1000 10000 100000 Vertical stress (tsf)





ONE-DIMENSIONAL CONSOLIDATION TEST AASHTO T 216 / ASTM D 2435

Project: Circle Interch Client: AECOM Soil Sample ID: Boring 1705-B	0	Tested by: M. Snider Prepared by: M. Snider Test date: 7/30/2013	
Sample Description: Gray LEAN C	, ,		
Initial sample height =	0.997 in	Ring diameter =	2.496 in
Initial sample mass =	160.54 g	Ring mass =	109.55 g
Initial water content =	25.63%	Initial sample and ring mass =	270.09 g
Initial dry unit weight =	99.81 pcf	Tare mass =	13.58 g
Initial void ratio =	0.738	Final ring and sample mass =	262.68 g
Initial degree of saturation =	96.54%	Mass of wet sample and tare =	166.60 g
		Mass of dry sample and tare =	141.37 g
Final sample mass =	153.02 g	Initial dial reading =	0.01000 in
Final dry sample mass =	127.79 g	Final dial reading =	0.12368 in
Final water content =	19.74%	LL=	33 %
Final dry unit weight =	112.66 pcf	PL=	17 %
Final void ratio =	0.540	% Sand=	13.8 %
Final degree of saturation =	100.00%	% Silt=	49.3 %
Estimated specific gravity =	2.78	% Clay=	33.9 %
		In-Situ Vertical Effective Stress =	2500 psf

Compression and Swelling Indices

-	-	
Compression index $C_c =$	0.192	
Field corrected $C_c =$	0.223	
Swelling index $C_s =$	0.045	

Preconsolidation pressure,s_C

		$\begin{array}{l} \text{orrected } C_c = \\ \text{g index } C_s = \end{array}$	0.223 0.045		Over-Consol	Casagrande idation Rati		2886 p 1.15
Load number	Vertical stress	Dial reading	System deflection	Vertical strain	Void ratio	C _v	Cae	Elapsed time
	psf	in	in	%		ft²/day	%	min
1	100.0	0.01019	0.00010	0.03	0.738	N/A	N/A	1440
2	200.0	0.01167	0.00023	0.19	0.735	0.1311	0.06	1140
3	500.0	0.01742	0.00058	0.80	0.724	0.1012	0.07	1440
4	1000.0	0.02494	0.00090	1.59	0.710	0.1030	0.09	1380
5	2000.0	0.03802	0.00135	2.95	0.687	0.1213	0.18	1350
6	4000.0	0.06526	0.00193	5.74	0.638	0.1031	0.37	960
7	8000.0	0.09293	0.00253	8.57	0.589	0.1018	0.36	1440
8	16000.0	0.12371	0.00324	11.73	0.534	0.1184	0.38	1440
9	32000.0	0.15605	0.00413	15.06	0.476	0.1519	0.39	1440
10	8000.0	0.15508	0.00295	14.85	0.480	N/A	N/A	480
11	2000.0	0.14033	0.00198	13.27	0.507	N/A	N/A	2820
11	500.0	0.12566	0.00123	11.72	0.534	N/A	N/A	1440

Prepared by:	Date:
--------------	-------

Checked by: _____ Date: _____













Sample 1705-B05A, ST#3, 25' to 27' 0.16 0.14 0.12 0.10 C_v (ft²/day) 0.08 0.06 0.04 0.02 0.00 100 1000 10000 100000 Vertical stress (tsf)



CONSOLIDATION COEFFICIENT (Cv) vs. VERTICAL STRESS



ONE-DIMENSIONAL CONSOLIDATION TEST AASHTO T 216 / ASTM D 2435

Project: Circle Interch Client: AECOM Soil Sample ID: Boring 08-ST-	C	Tested by: M. Snider Prepared by: M. Snider Test date: 1/8/2015	
Sample Description: Gray CLAY v		WEI: 1100-04-01	
Initial sample height =	1.002 in	Ring diameter =	2.495 in
Initial sample mass =	163.22 g	Ring mass =	109.57 g
Initial water content =	25.37%	Initial sample and ring mass =	272.79 g
Initial dry unit weight =	101.26 pcf	Tare mass =	71.58 g
Initial void ratio =	0.713	Final ring and sample mass =	267.91 g
Initial degree of saturation =	98.90%	Mass of wet sample and tare =	229.44 g
		Mass of dry sample and tare =	201.77 g
Final sample mass =	157.86 g	Initial dial reading =	0.01000 in
Final dry sample mass =	130.19 g	Final dial reading =	0.10757 in
Final water content =	21.25%	LL=	n.a. %
Final dry unit weight =	112.18 pcf	PL=	n.a. %
Final void ratio =	0.546	% Sand=	n.a. %
Final degree of saturation =	100.00%	% Silt=	n.a. %
Estimated specific gravity =	2.78	% Clay=	n.a. %
		In-Situ Vertical Effective Stress =	3400 psf
Compression and Swel	ling Indians		

Compression and Swelling Indices Compression index C_c = 0.182 Preconsolidation pressure,s_C Field corrected $C_c =$ 0.219 Casagrande Method = 3586 psf Swelling index $C_s =$ 0.051 Over-Consolidation Ratio (OCR) = 1.05 Load Dial Vertical Vertical System Elapsed Void ratio C_v Cae deflection number stress reading strain time ft²/day % % psf min in in N/A 0.00988 0.00010 0.00 0.713 N/A 1 100.0 1245 2 0.01152 0.0635 200.0 0.00023 0.17 0.710 0.07 2775 3 500.0 0.01982 0.00058 1.04 0.695 0.0811 0.10 1788 4 1000.0 0.02901 0.00090 1.99 0.679 0.0809 0.10 1410 5 2000.0 0.04280 0.00135 3.41 0.655 0.0851 0.16 1440 6 4000.0 0.06159 0.00193 5.34 0.0814 0.26 1344 0.622 7 8000.0 0.08722 0.00253 7.96 0.577 0.0889 0.32 3270 8 16000.0 0.11708 0.00324 11.01 0.525 0.0832 0.43 1944 9 32000.0 0.14821 0.00413 14.21 0.470 0.1154 0.37 1440 10 8000.0 0.14412 0.00295 13.68 0.479 N/AN/A 1440

Prepared by: _____ Date: _____

11.90

10.08

Checked by: _____

0.12727

0.10982

11

11

2000.0

500.0

Date: _____

N/A

N/A

N/A

N/A

1440

3240

0.509

0.540



0.00198

0.00123









Sample 08-ST-01, ST#11, 39' to 41' 0.14 0.12 0.10 0.08 C_v (ft²/day) 0.06 0.04 0.02 0.00 100 1000 10000 100000 Vertical stress (tsf)

CONSOLIDATION COEFFICIENT (Cv) vs. VERTICAL STRESS

AASHTO R18



APPENDIX C



0

120

3900

6

V Stiff to Hard SI CL to SI CL LOAM

FOR AECOM

1100-04-01





APPENDIX D



HIGHWAY CLASSIFICATION

Ramp SE Functional Class: Interstate ADTT: 123 (2012); 134 (2040) DHV: 440 (2040) Design Speed: 25 m.p.h. Posted Speed: 25 m.p.h. One-Way Traffic Directional Distribution: 100%

CURVE DATA

(Ramp SE) P-CIR-SE-2 P.I. Sta. = 1415+83.08 ⊿ = 157°44′18″ (LT) $D = 24^{\circ}48'12''$ R = 231.00' $T = 1174.08^{\circ}$ L = 635.96 $E = 965.59^{\circ}$ e = 5.6% T.R. = NAS.E. Run = 128 P.C. Sta. = 1404+09.00 P.T. Sta. = 1410+44.95

CURVE DATA

(Ramp NW) P-CIR-NW-6 P.I. Sta. = 1831+44.22 ⊿ = 88°30′25″ (LT) $D = 10^{\circ}36'37''$ $R = 540.00^{\circ}$ T = 526.11' L = 834.16E = 213.92 e = 5.4% T.R. = NAS.E. Run = 66'P.C. Sta. = 1826+18.11 P.T. Sta. = 1834+52.27

Ramp NW Functional Class: Interstate ADT: 4.600 (2010); 5.000 (2040) ADT: 32.500 (2012); 36.000 (2040) ADTT: 2,483 (2012); 2,750 (2040) DHV: 2,790 (2040) Design Speed: 35 m.p.h. Posted Speed: 35 m.p.h. One-Way Traffic Directional Distribution: 100%

DESIGN SPECIFICATIONS

2014 AASHTO LRFD Bridge Design Specifications 7th Edition with 2015 and 2016 Interim Specifications

DESIGN STRESSES FIELD UNITS

f'c = 3.500 psi fy = 60,000 psi (Reinforcement)

PRECAST UNITS

Ø

•

f'c = 4,500 psi

LEGEND

Electric

Exist. Storm Sewer

Light Pole

Soil Boring

Limits of Soil Reinforcement

Limits of Soil Reinforcement With Ground Improvements

Range 14E, 3rd P.M. Proposed Structure

LOCATION SKETCH

GENERAL PLAN RETAINING WALL 48 ALONG F.A.I. 94 (I-90/94 SB TO I-290 EB) SECTION 2014-013 R&B-R COOK COUNTY STATION 1403+78.00 TO STATION 1404+89.01 STRUCTURE NO. 016-1835

	F.A.I. RTE.	SECTION	COUNTY	TOTAL SHEETS	SHEET NO.
	90/94/290	2014-013 R&B-R	СООК	2	1
			CONTRACT	NO.	60X93
2 SHEETS		ILLINOIS FED. AI	D PROJECT		



TADLE I WALL ELEVATIONS											
Station	Offset	Elevation A	Elevation B	Elevation C	Elevation D	Elevation E	Elevation F				
1403+78.00	6.16′ Rt.	599 . 12	595.75	594.00	595.97	595.75	592.25				
1404+00.00	5.57′ Rt.	600.76	597.38	595.63	592.35	589.77	586.27				
1404 + 15.13	5.25' Rt.	601.88	598.50	596.75	591 . 19	585.92	582.42				
1404+25.00	5.25' Rt.	602.62	599.24	597.49	590.82	585.06	581.56				
1404+50.70	5.25' Rt.	604.54	601.16	599.41	586.80	583.57	580.07				
1404 + 70.00	5.17′ Rt.	605.97	602.60	600.85	584.47	582.44	578.94				
1404 + 75.00	5.42′ Rt.	606.33	602.96	601.21	583.94	582.15	578.65				
1404 + 79.70	5.75' Rt.	606.66	603.28	601.53	583.40	581.88	578.38				
1404+81.07	5.75′ Rt.	606.75	603.38	601.63	583.24	581.80	578.30				
1404+89.01	5.75′ Rt.	-	597.32	595.57	582.11	581.34	577.84				
1404+89.01	23.75' Lt.	-	595.87	594.12	583.35	582.97	579.47				
1404+80.66	23.75' Lt.	605.27	601.89	600.14	583.42	583.86	580.36				
1404 + 79.08	23.75' Lt.	605.16	601.78	600.03	583.43	584.03	580.53				
1404 + 75.00	23.87' Lt.	604.88	601.50	599.75	584.42	584.47	580.97				
1404 + 70.00	23.93' Lt.	604.52	601.14	599.39	583.61	585.01	581.51				
1404+50.70	23.25' Lt.	603.28	599.90	598 . 15	586.35	587.08	583.58				
1404+25.00	23.25' Lt.	601.65	598.27	596.52	589.64	589.85	586.35				
1404 + 12.12	23.25' Lt.	600.83	597.45	595.70	590.55	591.23	587.73				
1404+00.00	23.11' Lt.	600.06	596.69	594.94	591.47	592.64	589.14				
1403+78.00	22.81' Lt.	598.65	595.28	593.53	592.59	595.28	591.78				

Elevation A - Top of Parapet Elevation B- Top of Coping Elevation D- Existing Grade at F.F. of Wall Elevation E- Finished Grade at F.F. of Wall Elevation F- Theoretical Top of Leveling Pad



1. Direction of slope referenced from right edge of pavement. Slope Transition (0.00% to -5.60%) Sta. 1403+38.82 to Sta. 1404+68.00 Constant Cross Slope (-5.60%) Sta. 1404+68.00 to Sta. 1409+90.00

≷L										
٦		USER NAME = jrmickens	DESIGNED - WJC	REVISED -			F.A.I.	SECTION	COUNTY	TOTAL SHEET SHEETS NO.
• Tran Systems	Tron Svotomo		CHECKED - MDS/JNP	REVISED -	STATE OF ILLINOIS DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION			2014-013 R&B-R	соок	2 2
	JUCIU OYSIEIIIS >	PLOT SCALE = 6.0000 ' / in.	DRAWN - WJC	REVISED -					CONTRACT	NO. 60X93
		PLOT DATE = 8/15/2017	CHECKED - MDS/JNP	REVISED -		SHEET NO. 2 OF 2 SHEETS	ILLINOIS FED. AID PROJECT			

TABLE 1 - WALL FLEVATIONS

Elevation C- Bottom of Coping / Top of Exposed Panel Line



PROFILE GRADE (Along ₿ Ramp NW)

CROSS SECTION & DETAILS RETAINING WALL 48 ALONG F.A.I. 94 (I-90/94 SB TO I-290 EB) SECTION 2014-013 R&B-R COOK COUNTY STATION 1403+78.00 TO STATION 1404+89.01 STRUCTURE NO. 016-1835