STRUCTURE GEOTECHNICAL REPORT CULVERT AT STATION 310+50 IL ROUTE 176 EAST OVER UNNAMED CREEK PR SN 056-0110 MCHENRY COUNTY, ILLINOIS

> For Strand Associates, Inc. 1170 South Houbolt Road Joliet, IL 60432

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

> Original Report: May 17, 2023 Revised Report: NA

1. Title and Subtitle	2. Original Date: May 17, 2023					
Structure Geotechnical Rep	Revised Date: NA					
Illinois Route 176 East over	Unnamed Creek	3. Report Type SGR RGR				
		Draft 🖾 Final 🗌 Revised				
4. Route / Section / County		5. IDOT Contract				
FAP 326 (IL 176E)/ 105-N	-2(15) / McHenry	62B43				
6. PSB / Item No.	7. Existing Structure Number(s)	8. Proposed Structure Number(s)				
14-3/003	NA	SN 056-0110				
0 Deveryone di har		Constant.				
9. Prepared by	Contributor(s)	Contact				
Wang Engineering, Inc.	Author: Nesam S. Balakumaran, PEng	(630) 953-9928 ext. 1025				
1145 N Main Street	QA/QC: Corina T. Farez, PG, PE	<u>akurnia@wangeng.com</u>				
Lombard, IL 60148	PM: Liviu Iordache, PG					
10. Prepared for	Contact(s)	Contact Information				
Strand Associates, Inc.	Marc Grigas, PE	(815)744-4200				
1170 South Houbolt Rd		Marc.Grigas@strand.com				
Joliet, IL, 60431						
11. Abstract						
The existing 3-foot wide	e by 3-foot tall, concrete box culvert ca	rrying Illinois Route 176 East over				
unnamed creek will be re	moved and replaced with a longer, 8-foot	wide by 4-foot tall box culvert. The				
proposed culvert will be	132.8-foot long and will have horizontal w	vingwalls at both ends. The proposed				

**Technical Report Documentation Page** 

Beneath topsoil, the general lithologic profile includes 3 to 11 feet of medium stiff to very stiff clay and silty clay loam fill over up to 8 feet of soft to medium stiff clay to silty clay loam with organic matter and peat followed by stiff to very stiff silty clay to silty clay loam and clay loam. The groundwater was observed at elevations ranging from 894 to 911 feet during drilling and was measured at elevations ranging from 883 to 993 feet upon completion of drilling.

culvert will have upstream and downstream invert elevations of 908.92 and 908.76 feet, respectively.

At the culvert base elevations, soft to medium stiff clay to silty clay with organic matter and peat are expected. We recommend removing these soils to elevations 905 to 902 feet and replacing with granular aggregate. Prior to placement of granular fill, we recommend installing fabric for ground stabilization. Following the recommended removal and replacement, we estimate long-term settlement of 0.2 to 0.5 inches with a differential settlement of about 0.3 inches. As an alternative to removal and replacement, aggregate columns can be considered for subgrade improvements

We recommend the culvert barrel and wingwalls be designed for a maximum factored bearing resistance of 4,000 psf. Global stability analyses of the wingwalls show factors of safety meeting the minimum requirement of 1.5.

To accommodate stage construction, the sheet piling and temporary geotextile wall are shown on GPE. We estimate a temporary steel sheet piling according to IDOT Design Guide 3.13.1 is feasible. Temporary geotextile wall should be designed in accordance with IDOT Standard specifications.

#### 12. Path to archived file

N:\\_WANGLegacy\SHARED\Netprojects\1951302\Reports\Culvert\SN 056-

0110\V02\RPT\_Wang\_NSB\_1951302\_CulSN056\_0110\_V02\_20230517.doc

Geotechnical · Construction · Environmental Quality Engineering Services Since 1982



### TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0	INTRODUCTION	1
1.1	PROPOSED STRUCTURE	
1.2	Existing Structure and Land Use	
2.0	GEOLOGICAL SETTING	2
2.1	Physiography	
2.2	SUFICIAL COVER	
2.3	Bedrock	
3.0	METHODS OF INVESTIGATION	
3.1	Field Investigation	
3.2	LABORATORY TESTING	
4.0	INVESTIGATION RESULTS	5
4.1	LITHOLOGICAL PROFILE	
4.2	GROUNDWATER CONDITIONS	
5.0	FOUNDATION ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	6
5.1	SCOUR CONSIDERATIONS	6
5.2	GROUND IMPROVEMENT	7
5.3	BEARING CAPACITY	
5.4	Settlement	
5.5	GLOBAL STABILITY	
5.6	CAST-IN-PLACE OR PRECAST CULVERT CONSIDERATIONS	
5.7	STAGED CONSTRUCTION CONSIDERATIONS	9
6.0	CONSTRUCTION CONSIDERATIONS	9
6.1	SITE PREPARATION	9
6.2	EXCAVATION, DEWATERING, AND UTILITIES	9
6.3	FILLING AND BACKFILLING	10
6.4	EARTHWORK OPERATIONS	10
7.0	QUALIFICATIONS	
REF	FERENCES	



#### **EXHIBITS**

- 1. SITE LOCATION MAP
- 2. SITE AND REGIONAL GEOLOGY
- 3. BORING LOCATION PLAN
- 4. Soil Profile

#### APPENDIX A

BORING LOGS

#### APPENDIX B

LABORATORY TEST RESULTS

#### APPENDIX C

GLOBAL STABILITY ANALYSIS

#### APPENDIX D

GENERAL PLAN AND ELEVATION SHEETS

#### LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Summary of Consolidation Testing	6	5
---	---	---



### STRUCTURE GEOTECHNICAL REPORT CULVERT AT STATION 310+50 IL ROUTE 176 EAST OVER UNNAMED CREEK PR SN 056-0110 MCHENRY COUNTY, ILLINOIS FOR STRAND ASSOCIATES, INC.

### **1.0 INTRODUCTION**

This report presents the results of our subsurface investigation, laboratory testing, and geotechnical evaluations to support the removal and replacement of a culvert carrying Illinois Route 176 East (IL 176 E) over an unnamed Creek at Station 310+50 that is about 600 feet east of the intersection between IL 176 E and IL Route 47 (IL 47). The proposed structure replacement is part of the widening and reconstruction of 1.65-mile long of IL 47 between Station 565+80 and Station 660+92 in McHenry County, Illinois. A *Site Location Map* is presented as Exhibit 1.

#### 1.1 Proposed Structure

Based on the *General Plan and Elevation* (GPE) dated in August, 2020 provided by Strand Associates, Inc. (Strand), Wang Engineering, Inc. (Wang) understands the existing 3-foot wide by 3-foot tall culvert will be removed and replaced with a 8-foot wide by 4-foot tall culvert. The proposed culvert will be 132.8-foot long, which is about 68 feet longer than the existing one. The proposed culvert will have the upstream invert elevation at 908.92 feet and the downstream invert elevation at 908.76 feet; with flow directed from north to south. The proposed culvert will have horizontal wingwalls at both the upstream and downstream ends. The roadway will be widened at both sides and the traffic will be maintained in two construction stages.

### 1.2 Existing Structure and Land Use

The existing 3-foot wide by 3-foot-tall concrete box culvert has a total length of 65 feet. The land use of the surrounding area consists of a golf course on the south side and wooden area on the north side.

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 culvert and wingwalls.

Geotechnical · Construction · Environmental Quality Engineering Services Since 1982



### 2.0 GEOLOGICAL SETTING

The project area is located in Dorr Townships, McHenry County, Illinois. On the USGS *Huntley* 7.5 *Minute Series Quadrangle* map, the culvert is located in the SE <sup>1</sup>/<sub>4</sub> of Section 33, Tier 44 N, Range 7 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 subsurface investigation results. For the study of the regional geologic framework, Wang considered northeastern Illinois in general and McHenry County in particular. Exhibit 2 illustrates the Site and Regional Geology.

#### 2.1 Physiography

The Wheaton Morainal Country Physiographic Subsection (Leighton et al. 1948) dominates the eastern two thirds of McHenry County. The culvert is located along the former outwash valleys carved by glacial meltwater through the Barlina Moraine. The morainic surface is marked by kettle depressions left behind by ice blocks that were, in time, filled with lacustrine and organic sediments giving the topography a hummocky look.

In general, the relief within the project area is flat and occasionally hummocky. The culvert is at IL 176 East crossing over an unnamed creek tributary to Kishwakee River. About 1000 yards south of the project, the Kishwaukee River. The existing surface elevation is about 920 feet.

### 2.2 Surficial Cover

The project area was shaped during the Wisconsin-age glaciation and about 190-foot thick overburden covers the bedrock. The glacigenic deposits were emplaced during pulsating advances and retreats of an icesheet lobe responsible for the formation of end moraines and associated low-relief till and lake plains (Hansel and Johnson 1996). The surficial cover within the project area consists of organic silt and clay, peat, and marl of the Grayslake Peat, found discontinuously throughout the project area. The Grayslake Peat overlies either the clay and silt of the Equality Formation, or the silty clayey diamicton of the Yorkville Member of the Lemont Formation, which in turn overlies the loamy diamicton of the Tiskilwa Formation or gravelly sand outwash of the Henry Formation that interfinger with the two diamictons.



The Grayslake Peat, less than 10-foot thick, consists of black to brown peat interbedded with gray organic rich sand and silty clay and white to light gray marl (Curry and Thomason 2012, Flaherty et al. 2013). The Equality Formation, less than 15-foot thick, consists of brown to gray, bedded fine sand, silt, and clay lacustrine deposits (Curry and Thomason 2012). The Henry Formation consists of stratified sand and gravel outwash with thicknesses of about 2 feet, within the project limits to about 100 feet (Curry and Thomason 2012). The Yorkville Member of the Lemont Formation, up to 30-foot thick, consists of yellowish brown to gray silty clay to silty clay loam diamicton that contains lenses of gravel, sand, silt, and clay (Hansel and Johnson 1996, Curry and Thomason 2012). The Tiskilwa Formation, about 110-foot thick, consists of calcareous reddish brown to gray clay loam, loam to sandy loam diamicton that contains lenses of gavel, sand, silt, and clay (Wickham et al. 1988, Curry and Thomason 2012). The Tiskilwa Formation diamicton rests over the Illinoian-age drift, which in turn unconformably rests over the Solurian-age dolostone (Curry and Thomason 2012). The diamicton accounts for about 90% of the soil profile.

From a geotechnical viewpoint, the Yorkville Member characterized by low to moderate plasticity, high strength, and low to moderate moisture content and the Tiskilwa Formation characterized by low plasticity, medium to high strength, low moisture content, moderately to highly pebbly (Wickham et al. 1988, Bauer et al. 1991).

### 2.3 Bedrock

In McHenry County, the surficial cover rests unconformably on top of Silurian-age and Ordovician-age bedrock. The top of the bedrock lies about 190 feet below the ground surface (bgs). Structurally, the site is located on the eastern flank of the Wisconsin Arch (Willman 1971). No active faults or underground mines are known in the area.

Our subsurface investigation results fit into the local geologic context. The borings drilled in the project area encountered native sediments consisting of lacustrine clay and silt of the Equality Formation, silty clay diamicton of the Yorkville Member of the Lemont Formation and loamy diamicton of the Tiskilwa Formation. None of the borings were deep enough to encounter bedrock.



### 3.0 METHODS OF INVESTIGATION

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

#### 3.1 Field Investigation

The subsurface investigation consisted of three structure borings, designated as CUL-10 through CUL-12, and one peat delineation boring, designated as PT10-01. The borings were drilled by Wang from June 24 to July 13, 2020 and were advanced to depths of 15 to 35 feet bgs. In addition, Borings PT9-05, SGB-21, and shelby tube boring SGB-21ST drilled in 2017 by Wang were included in our analysis.

The as-drilled northings and eastings were acquired with a mapping-grade GPS unit; boring elevations were surveyed with a level. Stations and offsets were determined from drawings provided by Strand. 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).

Truck- and ATV- mounted drilling rigs, equipped with hollow stem augers, were used to advance and maintain open boreholes. 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 below ground surface (bgs) and at 5-foot intervals, thereafter. Peat delineation borings were sampled continuously or at 2.5-foot intervals. Soil samples collected from each sampling interval were placed in sealed jars and transported to the laboratory for further examination and laboratory testing.

Field boring logs, prepared and maintained by Wang geologists, include lithological descriptions, visual-manual soil classifications (IDH Textural), results of Rimac and pocket penetrometer unconfined compressive strength testing on cohesive soils, and results of Standard Penetration Tests (SPT) recorded as blows per 6 inches of penetration.

Groundwater observations were made during and at the end of drilling operations. Due to safety considerations, boreholes were backfilled immediately upon completion with soil cuttings and/or chips. The pavement surface was restored to its original condition.

### 3.2 Laboratory Testing

The soil samples were tested in the laboratory for moisture content (AASHTO T265). Atterberg limits (AASHTO T89/T90) and particle size (AASHTO T88) analyses were performed on selected samples.



A one-dimensional consolidation test (AASHTO T216) was performed on a shelby tube sample. Field visual descriptions of the soil samples were verified in the laboratory and index tested samples were classified according to the IDH Soil Classification System. Laboratory test results are shown in the *Boring Logs* (Appendix A) and in the *Laboratory Test Results* (Appendix B).

### 4.0 INVESTIGATION RESULTS

Detailed descriptions of the soil conditions encountered during the subsurface investigation are presented in the attached *Boring Logs* (Appendix A) and in the *Soil Profile* (Exhibit 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 Lithological Profile

The borings encountered 3 to 20 inches of silty clay loam topsoil at the surface. Boring CUL-11 encountered 2 inches of loam at the surface. In descending order, the general lithologic succession encountered beneath the surface includes: 1) man-made ground (fill); 2) soft to medium stiff organic clay to silty clay; and 3) stiff to very stiff silty clay to silty clay loam and clay loam.

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

Beneath the topsoil, borings revealed 3 to 11 feet of fill material. The fill material is cohesive, consisting of medium stiff to very stiff, brown to gray clay loam and silty clay loam. The fill has unconfined compressive strength ( $Q_u$ ) values of 0.3 and 2.2 tsf and the moisture content values of 12 to 27%. Laboratory index testing on sample from this layer shows a liquid limit ( $L_L$ ) value of 34% and a plastic limit ( $P_L$ ) value of 15%. Below the fill, Borings CUL-11 and CUL-12 encountered 0.7 to 2.5 feet of buried silty clay loam topsoil.

### 2) Soft to medium stiff organic clay to silty clay

Beneath the fill and topsoil, at elevations of 898 to 910 feet (1.5 to 10.5 feet bgs), the borings encountered 3 to 8 feet of soft to medium stiff, brown to gray clay to silty clay with organic matter, organic silty loam, and peat. The unit has  $Q_u$  values of 0.16 to 0.9 tsf and moisture content values of 21 to 164%. Laboratory index testing on samples from this layer shows  $L_L$  values of 24 to 74% and  $P_L$  values of 13 to 40%. Laboratory tests show 14.5 and 15.0% of organic content. The consolidation properties of this very soft to soft organic silty loam were obtained and are summarized in Table 1.



	Table 1: Summary of Consolidation Testing							
	Test	Test					Moisture	
Boring ID	Depth	Elevation	Cc	Cs	eo	OCR/ $P_c$	Content	
	(feet)	(feet)				(psf)	(%)	
SGB-21ST	14 to 16	903	1.038	0.146	2.251	1.16/1391	73	

T 11

 $C_{\rm C}$ : Compression index;  $C_{\rm S}$ : Swelling index;  $e_0$ : Initial void ratio; OCR: Over consolidation ratio; and

P'c: Preconsolidation pressure.

#### 3) Stiff to very stiff silty clay to silty clay loam and clay loam

At elevations of 899 to 911 feet (1.3 to 18.5 feet bgs), the borings encountered gray and brown to gray, stiff to very stiff silty clay to silty clay loam and clay loam with wet to saturated sand and loam interbeds. The unit has Q<sub>u</sub> values of 1.1 to 3.5 tsf and moisture content values of 9 to 18%.

#### 4.2 **Groundwater Conditions**

Groundwater was observed while drilling at elevations of 894 to 904 feet (13 to 19 feet bgs) and at an elevation of 911 feet (at the surface) in Boring PT10-01. At completion of drilling, the groundwater was measured at elevations of 883 to 893 feet (20 to 31 feet bgs). As per the GPE, at the unnamed creek culvert, the Estimated Water Surface Elevation (EWSE) is 910.02 feet.

#### FOUNDATION ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 5.0

Geotechnical evaluations and recommendations for the culvert and wingwalls are included in the following sections. The proposed culvert will have upstream and downstream invert elevations of 908.92 and 908.76 feet, respectively. Horizontal wingwalls are proposed at both ends of the culvert.

Wang has performed bearing capacity, settlement, and global stability analyses for the proposed culvert barrel and wingwalls.

#### 5.1 **Scour Considerations**

The design scour elevation should be taken at the bottom of the cutoff wall (IDOT 2012). At the horizontal cantilever wingwalls, the cutoff walls are established at 3.0 feet below the culvert invert elevations; whereas for T-type wingwalls, the cutoff walls are established at 4.0 feet below the invert elevations. To prevent local erosion, we recommend placing stone riprap or a concrete apron at the ends of the culvert; this will be particularly important if precast sections are used. This will also



prevent sediments from entering and accumulating in the culvert, minimize long term maintenance, and provide protection to the stream bed at the interface.

### 5.2 Ground Improvement

The subsurface investigation indicates the soils along the culvert base are primarily very soft to medium stiff clay to silty clay, and silty clay loam with organic matter. To mitigate settlement issues and to provide stable working platforms, Wang recommends removal and replacement of very soft to medium stiff soil along the proposed culvert barrel and wingwalls. The recommended removal limit and depth are:

- From the downstream end of the culvert going 66 feet upstream, for a depth of 5.6 feet below the proposed bottom of the culvert or to elevation 902 feet; and
- From 66 feet of downstream to upstream end, for a depth of 2.5 feet below the proposed bottom of the culvert or to elevation 905 feet.

Please note that Boring SGB-21, located about 50 feet from the culvert centerline, shows deeper soft soil to elevation 899 feet. The contractor should be prepared for deeper removal limits.

The removal and replacement material should extend a minimum of two feet beyond each side of the box (IDOT 2016). Prior to placement of replacement material, we recommend installing fabric for ground stabilization in accordance with IDOT Section 210 (IDOT 2016). In addition, the following note should be shown in the plans.

"The limits and quantities of removal and replacement shown are based on the boring data may be modified by the District Geotechnical and Field Engineers for variable subsurface conditions encountered in the field"

Based on information we received in October 2022; we understand that aggregate column is the preferred ground improvement method for the roadway section of IL 47. Therefore, as an alternative to removal and replacement, aggregate columns can be considered for subgrade improvements for the culvert. The soil within the limits as shown above could be improved by the installation of aggregate (stone) columns.



### 5.3 Bearing Capacity

Following the recommended removal and replacement, the walls should be designed based on a maximum factored bearing resistance of 4,000 psf, determined with a bearing resistance factor ( $\phi_b$ ) of 0.45 (AASHTO 2016). The wingwalls should be sized and designed based on the information and typical sections shown in IDOT *Culvert Manual*, Sections 4.3 and 4.4 (IDOT 2017).

The culvert wingwalls could also be constructed as horizontal cantilever walls if they are less than 16 feet in length and the wingwall location can be adequately dewatered (IDOT 2017). Horizontal cantilever walls should be designed based on the structural guidelines provided in Section 4.2 of the IDOT (2017). These wingwalls should be founded at a minimum depth of 3.0 feet below the culvert invert elevations.

The wingwalls types suitable for precast concrete culvert include apron, driven sheet pile and cast-inplace T-type wingwalls. For the cast-in-place culvert, the horizontal cantilever, L-type or T-type wingwalls are typically considered. The apron wingwalls should be designed and constructed based on IDOT Specifications and IDOT Base Sheet dated 2/17/2017 "SCB-GPE."

### 5.4 Settlement

As discussed in Section 5.2, very soft to medium stiff soil clay to silty clay and silty clay loam with organic matter will be encountered below the base of proposed culvert. Without removal and replacement, we estimate approximately 7 inches of settlement under the new culvert and fill loads at the widening portions. After the proposed removal and replacement, we estimate the foundation soils will experience total long-term settlements of about 0.2 to 0.5 inches, with differential settlement of 0.3 inches. We estimate the settlements are acceptable for the construction of the proposed culvert and wingwalls.

### 5.5 Global Stability

We performed global stability of the wingwalls for the maximum wingwall height of 6 feet and weakest soil conditions encountered in downstream end in Borings CUL-12 and PT10-01. *Slide v6.0* evaluation exhibits employing the Bishop Simplified method of analysis are shown in Appendix C. We estimate the wingwall has a minimum factor of safety (FOS) of 2.43 for undrained soil condition and a minimum FOS of 1.82 for drained soil condition. The FOSs meet the minimum FOS requirement of 1.5 (IDOT 2015).



#### 5.6 Cast-In-Place or Precast Culvert Considerations

After the recommended removal of unsuitable soil, the results of the analyses indicate that both the cast-in-place and precast culvert options are appropriate and feasible at the site. The differential settlement will be about 0.3 inches, which will not cause excessive separation of the precast sections. For precast end sections, we recommend considering either a concrete apron or riprap armoring at the downstream invert to protect against scour and erosion that could undermine the precast end section assuming a hydraulic analysis does not indicate a low-scour condition.

#### 5.7 Stage Construction Considerations

Based on the GPE, Wang understands temporary sheet piling system and temporary geotextile retaining wall will be utilized to accommodate stage construction. The sheet piling should be designed based on IDOT *Design Guide 3.13.1*. Assuming an exposed height of about 17 feet (from elevation 919 to 902 feet) located at the stage construction line, our evaluations indicate the temporary steel sheet piling is feasible. To accommodate stage construction, the geotextile wall show in the GPE should be designed based on IDOT Section 522.11 (IDOT 2016).

### 6.0 CONSTRUCTION CONSIDERATIONS

### 6.1 Site Preparation

The existing culvert will be removed and any vegetation, surface topsoil, pavements, and debris should be cleared and stripped where the new culvert and wingwalls will be placed. If unstable or unsuitable materials are exposed during excavation, they should be removed and replaced with compacted fill material as described in Section 6.3.

### 6.2 Excavation, Dewatering, and Utilities

Excavations should be performed in accordance with local, state, and federal regulations. The potential effect of ground movements upon nearby utilities should be considered during construction. Excavations for the placement of the culvert barrel should be steeped at no steeper than 1:2.5 (V:H). Any slopes that cannot be graded at 1:2 (V: H) should be properly shored with temporary sheeting or soil retention systems. Excavated material should not be stockpiled immediately adjacent to the top of slopes, nor should equipment be allowed to operate too closely to open excavations.

During the subsurface investigation, the groundwater was encountered at elevation ranging from 894 to 911 feet, which are about 4 and 7 feet above the culvert and wingwall base elevations. In addition,



the EWSE is 910.02 feet, which is about 3.3 feet above the culvert base and 5.3 feet above the wingwall. Therefore, we recommend Type I Cofferdam for the construction.

Any water that accumulates in open excavations by seepage or runoff should be immediately removed by sump-pump. Depending upon prevailing climate conditions and the time of the year when culvert construction takes place, control runoff and maintenance of existing flows may require temporary water diversion and control.

#### 6.3 Filling and Backfilling

Fill material used to attain the final design elevations should be IDOT Standard Specifications. Coarse aggregate of IDOT gradation CA-6 or pre-approved, compacted, cohesive or granular soils conforming to Section 204 would be acceptable as fill material (IDOT 2016). The fill material should be free of organic matter and debris and should be placed in lifts and compacted according to IDOT Section 205, *Embankment* (IDOT 2016).

Groundwater may exist beneath the culvert. As mentioned in IDOT Culvert Manual (IDOT 2017), in cases such as replacement below box culvert where dewatering and compaction may not be possible, the pay item "Rockfill" is commonly used. In this case, the following note should be added.

"The Rockfill shall be capped with 6 in. of CA7 and satisfy the Standard Specifications unless otherwise indicated in the Special Provisions. The cost of the capping material shall be included in the pay item for Rockfill."

### 6.4 Earthwork Operations

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

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



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

### 7.0 QUALIFICATIONS

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

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

Respectfully Submitted,

WANG ENGINEERING, INC.

Andri A. Kurnia, P. E. Senior Geotechnical Engineer Corina T. Farez, P.E, P.G. QA/QC Reviewer

Nesam S. Balakumaran, P.Eng. Project Geotechnical Engineer



#### REFERENCES

- AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF STATE HIGHWAY TRANSPORTATION OFFICIALS (2017) "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, 69 p.
- CURRY, B.B., AND J.F. THOMASON, 2012, *Surficial Geology of Huntley Quadrangle, McHenry and Kane Counties, Illinois*: Illinois State Geological Survey, USGS-STATEMAP contract report, 2 sheets, 1:24,000.
- HANSEL, A.K., and JOHNSON, W.H. (1996) Wedron and Mason Groups: Lithostratigraphic Reclassification of the Wisconsin Episode, Lake Michigan Lobe Area: ISGS Bulletin 104.
   Illinois State Geological Survey, Champaign, IL. 116 p.
- IDOT (2012) Bridge Manual. Illinois Department of Transportation.
- IDOT (2015) Geotechnical Manual. Illinois Department of Transportation.
- IDOT (2016) *Standard Specifications for Road and Bridge Construction*. Illinois Department of Transportation. 1098 pp.
- IDOT (2017) Culvert Manual. Illinois Department of Transportation.
- WICKHAM, S.S., W.H. JOHNSON, AND H.D. GLASS (1988) Regional Geology of the Tiskilwa Till Member, Weadron Formation, Northeastern Illinois, Illinois State Geological Survey, Circular 543; Champaignm, IL.
- WILLMAN, H.B., ATHERTON, E., BUSCHBACH, T.C., COLLINSON, C., FRYE, J.C., HOPKINS, M.E., LINEBACK, J.A., and SIMON, J.A., 1971, *Handbook of Illinois Stratigraphy*: ISGS Bulletin 95: Urbana, Illinois State Geological Survey, 261 p.



# **EXHIBITS**

Geotechnical · Construction · Environmental Quality Engineering Services Since 1982





Benchmark: CWA CP #5, dia% tebar Sta. 312+36.71 o/s 29.43 ft left, Elev. 917.84. Existing Structure: Concrete Box Culvert at Sta. 310+25 3 ft W x 3 ft H by approx. 65 ft in length at 0° skew shall be removed.

Traffic Control: Traffic will be maintained in a two stage construction process.



#### **GENERAL NOTES**

The 6 in. thick layer of porous granular material shall be placed below the bottom slab and satisfy Standard







# **APPENDIX A**

Geotechnical · Construction · Environmental Quality Engineering Services Since 1982



### **LEGEND FOR BORING LOG**

<b>Relative Density of Non-</b>
Cohesive Soils

N-Blows/ 12 inches	Relative Density Term
0-3	Very Loose
4-9	Loose
10-29	Medium Dense
30-49	Dense
50-80+	Very Dense

Consistency of Cohesive Soils						
Unconfined Compressive Strength Qu, tsf	Consistency Term					
<0.25	Very Soft					
0.25-0.49	Soft					
0.50-0.99	Medium Stiff					
1.00-1.99	Stiff					
2.00-3.99	Very Stiff					
>4.00	Hard					

Relative Drilling					
	Resistace				
PUP	Drilling Resistance				
NDN	Term				
1	Very Easy				
2	Easy				
3	Moderate				
4	Hard				
5	Very Hard				

<b>Proportional Terms</b>							
Trace	1-9	Pe					
Little	10-19						
Some	20-34	igh Pnt					
And	35-50	<b>~</b> <u>o</u>					

### **Gradation Terminology**

Devildere	5.000mmm				
Boulders	>200mm				
Cobbles	200mm to 75mm				
Gravel	75mm to 2mm				
Sand	2-0mm to				
Sanu	0.074mm				
Silt	0.074mm to 0.002mm				
Clay	<0.002mm				

### Sample Type Symbols



Split Spoon

No Recovery

Geoprobe

Drill Rig:

= Split Spoon

= Shelby Tube

Strength

Rimac test

Rimac test

SSA = Solid Stem Augers,

HSA = Hollow Stem Augers,

SPT = Standard Penetration Test

= Unconfined Compressive

P = Pocket Penetrometer

S = Shear failure of sample,

B = Bulge failure of sample,

SS

ST

Qu

TMR = Truck Mouted Rig ATV = All Terrain Vehicle Rig [--%] = SPT Hammer Efficiency

Rock Core

SPT = Standard Penetration Test N Value is the sum of the second and the third numbers

In-situ Vane Shear Test

Shelby Tube

Auger Cuttings



Geotechnical Construction **Quality Engineering Services Since 1982** 

.



9/15/20 1951302.GPJ WANGENG.GDT



WANGENGINC 1951302.GPJ WANGENG.GDT 9/15/20



WANGENGINC 1951302.GPJ WANGENG.GDT 9/15/20



wangeng@wangeng.com 1145 N. Main Street Lombard/IL/60148 Telephone: 6309539928 Fax: 6309539938	Client . Project Location	·····	<b>B(</b>	ORI WE Stra t IL 17 McH	NG I Job and <i>I</i> 76 an	L( No. Asso d Pl Co	DG F : 195-1 ociates leasan unty, II	PT9-05 13-02 , Inc. t Valley Road linois	Datum: N/ Elevation: North: 203 East: 9610 Station: 3 <sup>7</sup> Offset: 34	AVD 88 911.80 f 2330.80 006.90 ft 10+53.44 .57 LT	t ft	Page	1 of 1
BOIL AND ROCK	Depth ( <b>ft</b> )	Sample Type	Sample No. SPT Values (blw/6 in)	Qu (tsf)	Moisture Content (%)	Profile	Elevation (ft)	SOIL AND ROC DESCRIPTION	Cepth J	Sample Type recovery Sample No.	SPT Values (blw/6 in)	Qu (tsf)	Moisture Content (%)
20-inch thick, medium stiff, brown to black SILTY CLAY LOAM 910.1TOPS Soft to medium stiff, black ar dork grou CLAY to SILTY CL	OIL		1 1 2 2	0.66 B	37								
little to some organic matter; dampRD	R 1		2 2 1 2 1	0.66 B	59								
	5( -	$\bigcirc$	3 1 1 1	NA									
905.1           Stiff, gray SILTY CLAY LOAN      trace gravel; damp     RD	M, –		4 2 3 5	0.25 B	41								
                901.8 Boring terminated at 10.00 ft	_   10 /	$\left  \right\rangle$	3 5 5 8	1.15 B	14								
	-												
	-												
	15 _ _												
	-												
	20												
GENE         Begin Drilling       12-19-2017         Drilling Contractor       Wang Testin         Driller       N&J         Logger       Drilling Method         2.25 IDA HSA; 1	Com Com Ig Servic T. Roth 40 lb au	plete I ces nsch itoha	Drilling Drill R Id Cl	ig D necked ; Bor	12-19 50 A <sup>by</sup> ing b	)-20 TV [ C. N ack	17 88%] larin filled	VVAIL       While Drilling       At Completion of Drilling       Time After Drilling       Depth to Water       The stratification lines rep	INA I I I I I I I I I I I I I	L DA	DRY	у	·····







# **APPENDIX B**

Geotechnical · Construction · Environmental Quality Engineering Services Since 1982



L L L U U 4 ŝ 051202 НО SIZE GRAIN





1951302.GPJ US LAB.GDT ATTERBERG LIMITS IDH



### **Organic Content - Loss On Ignition** ASTM D 2974, Method C

Strand
IL 47
195-13-01
SS
440

Analyst: A. Mohammed Date Received: 12/20/2017 Date Tested: 12/26/17

Sample No./ Depth	SGB-21ST s#3(12-14ft.) middle	SGB-21ST s#3(12-14ft.) bottom	SGB-21ST s#4(14-16ft.)	
Description	Silt	Silty Loam	Silty Loam	
wet soil + tare	76.36	72.05	102.99	
Dry Soil + Tare	58.17	55.36	75.5	
Tare Mass	41.97	36.45	43.38	
w (%)	112	88	86	
Dry Soil + Tare	58.17	55.36	75.5	
Ash+ Tare	54.79	52.52	70.84	
Tare Mass	41.97	36.45	43.38	
Ash Content (%)	79	85	85	
Organic Content (%)	20.9	15.0	14.5	

Prepared by:

Checked by: \_

Date:  $\frac{1 \cdot 16 \cdot 18}{2 / 2 / 2 / 2}$ 

WANG ENGINEERING, INC. 1145 N. Main Street, Lombard, IL 60148



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

Project: Illinois Route	47	Tested by: M. Snider	
Client: Strand Associ	ates, Inc.	Prepared by: M. Snider	
Soil Sample ID: Boring SGB-2	21ST, ST#4, 14 to 16 feet	Test date: 12/21/2017	
Sample Description: Gray ORGAN	NIC SI LOAM	WEI: 195-13-01	
Initial sample height =	0.993 in	Ring diameter =	2.498 in
Initial sample mass =	113.25 g	Ring mass =	109.82 g
Initial water content =	84.78%	Initial sample and ring mass =	223.07 g
Initial dry unit weight =	47.99 pcf	Tare mass =	79.30 g
Initial void ratio =	2.251	Final ring and sample mass =	198.36 g
Initial degree of saturation =	94.16%	Mass of wet sample and tare =	167.70 g
		Mass of dry sample and tare =	140.59 g
Final sample mass =	88.40 g	Initial dial reading =	0.01000 in
Final dry sample mass =	61.29 g	Final dial reading =	0.38505 in
Final water content =	44.23%	LL =	72 %
Final dry unit weight =	77.11 pcf	PL =	40 %
Final void ratio =	1.023	% Sand =	5.0
Final degree of saturation =	100.00%	% Silt =	75.8
Estimated specific gravity =	2.50	% Clay =	19.2
		In-Situ Vertical Effective Stress =	1200 psf

#### **Compression and Swelling Indices**

Preconsolidation	pressure,s <sub>C</sub>

	Compression index $C_c =$		0.852			Prec	consolidation	pressure,s <sub>C</sub>
	Field co	prrected $C_c =$	1.038			Casagran	de Method =	1391 psf
	Swellin	index $C_s =$	0.146		Over-Conse	olidation Ra	tio (OCR) =	1.16
Load number	Vertical stress	Dial reading	System deflection	Vertical strain	Void ratio	$C_v$	Cae	Elapsed time
	psf	in	in	%		ft²/day	%	min
1	50.0	0.01026	0.00005	0.03	2.250	N/A	N/A	1440
2	100.0	0.01430	0.00010	0.44	2.236	0.4465	0.08	1440
3	200.0	0.01912	0.00023	0.94	2.220	0.0053	0.25	1440
4	500.0	0.04574	0.00058	3.66	2.132	0.1472	0.47	720
5	1000.0	0.09096	0.00090	8.24	1.983	0.1170	0.89	1440
6	2000.0	0.14749	0.00135	13.98	1.796	0.0913	1.58	1440
7	4000.0	0.22828	0.00193	22.18	1.530	0.0425	2.34	720
8	8000.0	0.30293	0.00253	29.75	1.284	0.0350	2.57	1440
9	16000.0	0.37205	0.00324	36.79	1.055	0.0314	1.83	720
10	32000.0	0.43400	0.00413	43.11	0.849	0.0226	2.13	720
11	8000.0	0.43807	0.00295	43.41	0.840	N/A	N/A	1440
12	2000.0	0.41801	0.00198	41.29	0.909	N/A	N/A	1440
13	500.0	0.38608	0.00123	38.00	1.016	N/A	N/A	1440

 Prepared by:
 A.L.
 Date:
 Charlie

 Checked by:
 A.R.
 Date:
 1/3//18





Applied stress	Elapsed time	Dial	Fitted Primary	Fitted Primary and Secondary		
psf	min	in	in	in		
50.0	0.00	0.01000	0.01000	0.01000	$h_0 =$	0.99300 in
	0.10	0.01012	0.01005	0.01005	$U_s =$	99%
	0.25	0.01012	0.01007	0.01007	$t_s =$	8.19 min
	0.50	0.01016	0.01010	0.01010	$d_s =$	0.01026 in
	1.00	0.01016	0.01014	0.01014	$d_0 =$	0.01000 in
	2.00	0.01017	0.01019	0.01019	$d_{100} =$	0.01026 in
	4.00	0.01029	0.01024	0.01024	d =	0.49643 in
	8.00	0.01026	0.01026	0.01026	$C_v =$	0.0536 in <sup>2</sup> /min
	15.00	0.01027	0.01026	0.01026	$r_i =$	0.3%
	30.00	0.01036	0.01026	0.01026	$r_p =$	15.3%
	60.00	0.01052	0.01026	0.01026	$r_s =$	84.4%
	120.00	0.01068	0.01026	0.01051	Slope =	0.0011
	240.00	0.01086	0.01026	0.01084	Intercept =	0.0083
	480.00	0.01113	0.01026	0.01116	$h_c =$	0.9927 in
	1440.00	0.01169	#NUM!	#NUM!	$t_c =$	70.73 min
					C <sub>ae</sub> =	0.109%

#### Time-Deformation curve for 50 psf seating load







99% 9.78 min

0.0446 in<sup>2</sup>/min 3.6% 28.5% 67.8% 0.0008 0.0117 0.9900 in 39.21 min

Applied stress	Elapsed time	Dial	Fitted Primary	Fitted Primary and Secondary		
psf	min	in	in	in		
100.0	0.00	0.01242	0.01249	0.01249	$h_0 =$	0.99058 in
	0.10	0.01259	0.01257	0.01257	$U_s =$	99%
	0.25	0.01263	0.01262	0.01262	$t_s =$	9.78 m
	0.50	0.01269	0.01267	0.01267	$d_s =$	0.01302 in
	1.00	0.01275	0.01275	0.01275	$d_0 =$	0.01249 in
	2.00	0.01285	0.01285	0.01285	$d_{100} =$	0.01303 in
	4.00	0.01301	0.01295	0.01295	d =	0.49512 in
	8.00	0.01302	0.01301	0.01301	$C_v =$	0.0446 in
	15.00	0.01301	0.01303	0.01303	$r_i =$	3.6%
	30.00	0.01321	0.01303	0.01303	$r_p =$	28.5%
	60.00	0.01340	0.01303	0.01318	$r_s =$	67.8%
	120.00	0.01355	0.01303	0.01342	Slope =	0.0008
	240.00	0.01367	0.01303	0.01367	Intercept =	0.0117
	480.00	0.01391	0.01303	0.01391	$h_c =$	0.9900 in
	1440.00	0.01430	0.01303	0.01430	$t_c =$	39.21 m
					C <sub>ae</sub> =	0.082%

#### Time-Deformation curve for 100 psf load







0.98852 in 99% 823.73 min 0.01908 in 0.01499 in 0.01912 in 0.49297 in 0.0005 in<sup>2</sup>/min 9.6% 78.3% 12.1% 0.0025 0.0119 0.9839 in 794.29 min 0.252%

$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$
200.0         0.00         0.01448         0.01499         0.01499           0.10         0.01488         0.01506         0.01506           0.25         0.01492         0.01510         0.01510           0.50         0.01499         0.01514         0.01514
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$
0.25 0.01492 0.01510 0.01510 0.50 0.01499 0.01514 0.01514
0.50 0.01499 0.01514 0.01514
<i>1.00</i> 0.01508 0.01520 0.01520
2.00 0.01530 0.01529 0.01529
4.00 0.01541 0.01542 0.01542
8.00 0.01561 0.01560 0.01560
15.00 0.01605 0.01583 0.01583
30.00 0.01638 0.01617 0.01617
<i>60.00</i> 0.01670 0.01667 0.01667
<i>120.00</i> 0.01719 0.01736 0.01736
240.00 0.01796 0.01819 0.01819
480.00 0.01858 0.01886 0.01886
1440.00 0.01976 0.01911 0.01975

### Time-Deformation curve for 200 psf load







0.98235 in 99% 28.27 min 0.04556 in 0.02720 in 0.04574 in 0.48327 in 0.0147 in<sup>2</sup>/min

19.8% 56.2% 23.9% 0.0045 0.0405 0.9573 in 14.54 min 0.469%

Applied stress	Elapsed time	Dial	Fitted Primary	Fitted Primary and Secondary	
psf	min	in	in	in	
500.0	0.00	0.02065	0.02720	0.02720	$h_0 =$
	0.10	0.02681	0.02886	0.02886	$U_s =$
	0.25	0.02858	0.02982	0.02982	$t_s =$
	0.50	0.03032	0.03091	0.03091	$d_s =$
	1.00	0.03238	0.03245	0.03245	$d_0 =$
	2.00	0.03475	0.03463	0.03463	$d_{100} =$
	4.00	0.03765	0.03770	0.03770	d =
	8.00	0.04015	0.04141	0.04141	$C_v =$
	15.00	0.04342	0.04428	0.04434	$\mathbf{r}_{i} =$
	30.00	0.04579	0.04560	0.04701	$r_p =$
	60.00	0.04842	0.04574	0.04850	$r_s =$
	120.00	0.04988	0.04574	0.04986	Slope =
	240.00	0.05116	0.04574	0.05121	Intercept =
	480.00	0.05258	0.04574	0.05256	$h_c =$
	720.00	0.05364	0.04574	0.05335	$t_c =$
					C <sub>ae</sub> =

#### Time-Deformation curve for 500 psf load







0.94544 in

99%

0.06187 in

0.09096 in 0.46329 in

9.1% 61.2%

29.7%

0.0081

0.0793 0.9120 in

0.891%

27.08 min

32.67 min 0.09067 in

0.0117 in<sup>2</sup>/min

Applied stress	Elapsed time	Dial	Fitted Primary	Fitted Primary and Secondary	
psf	min	in	in	in	
1000.0	0.00	0.05756	0.06187	0.06187	h <sub>0</sub> =
	0.10	0.06257	0.06429	0.06429	U <sub>s</sub> =
	0.25	0.06454	0.06570	0.06570	t <sub>s</sub> =
	0.50	0.06674	0.06729	0.06729	d <sub>s</sub> =
	1.00	0.06941	0.06953	0.06953	d <sub>0</sub> =
	2.00	0.07292	0.07271	0.07271	d <sub>100</sub> =
	4.00	0.07711	0.07720	0.07720	d =
	8.00	0.08230	0.08292	0.08292	$C_v =$
	15.00	0.08619	0.08782	0.08782	r <sub>i</sub> =
	30.00	0.09031	0.09054	0.09090	r <sub>p</sub> =
	60.00	0.09369	0.09095	0.09376	r <sub>s</sub> =
	120.00	0.09656	0.09096	0.09621	Slope =
	240.00	0.09884	0.09096	0.09866	Intercept =
	480.00	0.10080	0.09096	0.10110	h <sub>c</sub> =
	1440.00	0.10510	0.09096	0.10498	t <sub>c</sub> =
-					C <sub>ae</sub> =

#### Time-Deformation curve for 1000 psf load







0.89357 in

99%

0.11287 in

0.14749 in

0.43641 in

5.7%

57.5%

36.7% 0.0135

0.1269

1.579%

0.8555 in 33.16 min

0.0091 in<sup>2</sup>/min

37.13 min 0.14714 in

	Fitted Primary and Secondary	Fitted Primary	Dial	Elapsed time	Applied stress
	in	in	in	min	psf
h <sub>0</sub> :	0.11287	0.11287	0.10943	0.00	2000.0
Us	0.11558	0.11558	0.11372	0.10	
ts	0.11715	0.11715	0.11599	0.25	
d <sub>s</sub> :	0.11892	0.11892	0.11826	0.50	
<b>d</b> <sub>0</sub> :	0.12143	0.12143	0.12132	1.00	
d <sub>100</sub> :	0.12497	0.12497	0.12516	2.00	
d	0.12998	0.12998	0.12990	4.00	
Cv	0.13660	0.13660	0.13520	8.00	
ri	0.14274	0.14274	0.14028	15.00	
r <sub>p</sub>	0.14669	0.14669	0.14582	30.00	
r <sub>s</sub>	0.15095	0.14747	0.15070	60.00	
Slope	0.15504	0.14749	0.15501	120.00	
Intercept	0.15910	0.14749	0.15913	240.00	
h <sub>c</sub>	0.16317	0.14749	0.16318	480.00	
t <sub>c</sub>	0.16961	0.14749	0.16960	1440.00	
Cae					

#### Time-Deformation curve for 2000 psf load Time (min)







0.82840 in 99%

0.40053 in 0.0043 in<sup>2</sup>/min 1.4% 72.1% 26.5% 0.0181 0.1959

0.7747 in 61.27 min 2.341%

67.20 min 0.22775 in 0.17560 in 0.22828 in

	Fitted Primary and Secondary	Fitted Primary	Dial	Elapsed time	Applied stress
	in	in	in	min	psf
h <sub>0</sub> =	0.17560	0.17560	0.17460	0.00	4000.0
U <sub>s</sub> =	0.17866	0.17866	0.17806	0.10	
t <sub>s</sub> =	0.18044	0.18044	0.18016	0.25	
d <sub>s</sub> =	0.18245	0.18245	0.18223	0.50	
d <sub>0</sub> =	0.18528	0.18528	0.18524	1.00	
d <sub>100</sub> =	0.18929	0.18929	0.18936	2.00	
d =	0.19496	0.19496	0.19493	4.00	
$C_v =$	0.20297	0.20297	0.20384	8.00	
r <sub>i</sub> =	0.21227	0.21227	0.21181	15.00	
r <sub>p</sub> =	0.22227	0.22227	0.22024	30.00	
r <sub>s</sub> =	0.22743	0.22743	0.22685	60.00	
Slope =	0.23356	0.22826	0.23324	120.00	
Intercept =	0.23903	0.22828	0.23899	240.00	
h <sub>c</sub> =	0.24449	0.22828	0.24460	480.00	
t <sub>c</sub> =	0.24769	0.22828	0.24762	720.00	
C <sub>ae</sub> =					

#### Time-Deformation curve for 4000 psf load







Applied stress	Elapsed time	Dial	Fitted Primary	Fitted Primary and Secondary	
psf	min	in	in	in	
8000.0	0.00	0.25171	0.25316	0.25316	
	0.10	0.25543	0.25606	0.25606	
	0.25	0.25733	0.25775	0.25775	
	0.50	0.25942	0.25964	0.25964	
	1.00	0.26229	0.26233	0.26233	
	2.00	0.26619	0.26613	0.26613	
	4.00	0.27147	0.27150	0.27150	
	8.00	0.27833	0.27909	0.27909	
	15.00	0.28650	0.28788	0.28788	
	30.00	0.29458	0.29732	0.29732	
	60.00	0.30158	0.30215	0.30215	
	120.00	0.30794	0.30292	0.30801	
	240.00	0.31360	0.30293	0.31345	
	480.00	0.31879	0.30293	0.31887	
	1440.00	0.32419	0.30293	0.32747	

$h_0 =$	0.75129	in
$U_s =$	99%	
$t_s =$	66.85	min
$d_s =$	0.30244	in
$d_0 =$	0.25316	in
$d_{100} =$	0.30293	in
d =	0.36248	in
$C_v =$	0.0035	in²/min
$r_i =$	2.0%	
$r_p =$	68.7%	
$r_s =$	29.3%	
Slope =	0.0180	
ntercept =	0.2706	
$h_c =$	0.7001	in
$t_c =$	62.64	min
$C_{ae} =$	2.574%	

Time-Deformation curve for 8000 psf load







Applied stress	Elapsed time	Dial	Fitted Primary	Fitted Primary and Secondary	
psf	min	in	in	in	
16000.0	0.00	0.32634	0.32774	0.32774	
	0.10	0.32999	0.33046	0.33046	
	0.25	0.33174	0.33203	0.33203	
	0.50	0.33364	0.33381	0.33381	
	1.00	0.33629	0.33632	0.33632	
	2.00	0.33992	0.33987	0.33987	
	4.00	0.34488	0.34490	0.34490	
	8.00	0.35122	0.35201	0.35201	
	15.00	0.35825	0.35997	0.35997	
	30.00	0.36531	0.36799	0.36799	
	60.00	0.37156	0.37159	0.37262	
	120.00	0.37644	0.37204	0.37656	
	240.00	0.38032	0.37205	0.38005	In
	480.00	0.38340	0.37205	0.38354	
	720.00	0.38502	0.37205	0.38557	
					•

$h_0 =$	0.67666	in
$U_s =$	99%	
t <sub>s</sub> =	60.49	min
$d_s =$	0.37161	in
$d_0 =$	0.32774	in
d <sub>100</sub> =	0.37205	in
d =	0.32655	in
$C_v =$	0.0031	in <sup>2</sup> /min
$r_i =$	2.4%	
$r_p =$	75.5%	
r <sub>s</sub> =	22.1%	
Slope =	0.0116	
Intercept =	0.3525	
$h_c =$	0.6310	in
$t_c =$	48.83	min
C <sub>ae</sub> =	1.834%	

Time-Deformation curve for 16000 psf load Time (min)







Applied	Flored		Fitted	Fitted		
Applied	time	Dial	Pitted	Primary and		
suess	ume		Filliary	Secondary		
psf	min	in	in	in		
32000.0	0.00	0.38644	0.38820	0.38820	$h_0 =$	0.61656 in
	0.10	0.39035	0.39082	0.39082	$U_s =$	99%
	0.25	0.39210	0.39235	0.39235	$t_s =$	69.01 min
	0.50	0.39393	0.39407	0.39407	$d_s =$	0.43354 in
	1.00	0.39646	0.39650	0.39650	$d_0 =$	0.38820 in
	2.00	0.39999	0.39994	0.39994	$d_{100} =$	0.43400 in
	4.00	0.40478	0.40480	0.40480	d =	0.29595 in
	8.00	0.41106	0.41168	0.41168	$C_v =$	0.0023 in <sup>2</sup> /min
	15.00	0.41794	0.41971	0.41971	$r_i =$	2.9%
	30.00	0.42577	0.42850	0.42850	$r_p =$	76.4%
	60.00	0.43257	0.43318	0.43381	$r_s =$	20.7%
	120.00	0.43808	0.43398	0.43826	Slope =	0.0121
	240.00	0.44233	0.43400	0.44193	Intercept =	0.4130
	480.00	0.44539	0.43400	0.44559	$h_c =$	0.5690 in
	720.00	0.44639	0.43400	0.44773	$t_c =$	53.31 min
-					C <sub>ae</sub> =	2.135%

#### Time-Deformation curve for 32000 psf load Time (min)







Applied stress	Elapsed time	Dial	Fitted Primary	Fitted Primary and Secondary		
psf	min	in	in	in		
8000.0	0.00	0.44744	0.44443	0.44443	$h_0 =$	0.55556 in
	0.10	0.44513	0.44388	0.44388	$U_s =$	99%
	0.25	0.44444	0.44356	0.44356	$t_s =$	30.60 min
	0.50	0.44359	0.44320	0.44320	$d_s =$	0.43814 in
	1.00	0.44273	0.44270	0.44270	$d_0 =$	0.44443 in
	2.00	0.44193	0.44198	0.44198	d <sub>100</sub> =	0.43807 in
	4.00	0.44099	0.44097	0.44097	d =	0.28088 in
	8.00	0.44008	0.43971	0.43971	$C_v =$	0.0046 in <sup>2</sup> /min
	15.00	0.43912	0.43867	0.43867	$r_i =$	25.1%
	30.00	0.43815	0.43814	0.43814	$r_p =$	52.9%
	60.00	0.43741	0.43807	0.43874	$r_s =$	22.1%
	120.00	0.43667	0.43807	0.43948	Slope =	-0.0025
	240.00	0.43602	0.43807	0.44022	Intercept =	0.4418
	480.00	0.43542	0.43807	0.44096	$h_c =$	0.5649 in
	1440.00	0.43436	0.43807	0.44213	$t_c =$	32.12 min
					C <sub>ae</sub> =	0.434%

#### Time-Deformation curve for 8000 psf unload Time (min)







Applied stress	Elapsed time	Dial	Fitted Primary	Fitted Primary and Secondary	
psf	min	in	in	in	
2000.0	0.00	0.43444	0.43296	0.43296	$h_0 =$
	0.10	0.43444	0.43239	0.43239	$U_s =$
	0.25	0.43218	0.43205	0.43205	t <sub>s</sub> =
	0.50	0.43171	0.43168	0.43168	$d_s =$
	1.00	0.43114	0.43114	0.43114	$d_0 =$
	2.00	0.43038	0.43039	0.43039	$d_{100} =$
	4.00	0.42932	0.42932	0.42932	d =
	8.00	0.42787	0.42781	0.42781	$C_v =$
	15.00	0.42617	0.42590	0.42590	$r_i =$
	30.00	0.42392	0.42312	0.42312	$r_p =$
	60.00	0.42147	0.42016	0.42016	$r_s =$
	120.00	0.41892	0.41839	0.41895	Slope =
	240.00	0.41644	0.41802	0.42038	Intercept =
	480.00	0.41385	0.41801	0.42216	$h_c =$
	1440.00	0.41100	0.41801	0.42501	$t_c =$



#### Time-Deformation curve for 2000 psf unload Time (min)







Applied stress	Elapsed time	Dial	Fitted Primary	Fitted Primary and Secondary	
psf	min	in	in	in	
500.0	0.00	0.41075	0.41034	0.41034	
	0.10	0.40999	0.41001	0.41001	
	0.25	0.40977	0.40982	0.40982	
	0.50	0.40955	0.40960	0.40960	
	1.00	0.40926	0.40929	0.40929	
	2.00	0.40884	0.40885	0.40885	d
	4.00	0.40824	0.40824	0.40824	
	8.00	0.40736	0.40737	0.40737	
	15.00	0.40627	0.40627	0.40627	
	30.00	0.40459	0.40458	0.40458	
	60.00	0.40242	0.40220	0.40220	
	120.00	0.39954	0.39883	0.39883	Slo
	240.00	0.39579	0.39430	0.39430	Interc
	480.00	0.39146	0.38951	0.38951	
	1440.00	0.38505	0.38618	0.38618	

$h_0 =$	0.59225	in
$U_s =$	99%	
t <sub>s</sub> =	1208.68	min
$d_s =$	0.38632	in
$d_0 =$	0.41034	in
d <sub>100</sub> =	0.38608	in
d =	0.30240	in
$C_v =$	0.0001	in²/min
$\mathbf{r}_i =$	1.6%	
$r_p =$	94.4%	
$r_s =$	4.0%	
Slope =	-0.0125	
Intercept =	0.4254	
$h_c =$	0.6169	in
$t_c =$	1445.55	min
C <sub>ae</sub> =	2.019%	

#### Time-Deformation curve for 500 psf unload Time (min)







# CONSOLIDATION CURVE











# CONSOLIDATION COEFFICIENT (Cv) vs. VERTICAL STRESS





# **APPENDIX C**

Geotechnical · Construction · Environmental Quality Engineering Services Since 1982







# **APPENDIX D**

Geotechnical · Construction · Environmental Quality Engineering Services Since 1982

Benchmark: CWA CP #5, 5%" dia. rebar Sta. 312+36.71 o/s 29.43 ft left, Elev. 917.84. Existing Structure: Concrete Box Culvert at Sta. 310+25 3 ft W x 3 ft H by approx. 65 ft in length at 0° skew shall be removed. Traffic Control: Traffic will be maintained in a two stage construction process. Salvage: None.

PLOT DATE = 8/7/2020

CHECKED - BRL

€ Roadway Route 176E & Stage Construction Line 70'-7½" 74'-10½'' Stage IB Construction Stage IA Construction 6'-41/2' 6'-4<sup>1</sup>/2" 64'-3'' 68'-6'' Proposed 2'-0'' 5'-0",5'-0" 10'-0'' 24'-0" 24'-0'' 10'-0'' 5'-0" 10'-0'' 2'-0'' groundline Shldr Lane Shldr Grass Path Side ass Lane Nа EB PGL -WB PGL 2'-7'' 2'-7' ROV 7" Curb Curb Median 1'-0' 2% 2% 4% 4% 2% typ. 6 ñ Existing groundline-Edgebeam 0.15% \_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_4I\_\_0|\_\_\_t \_\_\_\_\_~ 122221222212222122221 F Elev. 909.92 ∽3" Ø Drain holes, typ. F\_ Elev. 909.76 1'-0" Fill U.S. Invert D.S. Invert 6" Porous Embedment Elev. 908.92 Elev. 908.76 ELEVATION Granular Material \*\* DHWE Elev. 911.45 \* Slab thickness subject to Pay Limits for PGE (below top \*\*\* EWSE Elev. 910.02 refinement in final design of box culvert, typ. each side) 24'-0'' 24'-0'' 5'-0" 5'-0" 10'-0'' 10'-0'' 2'-0" 5'-0" 10'-0'' 2'-0'' Side Shldr Shldr Path ase Lane Lane Grass 5'-5'' 5'-5'' V:H wal 1'-0" 1:6 2'-7'' 2'-7'' 1:6 ,FR Curb V:H V:H typ. Curb Median V:H 6628 \**6*" Sta KADDE Temporary Sheet 15'-4<sup>1</sup>/5'' Piling, typ. Flow Sta. 310+50.00 typ. **~**^\_ Elev. 919.10 g └─ C Culvert € Roadway Route 176E & Α Stage Construction Line 4 Name -Edgebeam Plate <u>1:6</u> V:H 1:3 1:6 1:3 ັດ V:H V:H V:H 80 64'-3" 68'-6" 9'-0" 6'-41/2 132'-9" Out to Out of Headwalls typ. typ. PLAN \*Wall thickness subject to refinement in final design 340' V.C. VPI Sta. 302+ El. 929.78 Sta. 316+64.74 El. 922.12 VPI Sta. 308+7 El. 918.21 Sta. 307+00 El. 921.52 Sta. 310+40 E1. 919.05 WATERWAY INFORMATION STATION 310+50 BUILT 201X BY Drainage Area = 0.1155 sq. mi. Low Grade Elev. =919.01 @ Sta. 311+75 STATE OF ILLINOIS Opening Sq. Ft. Nat. Head - Ft. Headwater El. Exist. Prop. H.W.E. Exist. Prop. Exist. Prop rea. Q F.A.P. RT. 326(IL-176E) Floon C.F.S. Yr SEC. 105-N-21(15) -1.94% 2 14.29 2.1 5.7 910.63 0.65 0.20 911.28 910.8 LOADING HL-93 10 27.07 5.6 911.04 1.23 0.42 912.27 911.4 3.3 STR. NO. XXX-XXXX 911.45 2.75 0.99 914.20 912.4 +0.49% 50 62.54 Desian 4.6 7.6 Base 100 89.01 5.2 8.7 911.66 4.75 1.37 916.21 913.0. Valley PROFILE GRADE NAME PLATE Overtopping >500 10.6 912.04 6.81 2.85 918.85 914.89 (ER and WR PGL) Max. Calc. 500 151.32 6.3 See Std. 515001 1170 SOUTH HOUBOLT ROAD USER NAME = brianf DESIGNED - BRL REVISED -SA ILLINOIS JOLIET, ILLINOIS 60431 CHECKED - KRB REVISED -STRAND IDFPR NO. 184-001273 (815) 744-4200 LOT SCALE = DRAWN BJF REVISED -RANSPORTATION -

REVISED -

development

wingwalls, and not closer than 2 ft from the face of embankment.



- General Plan and Elevation
- General Data
- Stage Construction Culvert Details - 1
- Culvert Details 2
- Bar Splicer Assembly Existing Structure



Filter fabric

Range 7E, 3rd P.M. Dean St Pleasant LOCATION SKETCH

(LD anu	WD FOL)			
		STATE	E OF	: 1
	DEPAR	<b>IMENT</b>	OF	TF

#### GENERAL NOTES

The 6 in. thick layer of porous granular material shall be placed below the bottom slab and satisfy Standard Specifications. The cost of the porous granular material shall be included in the pay item for Porous Granular Embankment. The subsurface soil foundation will be finalized in conjunction with the SGR during final plan

Nonwoven geotextile fabric shall conform to the requirements of Art. 1080.01 of the Standard Specifications. The minimum weight of the fabric shall be 6 ounces per square yard.

Concrete box culverts shall be backfilled with Porous Granular Embankment below the top of the box culvert extending to a vertical plane 2 ft from the exterior sides of the culvert, 2 ft from the back face of the



#### SECTION THRU BARREL

\*Slab and wall thickness subject to refinement during final design

#### HIGHWAY CLASSIFICATION

F.A.P. Rte. 326 (IL-176E) Functional Class: Other Principal Arterial ADT: 10,600 (2013); 16,000 (2040) ADTT: 2,290 (2013); 3,456 (2040) DHV: 1095 (2040) Design Speed: 60 m.p.h. Posted Speed: 55 m.p.h. 2-Way Traffic Directional Distribution: 50:50

#### DESIGN SPECIFICATIONS

2017 AASHTO LRFD Bridge Design Specifications 8th Edition

#### LOADING HL-93

Allow 50 #/sq.ft for future wearing surface Structure designed for a min fill height of 0.75' and a max. fill height of 5.43'

#### DESIGN STRESSES

SECTION A-A

4' - 0''

- FIELD UNITS = 3,500 psi f'c = 60,000 psi (Reinforcement) fv PRECAST UNITS f'c = 5,000 psi
- fy = 60,000 psi (Reinforcement)



δF	GENERAL PLAN AND ELEVATION
ĪL	RTE. 176E OVER UNNAMED CREEK
.A.P	. RTE. 326(IL-176E) SEC. 105-N-2(15)
	MCHENRY COUNTY
ed_	STATION 310+50
re	S.N. 056-0110

GENERAL PLAN AND ELEVATION	F.A.P. RTÉ.	SECTION	COUNTY	TOTAL SHEETS	SHEET NO.
STRUCTURE NO. 056-0110	326	105-N-2(15)	McHENRY	\$T0T\$	х
			CONTRACT	NO. 6	2B43
SHEET NO. X OF 7 SHEETS	ILLINOIS FED. AID PROJECT				



ILLINOIS FED. AID PROJECT