

Chicago Testing Laboratory, Inc.

30W114 Butterfield Road, Warrenville, IL 60555 p 630.393.2851 f 630.393.2857 w chicagotestinglab.com e info@chicagotestinglab.com

Testing • Inspection • Training • Consulting • Research • Geotechnical

October 31, 2024

Robert T. Boro, P.E. Senior Project Manager HBM Engineering Group, LLC 4415 Harrison Street, Suite 231 Hillside, IL 60162

Re: Abbreviated Roadway Geotechnical Report IDOT PTB 204-012 WO 3
IDOT Contract 62W87
WB US 6 to NB I-94 Ramp Y1
South Holland, Illinois

CTL Project No. 24F763

Dear Mr. Boro,

C hicago Testing Laboratory, Inc. (CTL) completed a geotechnical investigation for the proposed realignment and reconstruction for the ramp from WB US 6 to NB I-94 (Ramp Y1) for IDOT Contract 62W87 in South Holland, Illinois. The purpose of the investigation was to obtain subsurface soil samples to characterize and determine the soil properties, determine the groundwater conditions, and provide analysis and recommendations for the proposed improvements. Appendix A shows the Site Location Map with the contract limits.

1.0 Project Information

Based on the preliminary information provided by HBM Engineering Group (HBM), the proposed project will include realignment of Ramp Y1 to accommodate a longer merge lane along NB I-94. The proposed pavement section thicknesses have not been determined at this time but, our understanding, will consist of asphalt pavement underlain by a base course meeting the requirement of the BDE Special Provisions for Aggregate Subgrade Improvement. The surrounding area includes urban properties throughout the project site.

2.0 Subsurface Exploration

This section describes the subsurface exploration and laboratory testing programs completed as part of this project. The subsurface investigation program was performed, according to applicable IDOT and AASHTO manuals and procedures.



2.1 Subsurface Site Investigation

The subsurface investigation was conducted on October 10, 2024, which included advancing two (2) soil borings to a depth of 10 feet below ground surface (bgs) for the proposed improvements. The boring locations were selected by CTL, with approval from HBM, and completed in the field based on site conditions and accessibility. Elevations of the boring locations were estimated using the provided plan and profiles and internet resources. Table 1 below presents a summary of the soil boring completed.

	Ŭ	0	
		Elevation	
Boring	Location	(ft MSL)	Depth (ft)
SB-1-1	Ramp Y1, STA 105+00	596.0	10
SB-1-2	Ramp Y1, STA 109+50	596.5	10

Table 1: Summary of Soil Borings

The soil boring was conducted by GeoServices, a subcontracted drilling firm, under the field supervision by a CTL engineer using a truck mounted Mobile B-57 drill rig equipped with 2-1/4-inch I.D. hollow stem augers and an automatic hammer. Soil sampling was performed according to AASHTO T206 "Penetration Test and Split Barrel Sampling of Soils" using the Standard Penetration Test (SPT, ASTM D1556). In this procedure, a 2-inch O.D. split barrel or split spoon sampler is driven 18 inches into undisturbed soil using a 30-inch drop of a 140-pound hammer. The number of hammer drops (blow counts) is recorded in 6-inch intervals for each sample collected. The number of blow counts to advance the sampler the final 12 inches is called the SPT "N-value". The N-values are shown on the Soil Boring Logs (Appendix C).

Soil samples were obtained with the split barrel sampler at 2.5-foot intervals to the boring termination depths. A CTL field technician inspected, visually classified, and logged the soil samples throughout the subsurface exploration. Unconfined compressive strength values (Qu) of the cohesive soils encountered during the subsurface investigation were obtained in the field using a calibrated Rimac tester in according to IDOT procedures or using a Pocket Penetrometer when the soil sample is small or disturbed. Representative soil samples from each sampling interval were collected, placed in sealed glass jars, and returned to the laboratory for further evaluation and testing.

2.2 Laboratory Testing Program

All soil samples collected during the subsurface exploration were inspected in the laboratory to verify the field classifications. A laboratory testing program was conducted on the soils encountered to characterize and determine the engineering properties for the design of the proposed improvements. Moisture Contents (AASHTO T265) were performed on all soil samples.

Based on the laboratory test results, soil samples were classified using the Illinois Division of Highways (IDH) classification systems. The laboratory and field test results are shown on the Soil Boring Logs (Appendix C).



2.3 General Subsurface Conditions

General subsurface conditions are described below and are grouped based on similar soils encountered throughout the proposed improvements.

Generally, the borings encountered near surface materials consisting of 3 to 6 inches of aggregate shoulder. Below the surficial layer, the borings encountered stiff to hard, black to brown and gray silty clay to depths of 6 to 9 feet bgs with unconfined compressive strengths between 1.7 and 4.2 tsf underlain by loose, brown silty loam to the boring termination depth of 10 feet with SPT N values ranging from 6 to 10 blows per foot.

Detailed descriptions of the soil borings are provided in Appendix C (Soil Boring Logs) which provides specific conditions encountered at each soil boring location. The stratifications shown on the soil boring logs represent the conditions only at the actual soil boring location and represents the approximate boundary between subsurface materials; however, the actual transition may be gradual.

2.4 Groundwater Conditions

Groundwater was not encountered while drilling or upon completion of the soil borings. None of the borings were left open to collect delayed water readings after leaving the site due to safety concerns.

Based on the color change from brown to gray, the long-term groundwater may be at a depth greater than 10 feet bgs. The brown color of the soil is typically caused by oxidation that occurs above the long-term water level. In general, it should be noted that the groundwater levels could fluctuate based on seasonal precipitation and surface run-off.

3.0 Geotechnical Analysis and Recommendations

This section provides the geotechnical analysis and recommendations for the proposed roadway reconstruction based on the results of the field exploration and laboratory testing.

3.1 Drainage Characteristics

Per the IDOT Geotechnical Manual Section 6.3.4.1, the subgrade soils were evaluated based on soil type, moisture content, proposed roadway profile and topography. Based on the results of the field investigation and the proposed roadway profile, the roadway reconstruction will be supported on the native soils encountered. These soils consisted of native silty clay soils throughout the project site.

According to Table 6.3.4.1, Drainage Classification, in the IDOT Geotechnical Manual, the drainage class of the site was determined. Based on the proposed improvements and the existing



roadway conditions, shallow ditches will be constructed on the edge of the roadways, with grades greater than 0.5%. The drainage class should be taken as fair for the proposed realignment.

3.2 Frost Susceptibility

Per the IDOT Geotechnical Manual Section 6.3.2.2.3, the frost susceptibility of the subgrade soils that will be encountered in the proposed subgrade were evaluated. Based on the IDOT Geotechnical Manual, the maximum anticipated frost protection depth below pavement in northern Illinois is 45 to 60 inches for extreme weather conditions. Table 6.3.2.2.3-1 of the IDOT Geotechnical Manual, Frost Susceptibility Classification in Soils, was used to determine the frost class of the subgrade soils. The subgrade soils generally consisted of silty clay soils with a Plasticity Index (PI) greater than 12, silt and sand greater than 65% and capillary rise not within the frost depth zone. Therefore, the subgrade soils have a Frost Class of F3.

3.3 Organic Content

Any soils encountered during the subsurface investigation with potential organic content were evaluated. Typically, subgrade soils with an organic content greater than 10 percent are considered unsuitable to remain below the proposed pavement areas. Based on the soil borings, it is not anticipated that highly organic soils will be encountered in the proposed roadway subgrade.

3.4 Subgrade Support Rating

The Subgrade Support Rating (SSR) was determined for the proposed roadway construction based on Section 6.3.1 of the IDOT Geotechnical Manual, for pavement design purposes if the Mechanistic Pavement Design method is used. The SSR triangular chart consists of three categories (poor, fair or granular). The subgrade soils consisted of silty clay soils with an SSR of Fair. If the pavement is to be designed based on the CBR/IBR method, we recommend that an average CBR/IBR of 3 be used for the subgrade soils encountered in the soil borings at a depth of 2 feet bgs.

3.5 Subgrade Suitability and Stability

Based on the results of the field investigation and laboratory tests, no high moisture and/or unstable soils were encountered. If unstable soils are encountered during construction, treatment may include the use of a geotextile fabric and removal and replacement with approved structural fill or Aggregate Subgrade. Materials considered unstable to remain below the proposed roadway should be undercut and replaced with crushed aggregate meeting the requirement of the IDOT BDE Special Provision for Aggregate Subgrade Improvement. Based on the moisture contents and strength values in the soil borings, we believe the assumed 12-inch Aggregate Subgrade is adequate to provide a stable construction platform for the proposed roadway alignment.

3.6 Groundwater Management

Based on the subsurface investigation and the anticipated depth of the groundwater table, groundwater issues are not anticipated for this project. If water is encountered during any



excavation activities, the contractor should provide a dry condition for construction by using conventional sumping or temporary ditches to provide proper drainage on the site.

4.0 Professional Disclaimer

This report was prepared on the basis of the project information supplied by the client and is intended only for use on this project. This report was prepared by interpreting the data from the soil borings and field tests made within the project limits and from the results of the laboratory tests obtained from the samples taken. The report gives a representative, but not exhaustive, picture of the project subsurface conditions. The geotechnical engineer warrants that the findings, recommendations, specifications, and professional advice given within this report have been prepared using generally accepted professional engineering practices. The recommendations provided in the report are specific to the project described herein and are based on the information obtained from the soil boring locations within the proposed roadway improvements. Changes involving the proposed roadway alignment and wall structures, from those enumerated within this report, should be submitted for our review to evaluate our recommendations.

Chicago Testing Laboratory, Inc. (CTL) appreciates the opportunity to work with you on this project and look forward to serving as your Geotechnical Engineering Consultant on this project during construction or future projects. We would be pleased to discuss any questions you have about the contents of this report.

Respectfully Submitted, CHICAGO TESTING LABORATORY, INC.

Jeffing A Katter

Jeffrey Rothamer, P.E. Director of Technical Services

Rowent

Riyad Wahab, PhD, P.E. Senior Geotechnical Engineer

Attachments - Appendix A: Site Location Map Appendix B: Boring Location Plan Appendix C: Soil Boring Logs Appendix D: Design Plans (HBM) APPENDIX A

SITE LOCATION MAP



		DRAWN BY:	
CHICAGO TESTING LABORAT	ORY, INC.	JAR	SITE LOCATION MAP
30W114 BUTTERFIELD ROAD		CHECKED BY:	PTB 204-012 WO3
WARRENVILLE, IL 60555		RW	IDOT 62W87 WB US 6 TO NB I-94 RAMP
PHONE: (630) 393-2851	SCALE:	DATE:	SOUTH HOLLAND, ILLINOIS
FAX : (630) 393-2857	NTS	10/16/24	

APPENDIX B

BORING LOCATION PLAN AND PROFILE



APPENDIX C

SOIL BORING LOGS

Illinois De of Transpo Division of Highways	partn ortati	ne on	nt		SC	DIL BORING	LOG	Page <u>1</u> of <u>1</u>
Chicago Testing Laboratory FAI RTE 94 (I-94 Bisho	v, Inc p			ı		WP US6 to NP I 04 Pom		
							\mathbf{p} \mathbf{r}	
						low Stom Augor	JAMMED TVDE	Auto
	RILLING					iow Stem Auger r		Auto
STRUCT. NO. N/A Station N/A		D E	BL	U C	M O	Surface Water Elev Stream Bed Elev	<u>N/A</u> ft <u>N/A</u> ft	
BORING NO. SB-1-1		P T	O W	S	I S	Groundwater Elev.:		
Station 105+00 Offset 0.00ft CL		н	S	Qu	Т	First Encounter	<u>None</u> ft N/A ft	
Ground Surface Elev596.00) ft	(ft)	(/6")	(tsf)	(%)	After <u>N/A</u> Hrs.	N/A ft	
Stiff to Hard Brown and Gray, Moist	595.50		2					
SILTY CLAY (CL/ML, A-6)			6	4.0	18.2			
			7	P				
			3					
			4	2.9	17.7			
		-5	0	D				
			3					
		_	5 7	1.7 B	21.4			
	587.00		3					
Brown, Very Moist	586.00	-10	4		23.7			
End of Boring								
		-15						
		20						

The Unconfined Compressive Strength (UCS) Failure Mode is indicated by (B-Bulge, S-Shear, P-Penetrometer) The SPT (N value) is the sum of the last two blow values in each sampling zone (AASHTO T206)

Illinois De of Transp Division of Highways	partm ortatio	ent n		SC	IL BORING LOG	Page <u>1</u> of <u>1</u>
Chicago Testing Laborator FAI RTE 94 (I-94 Bish ROUTE Ford Expv)	ry, Inc OP DESC	RIPTIO	N		WB US6 to NB I-94 Ramp	LOGGED BY KL
SECTION	&T	LOCA		NE 1/4	, SEC. 11, TWP. 36N, RNG. 25E, 3 rd P l	 M
COUNTY Cook	DRILLING N	IETHOD)	Hol	low Stem Auger HAMMER TY	PE Auto
STRUCT. NO. N/A Station N/A		D B E L D O	U C S	M O I	Surface Water Elev. N/A fr Stream Bed Elev. N/A fr	t t
BORING NO. SB-1-2 Station 109+50 Offset 3.00ft RT Ground Surface Elev. 596.5		ft) (/6")	Qu (tsf)	5 T (%)	Groundwater Elev.: First Encounter None Upon Completion N/A After N/A Hrs. N/A	t t
3 inches of Aggregate Shoulder Very Stiff Black, Moist SILTY CLAY (CL/ML, A-6)	_/ 596.25	4	33	17.4		
Hard	593.50	8	B	17.4		
Brown and Gray, Moist SILTY CLAY (CL/ML, A-6)	_	4 6 -5 7	4.2 B	17.1		
Loose Brown, Very Moist	590.50	2 5		22.3		
SILTY LOAM (MLS, A-4)	_	5				
End of Boring	586.50	5 5 4		22.9		
	_	_				
	_					
		-15				
	_					
	_					
	_					

The Unconfined Compressive Strength (UCS) Failure Mode is indicated by (B-Bulge, S-Shear, P-Penetrometer) The SPT (N value) is the sum of the last two blow values in each sampling zone (AASHTO T206) APPENDIX D

DESIGN PLANS (HBM)





PLOT DATE = 8/15/2024

DATE

4/19/24



														 	625
														 	620
														 	615
G 50	.00													 	
														 	<u> </u>
	~ ~ -		,			E>	(PRO	FILE:F	EBit	IS 6				 	610
ST	RUCTI	ON		1		ι.,								 	
15.	50								,					 	COF
										1	<u> </u>			 	605
														 	600
														 	000
														 	595
														 	590
														 	550
	31		59		61		42		19		94		65		
	610.		609.		608.		607.		606.		604.		603.		
0			2348	3+00			2349	9+00			2350	0+00			
														 	605
															625
															625
															625
															625 620
															625 620
															625 620
G															625 620 615
G 50	.00														625 620 615
G 50	.00					- EX F	ROFIL	E & V	VB US	6					625 620 615 610
G 50	.00					EX - F	ROFIL	E & V	VB US	6					625 620 615 610
G 50 51	.00 .00 RUCTI 50					- EX [PROFIL	Eev	VB US	6					625 620 615 610
G 50 51	.00 	 ON				- EX F	PROFIL	E & V	VB US	6					625 620 615 610 605
G 50 51	00 RUCTI					- EX f	PROFIL	EBV	VB US	6					625 620 615 610 605
G 50 ST 15	.00 RUCTI	 ON				EX. F	PROFIL	EBV	VB US	6					625 620 615 610 605
G 50 IST	.00 RUCTI 50					- EX 1	PROFIL	E @ V	VB US	6					625 620 615 610 605 600
G 50 151	00 RUCTI 50					EX : f	PROFIL	E & V	VB US	6					625 620 615 610 605 600
G 50	.00 RUCTI 50					- EX F	PROFIL	E @ \	VB US	.6.					625 620 615 610 605 600
G 50	.00 RUCTI 50					- EX	PROFIL	E <u>B</u> V	VB US	6					625 620 615 610 605 600 595
G 50	.00 RUCTI 50					- EX 1	PROFIL	E @ V	VB US	6					625 620 615 610 600 600 595
G 50	.00 RUCTI 50					EX. f	PROFIL	E @ \	VB US	-6 					625 620 615 610 600 600 595
G 50	.00 RUCTI 50	- <u>-</u>				EX : f	PROFIL	E & V	VB US	6					625 620 615 610 605 600 595 590
G 50	000. RUCTI		15		32	EX - F	PROFIL 2	EEV	VB US	.6	<i>y</i>				625 620 615 610 605 600 595 590
G 50	000.000.000.000.000.000.000.000.000.00		09.45		08.52	EX !	ROFIL	E B V	:06:26		04.97				625 620 615 610 600 595 590
G 50 15T 15	000 RUCTI 50		600.45 600.45		608.52		PROFIL	E B V	606.26 606.26	6					625 620 615 610 600 595 590
G 50 151 15.	000 RUCTI 50 60 019	0N.	1348 603.45 603.45	<u></u>	008.52 25.80 008.52	- EX:	66 ° 200 09 1349 F 8	E.B.\	606.26 606.26		1322 6.4.97				625 620 615 610 600 595 590
G 50 15 15 15 0 0 AT	000 RUCTI 50 60 019 US ET	ON 6 (1!	59 7H	<u>></u> → → → → → → → → → → → → →	608.52	EX 1		E & \	606.26	6.	200 200 200 200 200 200 200 200				625 620 615 615 600 595 590