

Original Report Date:	2/4/20202	Proposed SN:	044-0063	Route:	FAP-885
Revised Date: 4/3/20		Existing SN:	044-0053	Section:	107B-2
<b>Geotechnical Enginee</b>	r: BBS Foundat	tion & Geotech U	Init Bill Kramer	County:	Johnson
Structural Engineer:	BBS Planning Ju	ustin Belue		Contract:	78681

Indicate the proposed structure type, substructure types, and foundation locations (attach plan and elevation drawing): The anticipated structure type is a three-span slab bridge superstructure with integral abutments and encased pile bent piers. We recommend using steel H-piles driven to bedrock at all substructures. The estimated factored loading is reported to be 752.17 kips/abutment and 1047.36 kips/pier. Assuming a pile spacing of 7.5' (3 piles per stage), the abutment would have a nominal required bearing of 126 kips/pile and the pier would have a nominal required bearing of 175 kips/pile which are relatively low. The existing three span bridge is supported HP8x36 piles. Discuss the existing boring data, existing plans foundation information, new subsurface exploration and need for any additional exploration to be provided with SGR Technical Memo (attach all data and subsurface profile plot): Two borings were taken by the district behind the abutments but no pier borings were obtained. Rock is relativity close at the West abutment (28' below the abutment) while the East abutment boring shows rock around 45' below the East abutment. One 5' core was taken which provided a 23% RQD and an Unconfined Compressive Strength of 875 tsf. which is guite strong for a Shale deposit. No additional data will be needed. Provide the location and maximum height of any new soil fill or magnitude of footing bearing pressure. Estimate the amount and time of the expected settlement. Indicate if further testing, analysis, and/or ground improvement/treatment is necessary: Although there are some soft soils at the site, no significant raise in grade is expected and with no new load, we would not expect any settlement at this location. Identify any new cuts or fill slope angles and heights. Estimate the factor of safety against slope failure. Indicate if further testing, analysis or ground improvement/treatment is necessary: The existing slopes are cut back on a 2:1 with no sign of existing end slope or side slope instability. Given no new loading or change in slope angle, we believe the factor of safety against slope instability if well above the minimum 1.5 required by IDOT. Indicate at each substructure, the 100-year and 200-year total scour depths in the Hydraulics report, the nongranular scour depth reduction, the proposed ground surface, and the recommended foundation design scour elevations: We have developed a scour table shown in red on the draft TSL attached. The soils at Pier 1 are more resistant to scour allowing an overall 21% reduction in the hydraulic report calculated scour depth of 15.9 feet. At Pier 2, the overall scour reduction is only 17 %. The abutments have no scour loss based on the end slopes being riprapped per Bridge manual policy. 200-year scour depths at the piers were less than the 100-year values due to the overtopping which is why the scour table show the same depths for both the 100-year and the 200-year events. Determining the seismic soil site class, the seismic performance zone, the 0.2 and 1.0 second design spectral accelerations and indicate if that the soils are liquefiable: Soil Site Class was determined to be a "D", the SD1 & SDS are equal to 0.497g and 1.144g respectively, which puts the structure in a Seismic Performance Zone of "3". Liquefaction potential evaluation has been checked and found to not be an issue at this site. Confirm feasibility of the proposed foundation or wall type and provide design parameters. Attach a pile design table indicating feasible pile types, various nominal required bearings, factored resistances available and corresponding estimated lengths at locations where piles will be used. Provide factored bearing resistance and unit sliding resistance at various elevations and confirm no ground improvement/treatment is necessary where spread footings are proposed. Estimated top of rock elevations as well as preliminary factored unit side and tip resistance values shall be indicated when drilled shafts are proposed: The depth to bedrock at the West abutment is around 25' which requires an H-pile be used as a metal shell would likely be damaged by the rock prior to getting bearing. However, the depth to rock is apparently highly variable as an H-pile would refuse in bedrock around 45' at the East Abutment. Please see the attached table for a list of Nominal Required Bearings, Factored Resistances Available and the corresponding Estimated Pile Lengths. The H-piles will require a metal shoe due to the relatively hard rock at this site. The pile lengths provided in the attached tables are based on assumed pile cutoff elevations of 370.3' and 367.3' at the piers and abutments respectively. Given this variability, we recommend one test pile be driven at the West Abutment and one be driven at Pier 2. Pier 1 is expected to be shorter than Pier 2 so its test pile can be used to order pier 1. The East Abutment is West of where the boring was taken so ordering this pile based on the boring data top of rock should be conservative and this is reflected in this Report's estimated lengths.

Calculate the estimated water surface elevation and determine the need for cofferdams (type 1 or 2), and seal coat: The estimated water surface elevation (EWSE) was calculated to be equal to 358.7'. Since the pier encasement is 9.1' below the EWSE, Type 2 cofferdams will be required. We do not think a seal coat will be required.

Assess the need for sheeting or soil retention or temporary construction slope and provide recommendation for other construction concerns: The structure will be stage constructed and require Temporary Sheet Piling which is found to be feasible.

## West Abutment Pile Design Table

	Nominal	Factored	Estimated
	Required	Resistance	Pile
	Bearing	Available	Length
	(Kips)	(Kips)	(Ft.)
Steel HP 12 X 53	418	230	41
Steel HP 12 X 63	497	273	41
Steel HP 12 X 74	589	324	42
Steel HP 12 X 84	664	365	42
Steel HP 14 X 73	578	318	43
Steel HP 14 X 89	705	388	43
Steel HP 14 X 102	810	445	44
Steel HP 14 X 117	929	511	44

# East Abutment Pile Design Table

	Nominal	Factored	Estimated
	Required	Resistance	Pile
	Bearing	Available	Length
	(Kips)	(Kips)	(Ft.)
Steel HP 12 X 53	418	230	54
Steel HP 12 X 63	497	273	54
Steel HP 12 X 74	589	324	55
Steel HP 12 X 84	664	365	55
Steel HP 14 X 73	578	318	56
Steel HP 14 X 89	705	388	56
Steel HP 14 X 102	810	445	57
Steel HP 14 X 117	929	511	58

<u>F</u>	Pier 1 Pile Design Table					
	Nominal	Factored	Estimated			
	Required	Resistance	Pile			
	Bearing	Available	Length			
			<i>(</i> <b>_</b> ) )			

	Required	Resistance	Pile
	Bearing	Available	Length
	(Kips)	(Kips)	(Ft.)
Steel HP 12 X 53	418	225	45
Steel HP 12 X 63	497	268	45
Steel HP 12 X 74	589	319	46
Steel HP 12 X 84	664	360	46
Steel HP 14 X 73	578	312	47
Steel HP 14 X 89	705	382	47
Steel HP 14 X 102	810	439	48
Steel HP 14 X 117	929	505	48

# Pier 2 Pile Design Table

	Nominal	Factored	Estimated
	Required	Resistance	Pile
	Bearing	Available	Length
	(Kips)	(Kips)	(Ft.)
Steel HP 12 X 53	418	222	56
Steel HP 12 X 63	497	265	57
Steel HP 12 X 74	589	316	59
Steel HP 12 X 84	664	357	60
Steel HP 14 X 73	578	308	57
Steel HP 14 X 89	705	378	59
Steel HP 14 X 102	810	435	60
Steel HP 14 X 117	929	501	62





ng, Bradly L

From: Sent: To: Subject: Attachments: Belue, Justin T. Tuesday, November 26, 2019 3:34 PM Hessing, Bradly L SN 044-0063 Loads for Pile Type Selection.pdf; Boring Logs.pdf; Foundations Info.pdf

July 19 044-0063

Please see forwarded e-mil from Justin Belue

Brad,

I am beginning work on an in-house TSL. It is a total replacement (3 span slab bridge). The abutments will be replaced with integral abutments. The Structure Report along with the borings and plan & profile is attached. I also attached the preliminary superstructure loads on the proposed abutments & piers, loads for pile type selection.

In order to complete the TSL, please provide an SGR by January 10, 2020.

If you need anything else please let me know. I will also send a request in BPTR.

Thanks, Justin T. Belue Illinois Department of Transportation Bureau of Bridges & Structures – Planning Phone: (217) 782-9254 E-mail: Justin.Belue@illinois.gov

Please consider the environment before printing this email

State of Illinois - CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: The information contained in this communication is confidential, may be attorney-client privileged or attorney work product, may constitute inside information or internal deliberative staff communication, and is intended only for the use of the addressee. Unauthorized use, disclosure or copying of this communication or any part thereof is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. If you have received this communication in error, please notify the sender immediately by return e-mail and destroy this communication and all copies thereof, including all attachments. Receipt by an unintended recipient does not waive attorney-client privilege, attorney work product privilege, or any other exemption from disclosure.

Need 56R m In House 044-0063



BBS 2049 (Rev. 9/06)

12/24/19

## Loads for Pile Type Selection

SN 044-0063

Beam Spacing=	42.833 ft
Number of Lanes=	3
Number of Beams=	1
Out-to Out Width=	42.833 ft
Distribution Factor @ Abutment=	1
Distribution Factor @ Pier=	1

, "B `

. . .

Abutment

ts:		PER BEAM					
		Service		Factored			
	DC1=	174.294	k	217.87	k		
	DC2=	18 99	ĸ	23.74	k		
	DW=	38.73		58.10	k		
	LL+IM=	60.6	k	106.05	k		
	Approach=	145.6333	k	182.04	k		
	Σ	438.2473	k	587.7917	K		

1 1

TOTAL							
	Service		Factored				
DC1=	174.29	k	217.87	k			
DC2=	18.99	k	23.74	k			
DW=	38.73	k	58.10	k			
LL+IM=	154.53	k ·	270.43	k			
Approach=	145.63	k	182.04	k			
Σ	532.18	k	752.17	k			

Piers:	PER BEAM					
		ſ	Service		Factored	
	DC1=		364.63	k	455.79	k
	DC2=		39	k	49.66	k
	DW=		81.03	k,	121.55	k
	LL+IM=		94.2	k	164.85	k
		Σ	579.59	k	791.845	×

	TOTAL					
	Service		Factored			
DC1=	364.63	k	455.79	k		
DC2=	39.73	k	49.66	k ·		
DW=	81.03	k	121.55	k		
LL+IM=	240.21	k	420.37	k		
Σ	725.60	k	1047.36	k		



# **Illinois Department of Transportation**

Memorandum

To:	Carrie Nelsen	Attn: Dave Piche	
From:	Keith Roberts	By: Aaron Hayes	AWH
Subject:	Boring Logs SN 044-0053		
Date:	July 30, 2018		

### FAP 885 (IL 146) over Little Cache Creek Structure 044-0053 Johnson County

Foundation boring logs have been obtained for the above listed structure and are attached.

Attachments AH:ah

cc: Soils File

	1	LLINOI	S DEP Distr	ARTMEN ict Ni	T OF TRANSPORTATION ne Materials	1	Bridge I Boring J	loundat Log	ion
FAP 885 (IL 146) Over Litt]	le Cach	e Creek					Sheet 1	of l	
Route: FAP 885 (IL 146 St	tructur	e Numbe	r: 044	-0053	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Date	:	5/6/20:	18
Section 110-BC-1					Bo	red By:	L Este	: <b>1</b>	
County: Johnson	Loca	tion:_0	.1 mil	e East	of US 45 Chec	ked By:	A Haye	5	
Porting No 1-9	D	в			Surf Wat Elev:	— D	В		
Etation 32+59	E	L			Ground Water Elevation	E	L	i	1
Offset 7' Lt CI.	┥╏│	0	00		when brilling	- 2	0	<b>O</b> 12	
Ground Surface 371.9 Ft		S S	tsf	W%	At completion	-	W	uu tef	Wey.
Acabalt (184)					AL: AIS:		3		
Aspirait (10)					very loose, wet, grey, Sand		WH		
370.4									
Stiff, moist, brown and grey,		2			344.9		WH		
Silty Clay Loam A-4		3	1.85	18	Very soft, wet, grey, Silt Loam		WH	0.2\$	60
		5			A-4 with rotten wood		WН		
	]				343.4				
367.9					Very loose, wet, grey, Sand				
Sort, very moist to wet, grey,		WH	0.47		342.4		1		
Sin Loain A-4	5.0	WM O	0.48	26	Very stiff, moist, grey streaked	30.0	7	2.05	26
	2  brown, Clay to weathered Clay  12    365.4  Shale								
365.4					Shale				
Soft, very moist, grey, Silty Clay		WH					8		
Loam A-4		WH	0.4B	27	-		15		
		WH					20	_	
362.9									
Medium, moist, grey, Siity Ciay	10.0	1	0.00		<u>337.4</u>	0.5.0	17		-
Loan A-4	10.0	1	0.98	23	Hard, dry, grey, Clay Shale	35.0	100/12		
		!							
360.4						·			
Stiff, moist, grey, Silty Clay Loam		WH							
A-4		2	1.1B	23					
		3							
357.9		18/11							
Clav I nam A-4	15.0		0.68	25			100/6"		
	10.0	2	0.00	20	Elevation referenced to BM B105	40.0			
		<u> </u>		-	= 371.6 feet				
355.4									
Stiff, moist to very moist, grey,		WH			To convert "N" values to "N60"				
Silty Clay Loam A-4		1	1.3B	24	multiply by 1.5				
		2		· · · · ·					
Medium very moiet brown Cilb					Clau Shala		400511		
Clav A-6	20.0	<u> </u>	0.78	70		AE 0	100"1"		
	20.0	2	0.70	<i>C1</i>		40.0			
				•	Bottom of hole = 44.1 feet			•····	
350.4									
Very soft, wet, grey, Silt Loam		WH			Free water observed at 25.0 feet				
A-4		WH	0.2B	26					
· · ·		WH			Elevation referenced to BM R105				
1					= 371.6 feet				
· ·		WH							
346.9	25.0	WH				50.0			
	_						L		

ŗ

N-Std Pentr Test: 2" OD Sampler, 140# Hammer, 30" Fall (Type Fail. B-Bulge S-Shear E-Estimated P-Penetrometer)

### .

#### ILLINOIS DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION District Nine Materials

-

» ۲۰۰۰

> Bridge Foundation Boring Log Sheet 1 of 2

> > .

FAP 885 (IL 146) Over Littl	e Cachi	e Creek	2				Sheet 1	of 2	
Route: FAP 885 (IL 146 St	ructur	e Numbe	er: 044-	-0053		Date	:6	5/13/20	18
Section 110-BC-1					Во	red By:	L Este	<u>}1</u>	
County: Johnson	_ Loca	tion:_0	.1 mile	e East	of US 45 Check	ked By:	A Haye	8	<u> </u>
		R			Surf Wat Elev:		R		
Boring No 2-S	- Ĕ	ĩ			Ground Water Elevation	E	Ľ		
Station 34+16	- P	0			when Drilling 25.5	_ P	0		
Offset 7' Rt CL	- <u> </u>	W	Qu		At Completion	_  T	W	Qu	
Ground Surface 372.7 Ft	Н	S	LSI	₩%	At: Hrs:	Н	S	tsi	W%
25" Asphalt					347.2		2	·····	
-					Loose, wet, grey, Fine Sand				
					0.57				
Stiff moist brown and grov Silby			1 52	17	345.7			0.48	
Clay Loam A-4			['9E	17	Sity Clay A-6 with rotten wood		14/LL	V.4D	20
-					Sinty Chay Aro with rottent wood		4411		
368.7					343.7				
Medium, very moist, brown, Silty		1			Soft to medium, very moist, grey,		WH		
Clay to Silty Clay Loam A-6	5.0	1	0.8B	22	Clay A7-6	30.0	WH	0.5B	32
		1	····				WH		
· · ·									
366.2						·			
Medium, moist to very moist, grey,		1					<u></u>		
Siit Loam A-4		2	0.88	22			WH	0.58	30
-		.4		•		·	<u> </u>		
363.7					338.7				ļ
Soft, very moist, grey, Silt Loam		WH			Soft, very moist, grey, Clay A7-6		WH		
A-4	10.0	1	0.4B	27		35.0	WH	0.3B	27
-		2					WH		
-							\$		
361.2	<i>,</i> ,,				336.2				
Very soft, wet, grey, Silt Loam		<u>WH</u>					<u>WH</u>		
A-4		WM	0.28	29	Son, very moist, grey, Silty Clay		WH	0.4B	27
-		<u> YV N</u>			A-0		<u></u>		
358.7					333.7				
Stiff, moist, brown mottled arey.		1			Medium, very moist, arey, Silty		WH		
Silt Loam to Silty Clay Loam A-4	15.0	3	1.2B	24	Clay to Silty Clay Loam A-6	40.0	WH	0.7B	34
		3					1		
356.2		_							
-		2							
Wedium, moist, brown, Silt A-4		6	0.85	23					
-			······						
					328.7				
•		2			Soft, very moist to wet, grey,		WH		
_	20.0	6	0.85	19	Silty Clay Loam A-4 with Sand	45.0	WH	0.4B	31
		6			layers		wн		•
351.2					4				
Medium, very moist, brown,		1			4				
Sity Clay Loam A-6		2	0.6B	26					
-		2							
348.7					323.7	·			
Soft, very moist, grey, Silty Clay		WH			Very loose, wet, grev. Sand and		3		
A-6	25.0	1	0.3B	28	Gravel	50.0	1		

N-Std Pentr Test: 2" OD Sampler, 1404 Hammer, 30" Fall (Type Fail. B-Bulge S-Shear E-Estimated P-Penetrometer)

	(				C					
								Sheet 2	2 of 2	
Section: 110-BC-1							Date		67	13/2018
County: Johnson										
Boring No: 2-S		BL					D E	B L		
Offset: 7' Rt CL	┥╏	O W	00				P	0	0.	
Ground Surface: 372.71	t H	S	tsf	W%			н	S	tsf	W%
59% Sand		1	····							
3% Clay										
25% Gravel		1								
Hard. drv. grev. Clav Shale	•····									
		]								
Auger refusel 318.2		100/2*				-				
	55.0						80.0			
Cored 54.2 to 59.2 feet										
88% Recovery; 23% RQD										
Manual and the second study		]								
grey and dark			12125.0	) .						
Shale turning to Sandstone at @		]								
58.0 feet 313.2	·····	4								
	60.0	5					85.0			
		4								
Bottom of hole = 59.2 feet	<del>رور برمین این این این این این این این این این ا</del>									
Free writer observed at 05 5 feet		-								
Free water observed at 25.5 teet										
Elevation referenced to BM at	<u> </u>									
NE wingwall = 371.6 feet										
To convert "N" values to "N60"	65.0	2					90.0			
multiply by 1.5	·									
		4				_				
		4								
	•	]								
	<u></u>	1								
	70.0	1				-	95.0			
		4								
		1								
	<del></del>	4								
		1								
		-								
		-								
	75.0	]			<u>_</u>		100.0			

### N-Std Pentr Test: 2" OD Sampler, 1404 Hammer, 30" Fall (Type Fail. B-Bulge S-Shear E-Estimated P-Penetrometer)

Illinois Department of Transportation District Nine Materials Unconfined Compressive Strength

FAP 885 (IL 146) Structure 044-0053 (Boring 2-S) Johnson County



Boring #	Specimen#	Depth	Unconfined Compression
2-S	1	57.2'	12,125 psi
2-8	2	57.7'	12,189 psi

### \*Both samples manually stopped, no break

Foundation Core Instructions Use 1.78" for the diameter 3.8" is the length

$$\frac{\pi d^2}{4} = 2.487$$

Pounds divided by 2.487 = psi

Number	DO (IL 140)	146) Section: Contract: 7			~			-		****************			•		-			<u>,</u>		
		ntract	:		T	Uwr	ner:						Tested By				K. Hichards			
Lab Number			1				<u>.</u>													
Stauon		34	+16	10 45			<b>6</b>										ļ			
	0.		2. OF L	<u>JS 45</u>	·				<b> </b>								<b> </b>			
		49.0	- 52.	5'	<u> </u>		ikasakaanna.		ļ								<u> </u>			
Suil Type (7 nour 10 minute)	<u> </u>	8	AL		<b> </b>				ļ	<del>~~~~~</del>							Ļ			
Subgrade Group (7 hour 10	minute)				<u> </u>		• • • •										<u> </u>			
Soil Type (1 hour)	•	. <b>.</b>	AL'		1.	•	•			• •		• •	. •	• •	•		· · .	• •		
Subgrade Group (1 hour)	•				•	8	• •		•	• •	*	•		•	* 1	• •	•	• •		
Weight Ret. #10 Sieve		9	5.3		1												1			
% Ret. #10 Sieve		2	4.7		1												1			
Wet Hygroscopic		1	00		1												1			
Dry Hygroscopic					<u> </u>				<u> </u>								<u> </u>			
% Hygroscopic									1					*******			1			
Wt. Hydrometer Sample		1	00		1				<u> </u>								<u> </u>			
Corr, WT, Hvd, Sample			9.67		1				1								<b> </b>			
Correction Factor		1	003		1				<u> </u>						<del>.</del>	<del></del>	<u> </u>			
Sand %		59	• 1	59 *	+		•		ł		4 1	•				•			•	
Silt %		13		11 •	1		- <b>*</b>	<b>s</b>				•				<u></u>				
Clav %		3		5 -	1		-					-	-		• _ •		├──			
Hydrometer Beeding		Τρ			T												┝┯		$\frac{1}{2}$	
2 Min		+	+	1.011	1	<u>  ∩</u>			<u> </u>	<u> </u>			<u> </u>	. п			┢╧┙		卢	
5 Min		+	+			+										<u> </u>		┞──	┢─	
15 Min			+			<del>                                      </del>	<u> </u>												╂	
30 Min			+		<del> </del>		<u> </u>	<u> </u>		<u> </u>							┼───	<b> </b>	┢	
60 Min.			+						<b> </b>	þ•					<b> </b>	┼─┯	┢╼──		┢	
250 Min	70:	0 10.5		5.7	<u> -</u>	f	┼──	<b> </b> -'	<b></b>		••••	<b></b>		•••	<b></b>	<b>?</b>	<u> </u>	•	ŀ	
420 Min.			+	+	┼───			-				-			┠───		╂────		┢──	
1/40 Min	/0.	0 8.0	-4,8	4.2													┢───		┢	
	14	TOET		2466			N 0		14/7		0/ 5								$\frac{1}{2}$	
#40 Sieve	• ( ) and a second s		/8 1	000		nci		7499	1.441		78.5	<u>455</u>			76 1	<u>'A55</u>		REI	<u>+×</u>	
#50 Sleve			+				<u> </u>										+		┢─	
#200 Sieve		78 7		11	┼───			•							ļ				+	
<u>«200 0,010</u>		0.1	<u>,                                     </u>	<u> </u>	L		1	· · · · · · · · ·	L	IQUI	) LIM	IT			L		L		J	
Pat. Number																				
Pat. Weight					<u> </u>															
Wt. Soil + Wet Pat.			1		<u> </u>		Į		l											
Wt. Soll + Dry Pat.					<u> </u>		l													
% Moisture																				
Number Blows																				
Correction Factor																				
Liquid Limit						·														
Pat. Number									Pl 	_AST		AI T	l				T			
Pat. Weight					1												<u>†</u>		•*******	
Wt. Soil + Wet Pat.			1		1	·	T										<del> </del>		T	
Wt. Soil + Dry Pat		<del></del>	1			·····			<u> </u>		<u> </u>				<del> </del>		+		+	
Plastic Limit			1		<u> </u>		<b>.</b>				L				L		+		<u> </u>	
Plasticity Index							•		<u> </u>				<u>}</u>	··· ·		•••••••			<u>.</u>	
A ROUGH HINGY	L	COM	2021	TET	EMP	FRAT		<u>. co</u>	RPF	CTIO	NH			'EQ	(Not	2021	L			
66*F -	-5.7	60*5	ابات محد _:	· •		72*5				75+5			ا عتنا ۲۷۷	7096	11 Mar 	03		0400		
67*F =	-5.5	70*5	), ر کار س	, l		79.5		,		75*				70°r	= -3.1 0.1	1		01.12		
	5.0			•		10 5	4,0	•		101	0.3			19.6	2.2	,		o∠*F	a -2	

 $\bigcirc$