STRUCTURE GEOTECHNICAL REPORT KEAN AVENUE CULVERT AT STATION 77+13.55 EX SN 016-1255, PR SN 016-2298 COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS

For Collins Engineers, Inc. 123 North Wacker Drive, Suite 900 Chicago, IL 60606

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

> > Original Report: August 16, 2017 Revised Report: November 8, 2017

	-	0	
1. Title and Subtitle Structure Geotechnical Repor	2. Original Date: August 16, 2017 Revised Date: November 8, 2017		
//+13.55	3. Report Type ⊠ SGR □ RGR □ Draft ⊠ Final ⊠ Revised		
4. Route / Section / County/ Distr FAU 2721/ 10-37-12 / Cook/	5. Contract IDOT 62D40		
6. PTB / Item No. 182/04	7. Existing Structure Number(s) SN 016-1255	8. Proposed Structure Number(s) SN 016-2298	
9. Prepared by Wang Engineering, Inc. 1145 N Main Street Lombard, IL 60148	Contributor(s) Author: M. Kothawala, P.E., D.GE QA/QC: Mickey Snider, P.E. PM: M. Kothawala, P.E., D.GE	Contact (630) 953-9928 ext. 1036 mkothawala@wangeng.com	
10. Prepared for Collins Engineers, Inc. 123 N Wacker Drive Suite 900 Chicago, IL, 60606	Design Engineer HBM Engineering Group, LLC 4415 West Harrison Street Hillside, IL 60162	Contact (773) 236-0960 Mahmoud.issa@hbmengineering.com	
 11. Abstract The existing single-cell bowill be removed and replainterior openings of 7-foot 936.0 feet. Invert elevations The culvert will have 6-food design and construction of the sense of the pavement and of soft to stiff silty clay to Deeper foundation soils into measured at elevations ran the Estimated Water Surfaindewatering for the foundat. The proposed culvert in excavations up to 13 feet foundations; however, as a driven metal shell piles. V the foundation soils along with the differential settler. The proposed wingwall let per IDOT <i>Culvert Manual</i> below the invert elevation. Any temporary slopes that sheet piles. Our analyses i be feasible.	ox culvert carrying Kean Avenue over ced with a new double-cell concrete bo wide by 3-foot high and a total width of will be at 660.56 feet at the upstream en- t horizontal wingwalls. This report prov he proposed culvert and wingwalls. up to 4 feet of fill material, the general I clay loam with organic matter and sand clude stiff to very stiff silty clay to silty ging from 653 to 654 feet, primarily w ace Elevation is 662.52 feet. Tempora ion excavations protected by steel sheet stallation as well as recommended from existing grade. It will be feast in alternative to the removal and replace With the recommended removal and re the culvert will undergo a maximum co- nent of 0.5 inch or less. mgth of 6.0 feet complies with the requi (2017). The horizontal cantilever walls cannot be sloped 1:1 (V:H) or flatter s ndicate that temporary sheet pile desig	an Unnamed Ditch at Station 77+13.55 ox culvert. The new culvert will have two 15.5 feet. The culvert length will measure and and 660.32 feet at the downstream end. ides geotechnical recommendation for the lithologic profile includes up to 4 to 9 feet d lenses followed by loose granular soils. y clay loam. The groundwater level was within the sand and silt. As per TSL plan, ry ditch diversion as well as temporary t piling will be required. removal and replacement will require ible to construct the culvert on shallow beement, the culvert could be supported on placement, our settlement analyses show onsolidation settlement of 0.5 inch or less rements for horizontal cantilever walls as should be founded a minimum of 3.0 feet	

Technical Report Documentation Page

12. Path to archived file

S:\Netprojects\4862301\Reports\SN 016_2298_North\RPT_Wang_NSB_MAK_4862301_SN016_2298_v05_20171108.doc



TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0	INTRODUCTION	1
1.1	PROPOSED STRUCTURE	1
1.2	EXISTING STRUCTURE AND LAND USE	1
2.0	METHODS OF INVESTIGATION	2
2.1	Field Investigation	2
2.2	LABORATORY TESTING	2
3.0	INVESTIGATION RESULTS	3
3.1	LITHOLOGICAL PROFILE	3
3.2	GROUNDWATER CONDITIONS	4
4.0	FOUNDATION ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	4
4.1	Culvert Foundations	4
4.2	SETTLEMENT	5
4.3	GLOBAL STABILITY	6
4.4	CAST-IN-PLACE OR PRECAST CULVERT CONSIDERATIONS	6
4.5	STAGE CONSTRUCTION	6
5.0	CONSTRUCTION CONSIDERATIONS	6
5.1	SITE PREPARATION	6
5.2	EXCAVATION, DEWATERING AND UTILITIES	6
5.3	FILLING AND BACKFILLING	7
5.4	EARTHWORK OPERATIONS	7
6.0	QUALIFICATIONS	8
REF	ERENCES	9



EXHIBITS

1. SITE LOCATION MAP

2. BORING LOCATION PLAN

3. SUBSURFACE SOIL PROFILE

APPENDIX A

BORING LOGS

APPENDIX B

LABORATORY TEST RESULTS

APPENDIX C

TSL PLAN

LIST OF TABLES



STRUCTURE GEOTECHNICAL REPORT KEAN AVENUE CULVERT AT STATION 77+13.55 EX SN 016-1255, PR SN 016-2298 COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS FOR COLLINS ENGINEERS, INC.

1.0 INTRODUCTION

This report presents the results of the Wang Engineering, Inc. (Wang) subsurface investigation, laboratory testing, and geotechnical evaluations to support the design and reconstruction of a culvert carrying Kean Avenue over an Unnamed Ditch at Station 77+13.55 in Palos Hills, Cook County, Illinois. A *Site Location Map* is presented as Exhibit 1.

1.1 Proposed Structure

Based on the *TSL Plan* provided by HBM Engineering Group, Inc. on November 8, 2017, the proposed culvert will be a concrete double box with two interior openings of 7-foot wide by 3-foot high and a total width of 15.5 feet. The culvert length will measure 36.0 feet. The upstream invert elevation will be established at 661.56 feet, while the downstream invert elevation will be at 661.32 feet with the flow from east to west. The new structure will be constructed in the same location as the existing culvert; however, it will be longer and wider than existing one. The culvert end will have 6-foot long horizontal wingwalls at each corner. The proposed roadway grade elevation will be 665.76 feet. The TSL plan is included in Appendix C.

It is understood the proposed culvert design will be in accordance with 2014 AASHTO *LRFD Bridge Design Specifications* with 2015 and 2016 interims except as modified by 2017 IDOT *Culvert Manual*.

1.2 Existing Structure and Land Use

The existing culvert is a single cell cast-in-place concrete box culvert with an interior opening of 10-foot wide by 3-foot high and 32.2-foot long. The surrounding land is the Cook County Forest Preserve's open wetland area on the west side and developed area on the east side of Kean Avenue.



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.

2.0 METHODS OF INVESTIGATION

2.1 Field Investigation

The subsurface investigation consisted of two structure borings, designated as 1255-CUL-01 and 1255-CUL-02. The borings were drilled by Wang on July 18 and 19, 2017. The as-drilled northings, eastings, and elevations were acquired with a mapping-grade GPS unit. Stations and offsets were provided by HBM. Boring location data are presented in the *Boring Logs* (Appendix A). The as-drilled boring locations are shown in the *Boring Location Plan* (Exhibit 2).

A truck- mounted drilling rig, equipped with hollow stem augers, was used to advance and maintain open boreholes. Soil sampling was performed according to AASHTO 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. 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.

2.2 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. 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).

3.0 INVESTIGATION RESULTS

Detailed descriptions of the soil conditions encountered during the subsurface investigation are presented in the attached *Boring Logs* (Appendix A) and in the *Soil Profile* (Exhibit 3). Please note that strata contact lines represent approximate boundaries between soil types. The actual transition between soil types in the field may be gradual in horizontal and vertical directions.

3.1 Lithological Profile

The borings advanced through pavement encountered 9 to 9.5 inch thick asphalt over 4.8 inch thick sandy gravel or 8 inch thick concrete. In descending order, the general lithologic succession encountered beneath the surface includes: 1) man-made ground (fill); 2) soft to stiff organic silty clay loam to clay loam; and 3) stiff to very stiff silty clay to silty clay loam.

1) Man-made Ground (Fill)

Beneath the pavement, the borings revealed 2 to 4 feet of fill materials. The fill is cohesive, consisting of medium stiff to very stiff silty clay to silty clay loam with organic matter. Boring 1255-CUL-01 encountered buried topsoil beneath cohesive fill. The unconfined compressive strength (Q_u) values range from 0.8 to 2.5 tsf with an average of 1.8 tsf and the moisture content values of 14 to 25%.

2) Soft to stiff silty clay to clay loam

Beneath the fill at elevations of 659 to 662 feet, the borings encountered 4 to 9 feet of soft to stiff, dark gray to gray silty clay to clay loam with organic matter. The cohesive soils have Q_u values of 0.4 to 1.1 tsf. The moisture content values through the full extent of this layer range from 33 to 67%. Laboratory index testing on samples from this unit showed liquid limit (L_L) values of 63 to 84% and plastic limits (P_L) values of 26 to 35%.

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

Beginning at elevations of 653 to 655 feet, the borings encountered gray, stiff to very stiff silty clay to silty clay loam with silt and sand lenses. The unit has Q_u values of 1.0 to 2.8 tsf and moisture content values of 11 to 28%. Loose, gray silt and sand lenses has N values of 5 to 8 blows per foot and moisture content values of 16 to 17%.



3.2 Groundwater Conditions

Groundwater was encountered while drilling at elevations of 653 and 654 (10 and 12 feet bgs). At the completion of drilling, the groundwater was observed at an elevation of 625 feet (39 and 40 feet bgs). As per the TSL plan, the Estimated Water Surface Elevation (EWSE) is 662.52 feet.

4.0 FOUNDATION ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Geotechnical evaluations and recommendations for the culvert are included in the following sections. Wang has performed bearing capacity, settlement, and global stability analyses for the culvert barrel and wingwalls. In addition, Wang has also evaluated the feasibility of cast-in-place and precast options based on foundation soils and new embankment loads.

4.1 Culvert Foundations

Based on our subsurface investigation, the foundation soils at the base of the culvert barrel are primarily soft to medium stiff, high moisture silty clay to clay loam with organic matter overlying by loose granular soils and stiff to hard cohesive soils. The soft to medium stiff soils or loose granular soils are up to 8 feet thick of the upstream end and up to 5 feet thick of the downstream end. We recommend removing these soils to an elevation of 652 feet at the upstream end and 655 feet at the downstream end and replacing it with Rockfill. The Rockfill should be capped with 6 inches of CA-7 and satisfy IDOT Standard Specifications. There is no removal and replacement information available for the existing culver construction. We recommend showing the removal and replacement on the plan for the full length of the proposed culvert. The actual depth of removal and replacement should be determined in the field during construction. The replacement material should extend a minimum of two feet beyond each side of the box (IDOT 2016).

Following the recommended removal and replacement, the recommended factored bearing resistance for culvert barrels is 3,000 psf with a bearing resistance factor of 0.45 (AASHTO, 2014). Culvert barrels should be designed based on lateral earth pressure diagram determined according to IDOT *Culvert Manual* (IDOT, 2017).

As an alternative to the removal and replacement, the proposed culvert could be supported on metal shell piles. The pile lengths were calculated with the spreadsheet, *IDOT Static Method of Estimating Pile Length vs Resistance*. The R_F , R_N , estimated pile tip elevations, and pile lengths for 12-inch diameter metal shell piles (MSP) are summarized in Table 1. The lengths shown in the table



assume a 1-foot pile penetration into the pile cap. We estimate the relative settlement between the pile and soil will be more than 0.4 inches; therefore, there will be downdrag load on piles.

Cable 1: Estimated Pile Lengths and Tip Elevations for 12-inch Diameter w/0.25-inch Walls Metal Shell Piles								
Limits (Reference	Culvert Base Elevation	Required Nominal Bearing, R _N	Factored Geotechnical Loss	Factored Geotechnical Load Loss	Factored Resistance Available, R _F	Total Estimated Pile Length	Estimated Pile Tip Elevation	
Boring)	(feet)	(kips)	(kips)	(kips)	(kips)	(feet)	(feet)	
		89	6	12	30	19	641.5	
		106	6	12	40	22	638.5	
Downstream 1255-CUL-01	659.5	124	6	12	50	23	637.5	
		143	6	12	60	27	633.5	
		161	6	12	70	28	632.5	
		343(*)	6	12	171	32	628.5	
Upstream 1255-CUL-02	659.7	99	8	16	30	20	640.7	
		117	8	16	40	22	638.7	
		135	8	16	50	27	633.7	
		153	8	16	60	32	628.7	
		160(*)	8	16	64	33	627.7	

(*) Maximum Nominal Bearing at boring depth.

4.2 Settlement

Based on the plan and profile drawings, an approximately 0.7 feet of grade raise is proposed. The consolidation settlement of the foundation soils under the proposed culvert is estimated to be less than one inch across the existing embankment portion; however, without removal and replacement, the culvert in the widening portions of embankment will experience up to 2 inches of consolidation settlement.

Following the recommended removal and replacement, we estimate the foundation soils will



experience consolidation settlement of 0.5 inch in the widening portion of the culvert with the differential settlement of less than 0.5 inch.

4.3 Global Stability

Since the horizontal cantilever wingwalls will be utilized at the each corner, we do not anticipate any global instability concerns.

4.4 Cast-In-Place or Precast Culvert Considerations

The results of the settlement analyses indicate that the cast-in-place culvert is feasible if the unstable soil is removed and replaced with aggregate. Due to insuffient cover between the bottom of pavement to the top of the top slab (<6" per Culvert Manual 2.1.4), the precast alternate is not allowed. The differential settlement will be about 0.5 inch which will not cause excessive separation of the precast sections. A cast-in-place culvert will be required if the proposed culvert is supported on piles.

4.5 Stage Construction

The construction will be in one stage since the traffic will be fully detoured.

5.0 CONSTRUCTION CONSIDERATIONS

5.1 Site Preparation

Vegetation, surface topsoil, and debris should be cleared and stripped where the structure will be placed. If unstable or unsuitable materials are exposed during excavation, they should be removed and replaced with compacted fill as described in Section 6.3.

5.2 Excavation, Dewatering, and Utilities

Excavations should be performed in accordance with local, state, and federal regulations. The potential effect of ground movements upon nearby utilities should be considered during construction. The proposed culvert installation, including the recommended removal and replacement, will require excavations up to 13 feet from the existing grade. We performed global slope stability analysis for a temporary excavation slope along the length of the culvert (across the roadway) considering undrained condition (short term). The minimum factor of safety (FOS) calculated was 4.2 for a temporary slope of 1:1 (V:H) with traffic load and 5.8 without traffic load. The IDOT accepts minimum FOS of 1.30 for a temporary cut slope. Any slopes that cannot be sloped 1:1 (V:H) or flatter should be properly shored with temporary sheet piling. Our analyses indicate that temporary sheet pile



design in accordance with the IDOT AGMU 3.13.1 Charts will be feasible.

During the subsurface investigation, the groundwater was encountered at elevations ranging from 653 to 654 feet and the Estimated Water Surface Elevation is 662.52 feet. At the culvert, the groundwater will be encountered at the founding level which is 7 to 10 feet above the anticipated excavation level. Temporary ditch diversion as well as temporary dewatering system for the foundation excavations will be required to construct the culvert.

Depending upon prevailing climatic conditions and the time of the year when construction take place, control of runoff and maintenance of existing flows will require temporary water diversion and control. The temporary water diversion could be achieved by routing the ditch channel to adjacent creek channel. Water that does accumulate in open excavations by seepage or runoff should be immediately removed by sump pump method.

5.3 Filling and Backfilling

Fill material required to attain the final design subgrade elevations should be in accordance with Section 205, Embankment (IDOT 2016). All fill and backfill materials should be pre-approved by the site engineer. The fill should be free of organic materials and debris.

Replacement material below the culvert barrel should be Rockfill capped with 6 inches of CA-7 and satisfy the IDOT Standard Specifications. Backfill materials for the wingwalls should be pre-approved by the Resident Engineer. We recommend porous granular material conforming to the requirements specified in the 2017 IDOT Supplemental Specification, *Granular Backfill for Structures*.

5.4 Earthwork Operations

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

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



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

6.0 QUALIFICATIONS

The analysis and recommendations submitted in this report are based upon the data obtained from the borings drilled at the locations shown on the boring logs and in Exhibit 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 Collins Engineers, 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.

wallethandla_

Mohammed Kothawala, P.E., D.GE. 11-8-17 Sr. Project manager/Sr. Geotechnical Engineer

18-Balar

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



Mallathesale

Mickey L. Snider, P.E. QA/QC Reviewer

License Expires: 11-30-17



REFERENCES

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF STATE HIGHWAY TRANSPORTATION OFFICIALS (2014) "AASHTO LRFD Bridge Design Specifications." United States Depart of Transportation, Washington, D.C.

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 Manaul. Illinois Department of Transportation



EXHIBITS





WATERWAY INFORMATION

	Existing Overtopping Elev. = 664.66 at Sta. 77+50 Proposed Overtopping Elev. = 665.36 at Sta. 77+95						
е	Opening Sq. Ft.		Nat.	Head - Ft.		Headwater El.	
	Exist.	Prop.	H.W.E.	Exist.	Prop.	Exist.	Prop.
						663.88	663.73
						664.74	664.20
						664.97	664.64
						664.91	
							665.58
						665.04	665.43

 $\triangleleft W$



11X17 4862301.GPJ WANGENG.GDT 8/3/1

 $E \triangleright$





APPENDIX A







APPENDIX B



SU 4862301.GPJ Ы SIZE GRAIN



4862301.GPJ US_LAB.GDT ATTERBERG LIMITS IDH



ORGANIC CONTENT in SOILS by LOSS on IGNITION

ASTM D 2974, Method C

Client: Collins Engineers Project: Kean Ave. Culverts WEI Job: 486-23-01 **Type/Condition: SS** Testing Furnace Temp °C.: 440

Analyst Name: A. Mohammed Date Received: 7/20/2017 Date Tested: 7/24/2017 Soil Sample ID: 1255-CUL-02,No.3(6-7.5 ft.) Sample Description: Brown Clay Loam

Moisture	Wet soil +	Dry Soil + tare	Tare mass	w (%)
Content	tare (g)	(g)	(g)	
oven-dry method	53.96	46.62	36.47	72

Ash Contant	Dry Soil +	Ash + tare (α)	Tare mass	Ash Content
Asn Content	tare (g)	(g)	(g)	(70)
Loss On Ignition	46.62	45.62	36.47	90

Organic Content (%)=

9.9

Prepared by:

Checked by:

Date: 8717





APPENDIX C



	Existing Overtopping Elev. = 664.91 at Sta. 77+50 Proposed Overtopping Elev. = 665.58 at Sta. 77+95						
e	Opening Sq. Ft.		Nat.	Head - Ft.		Headwater El.	
	Exist.	Prop.	H.W.E.	Exist.	Prop.	Exist.	Prop.
	N⁄A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	663.88	663.73
	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	664.74	664.20
	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	664.97	664.64
	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	664.91	
	N⁄A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		665.58
	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	665.04	665.43