

River Street (SR 164) Soil Stabilization Willoughby, Ohio

$\frac{1}{2}$ **Geotechnical Subsurface Investigation and Conceptual Alternatives Evaluation Report**

City of Willoughby Ohio

December 21, 2023

CT Project No. 231093

CT Consultants, Inc.

8150 Sterling Court Mentor , OH 44060 440-951-9000 www.ctconsultants.com

December 21, 2023 CT Project No. 231093

Mr. Robert Fiala City of Willoughby 1 Public Square Willoughby, Ohio 44094

Re: Geotechnical Subsurface Investigation & Conceptual Alternatives Evaluation River Street Soil Stabilization Willoughby, Ohio

Dear Mr. Fiala:

Following is the final report of the geotechnical subsurface investigation performed by CT Consultants, Inc. (CT) for the referenced project conducted for City of Willoughby. This study was performed in accordance with CT Proposal No. P231093, dated June 28, 2023..

This report contains the results of our study, our engineering interpretation of the results with respect to the project characteristics, and our recommendations for design and construction of a proposed soldier pile retaining wall. Soil samples collected during this investigation will be stored at our laboratory for 90 days from the date of this report. The samples will be discarded after this time unless you request that they be saved or delivered to you.

Should you have any questions regarding this report or require additional information, please contact our office.

Respectfully,

CT Consultants, Inc.

Imad El Hajjar Curtis E. Roupe, P.E. Geotechnical Project Manager Vice President/Market Leader

 E

GEOTECHNICAL SUBSURFACE INVESTIGATION RIVER STREET SOIL STABILIZATION WILLOUGHBY, OHIO

FOR

CITY OF WILLOUGHBY 1 PUBLIC SQUARE WILLOUGHBY, OHIO 44094

SUBMITTED

DECEMBER 21, 2023 CT PROJECT NO. 231094

> CT CONSULTANTS, INC. 8150 STERLING COURT MENTOR , OH 44060 (440) 951-9000

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page No.

PLATES

Appendix

- A Logs of Test Borings
- B Legend Key
- C Tabulation of Test Data

City of Willoughby
CT Project No. 231093

Appendix (Cont'd)

- D Laboratory Test Results
- E Rock Core Photo Logs
- F Site Photographs
- G Slope Stability Analysis Outputs
- H L-Pile Analysis Outputs
- I Subgrade Analysis Outputs

1.0 INTRODUCTION

This report describes the investigative and testing procedures, presents the findings, discusses our evaluations and conclusions, and provides our design and construction recommendations for a proposed soldier pile retaining wall.

This report has been prepared for City of Willoughby. This study was performed in accordance with CT Proposal No. P231093, dated June 28, 2023.

The purpose of this investigation was to evaluate the subsurface conditions and laboratory data relative to the design and construction of pavements at the referenced site. This investigation included two (2) test borings, field and laboratory soil testing, and a geotechnical engineering evaluation of the test results.

This report includes:

- A description of the subsurface soil and groundwater conditions encountered in the borings.
- Design recommendations for a proposed retaining wall.
- Recommendations concerning soil and groundwater-related construction procedures such as site preparation, earthwork, pavement subgrade preparation, and related field testing.

2.0 INVESTIGATIVE PROCEDURES

This subsurface investigation included two (2) test borings performed on September 15 and 18, 2023 and were designated as B-1 and B-2. Two borings were conducted along River Street, in the general area of the proposed site for the retaining wall. Ground surface elevations at the boring locations were depicted from Google Earth and are reported to the nearest foot. The approximate locations of the test borings are shown on the Test Boring Location Plan (Plate 2.0).

The test borings were performed in general accordance with geotechnical investigative procedures outlined in ASTM Standard D 1586, ASTM D 1452, or ASTM D 6151. The test borings performed during this investigation were drilled with a truck-mounted drill rig with utilizing 3¼-inch diameter hollow-stem augers. The borings extended approximately 40 feet below surface grades and included 10 feet of rock coring.

During auger advancement, soil samples were collected continuously within the overburden soils strata and at approximate 2.5-foot intervals therafter. Split-spoon samples were obtained by the Standard Penetration Test (SPT) Method (ASTM D 1586), which consists of driving a 2-inch outside diameter split-barrel sampler into the soil with a 140-pound weight falling freely through a distance of 30 inches. The sampler was driven in three successive 6 inch increments with the number of blows per increment being recorded. The sum of the number of blows required to advance the sampler the second and third 6-inch increments is termed the Standard Penetration Resistance (N-value) and is presented on the Logs of Test Borings which are attached to this report. The split-spoon samples were sealed in jars and transported to our laboratory for further classification and testing.

Two ten-foot core runs were completed immediately following auger refusal in Borings B-1 and B-2. Recovery of the core is expressed as the percentage ratio of the recovered rock length to the total length of the core run. The Rock Quality Designation (RQD) is the percentage ratio of the summed length of rock pieces 4 inches long and greater to the total length of the run. The rock core samples are designated as "NQ2" on the Logs of Test Borings. The rock cores were documented in photographic core logs, which are attached to this report.

Soil and rock conditions encountered in the test borings are presented in the Logs of Test Borings, along with information related to sample data, SPT results, water conditions observed in the borings, and laboratory test data. It should be noted that these logs have been prepared on the basis of laboratory classification and testing as well as field logs of the encountered soils.

City of Willoughby December 2023 CT Project No. 231093 Page 4

All samples of the subsoils were visually or manually classified using the Unified Soil Classification System (ASTM D 2487 and D 2488) and were tested in the laboratory for moisture content (ASTM D 2216). An Atterberg limits test (ASTM D 4318) and particle size analysis (ASTM D 6913 and D 7928) were performed on select samples. Dry density determination and compressive strength tests (ASTM D 2166 were also performed on select samples. Rock Core Unconfined Compressive Strength Tests (ASTM D 7012 Method C) were performed on intact rock samples. The results of these tests are presented on the Logs of Test Borings and Grain Size Distribution sheet attached to this report.

Experience indicates that the actual subsoil conditions at a site could vary from those generalized on the basis of test borings made at specific locations, especially at previously developed sites. Therefore, it is essential that a geotechnical engineer be retained to provide soil engineering services during the site preparation, excavation, and foundation phases of the proposed project. This is to observe compliance with the design concepts, specifications, and recommendations, and to allow design changes in the event subsurface conditions differ from those anticipated prior to the start of construction.

3.0 PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION

The proposed project involves constructing drilled shafts with soldier pile and plug pile shafts type retaining wall spanning around 175 feet in length. The associated shafts piles are planned to be anchored (ie. Socketed) into the underlying intact shale bedrock.

During a site inspection conducted by CT on March 29, 2023, coupled with online aerial and street view assessments around the junction of River Street and South Street, a notably visible area of distress—a crown or head scarp—was identified along River Street near its intersection with South Street. This distressed area sits at an elevation of approximately 695 feet above mean sea level (msl), which is roughly 100 feet higher in elevation than the Chagrin River surface at 595 feet msl. The terrain between the Chagrin River and the road exhibits a steep slope, much steeper than 0.5:1 gradient in most sections.

4.0 GENERAL SITE AND SUBSURFACE CONDITIONS

4.1 General Site Conditions

The project area featured asphalt pavements displaying longitudinal and transverse cracking, which seemed to have been sealed.

In boring B-1, the surface materials encountered comprised 11 inches of asphalt overlying 3 inches of crushed stone aggregates. On the other hand, boring B-2 revealed 8 inches of asphalt overlying 4 inches of brick, with an underlying layer of 3 inches of crushed stone aggregates.

4.2 General Site Geology

Published geologic maps from the Ohio Department of Natural Resources (ODNR) indicate that the project site is located within the glaciated portion of Ohio. The geologic deposits covering the site consists of Holocene-age Alluvial deposits (a) consisting of alluvium and alluvial terraces, deposited in present and former floodplains, ranges from silty clay in areas of fine-grained deposits to coarse sand, gravel, or cobbles in areas of shallow bedrock.

Bedrock in the project area is broadly mapped on the "Geologic Map of Ohio" as Upper Devonian aged Shale of the Ohio Shale formations. The borings performed for this exploration encountered weathered bedrock at elevations ranging from approximate Elevs. 685 to 682.5 and sound rock at elevations ranging from approximate Elevs. 665 to 664. Bedrock was generally sloping upward from south to north, and from east to west.

4.3 General Soil and Rock Conditions

The findings from both field and laboratory tests indicate that the subsoils beneath the pavement materials can be characterized as a shallow layer of alluvial deposits overlying decomposed and weathered shale layers, which in turn overlay a sound (i.e., more intact) shale bedrock.

The deposits alluvial comprise a mix of cohesive and granular soils, extending to a depth of approximately 5½ feet below the existing grades, ranging from Elevations 690± to 689± feet. The cohesive soils predominantly consisted of lean clay (CL) silty clay (CL-ML), silt (ML) sandy silt (ML), lean clay (CL) mixed with varying portions of sand and gravel . SPT N-values for the cohesive soils ranged from 4 to 6 blows per foot (bpf) which is indicative of medium stiff consistency. Unconfined compressive strengths were on the order of 1,660 to 9,000 pounds per square foot. Moisture contents ranged from 13 to 23 percent. The granular soils consisted of silty sand (SM) or clayey sand (SC) mixed with varying portions of gravel, sand and shale fragments. SPT N-values for the granular soils ranged from 3 to 7 bpf wich is indicative of very loose to loose compactness. Moisture contents ranged from 12 to 16 percent.

A layer of severely weathered/decomposed shale bedrock was encountered underlying the alluvial deposits and extended to approximately 11 to 12½ feet, ranging from Elevations 685± to 682± feet. This stratum comprises a combination of sand, and gravel mixed with varying proportions of shale fragments. SPT N-values ranged from 12 to 65 bpf. Moisture contents ranged from 10 to 13 percent.

Shale Bedrock was encountered underlying the decomposed bedrock stratum in both borings. The upper 17½ to 19 feet of bedrock was highly weathered such that it was augerable. Based on auger refusal, the more intact bedrock was encountered at depths on the order of 30 feet (Elevs. 666± to 665±). The depths of encountered rock are summarized in the following table.

The rock core recovery ranged from 98 to 100 percent. RQD values for the core runs ranged from 15 to 37 percent, indicating the rock mass quality of the bedrock can be generally described as varying from poor to fair. An intact specimen of shale for compressive strength testing was obtained, resulting in an unconfined compressive strength ranging from 5,510 pounds per square inch (psi), indicating that the Shale can be characterized as moderately strong.

Additional descriptions of the stratigraphy encountered in the borings are presented on the Logs of Test Borings. A rock core photographic log is attached to this report.

4.4 Groundwater Conditions

Groundwater was initially encountered during drilling at a depth of 30 feet in Borings B-1 and B-2 (Elev. 666± and 665±). Water was noted upon completion of drilling and rock coring operations at a depth of 32 feet (Elev. 664±) in Boring B-1 and at a depth of 21½ feet (Elev. 643±) in Boring B-2. However, these water levels were affected by water introduced during rock coring. It should be noted that the boreholes were drilled and sealed within the same day, and stabilized water levels may not have occurred over this limited time period.

Based on the soil characteristics and moisture conditions encountered in the borings, it is our opinion that the "normal" groundwater level will generally be encountered at the bottom

City of Willoughby December 2023 CT Project No. 231093 Page 8

of the decomposed bedrock layer at depths of approximately 11 to 12 ½ feet below existing grades. However, this investigation did not include research of possible hydrological influences at the project site. It should be noted that groundwater elevations can fluctuate with seasonal and climatic influences. Therefore, the groundwater conditions may vary at different times of the year from those encountered during this investigation.

5.0 DESIGN RECOMMENDATIONS

The following conclusions and recommendations are based on our understanding of the proposed construction and on the data obtained during the field investigation. If the project information or location as outlined is incorrect or should change significantly, a review of these recommendations should be made by CT. These recommendations are subject to the satisfactory completion of the recommended site and subgrade preparation and fill placement operations described in Section 6.0, "Construction Recommendations."

5.1 Slope Stability Analyses and Slope Repair Recommendations

The scope of this project included slope stability analyses performed to "back-calculate" soil properties and evaluate appropriate values for remedial design considerations. In accordance with Ohio Department of Transportations(ODOT) geotechnical bulleting, GB-7, evaluation of soil properties included "back-calculation" utilizing slope stability analyses such that the worst-case potential failure surface exhibited a factor of safety of 1.0, and coincided with the known points of shear failure, as indicated by the apparent top scarp that was observed along the guardrail. We performed global slope stability analyses using the 2-D Limit Equilibrium Slope Stability Program Slide 6.0 by Rocscience to evaluate the Existing slope failure based on the available site topographic information.

Using this program, a myriad of potential failure surfaces can be generated theoretically, from which the factor of safety can be determined as to whether sufficient resisting soil strength can be mobilized to counteract the driving forces (weight of soil, seepage, and surcharge loads) that would cause the slope to move downward. The factor of safety is the ratio of the resisting forces to the driving forces. Global instability typically is manifested by pronounced movements of a large arc or wedge of soil that result in bulging at the toe of the slope as well as observable displacement of soil at or near the crest of the slope. This crest displacement may be exhibited by a near-vertical tension crack at the back edge of the displaced soil mass, or may be significant enough to exhibit a downward movement of soil that creates a "scarp" such that a sharp drop occurs in an otherwise level ground surface. Global instability of the embankment at this site could create a significant impact due to the potential for such movement to encompass a portion of the roadway and existing utilities.

We analyzed a representative slope section situated within the targeted remediation area, specifically focusing on the section with the most pronounced degree of slope.

Shear strength parameters for the new embankment fill were determined using ODOT GB-2 as a general guideline. Remaining soil strengths were evaluated based on unconfined compressive strength test results, hand penetrometer readings as well as SPT N-values,

City of Willoughby December 2023 CT Project No. 231093 Page 10

moisture content, unit weight (density), and soil plasticity data of the encountered soils. Correlations with published data from ODOT GB-7 "Drilled Shaft Landslide Stabilization Design" Table 1 "Typical Unit Weight Relationships for Various Soils" and Table 2 "Typical Strength Values for Various Soils" were also utilized to estimate soil properties. In general, low to average long-term effective stress internal angle of friction (φ'), along with a low to average residual cohesion (c') was used in our analyses for the native soils.

The groundwater table was modeled at 11 to 12 ½ feet below the existing roadway and extending consistently and parallel to the slope face, aligning with the water elevation within the Chagrin River at Elev. 596 feet. Additionally, an average surcharge load of 250 pounds per square foot (psf) was modeled for the roadway area.

Once the failure surface was modeled with a factor of safety of 1.0 using the soil profile encountered during this investigation, global stability analyses were performed using circular failure mode for the short-term conditions (i.e., end of construction) using total stress soil parameters (TSSP). The soil parameters utilized for analysis of the wall are also presented on the wall slope stability outputs attached to this report.

The results of the slop stability analyses are summarized in the following table:

After reviewing our stability analysis outlined in Appendix H, it seems that the failure mechanism is a shallow-seated circular failure that transpires along the interface of the decomposed bedrock layer and the weathered, comparatively more intact layer of shale bedrock. As such, remedial measures both geometric and structural would require substantial work outside of the existing right-of-way in areas exhibiting very steep grades.

Therefore, we recommend protecting the roadway against on-going and potential slope failures by constructing a retaining wall structure.

We considered a retaining wall along the slope between the road and the river to determine what would be required to achieve factors of safety 1.3. In these analyses, we determined that the required shear resistance provided by the wall was on the order of 20,000 lb/ft, requiring a minimum rock socket depth of 5 feet embedded into the solid rock layer..

Based on the results of our slope stability analysis, the depth of the failure plane below the road, and the depth of bedrock, options for protecting the road include soldier pile and lagging, and secant, tangent, or plug pile walls. A soldier pile and lagging wall would likely consist of a structural W or HP section set in a drilled shaft filled with concrete. The soldier piles would likely be spaced at 4 feet on center and lagging would be set to a depth that would retain the soil on the upslope side as the slope below the wall continued to fail and slide toward the river. Tangent, secant, and plug pile walls are all variations of continuous drilled pier walls that would retain the soil up slope of the wall and protect the road. Reinforcement could consist of a W and HP structural section or deformed bar reinforcement. With plug pile walls every second pier is reinforced. The drilled shafts should be drilled into bedrock with a minimum embedment of 5 feet into moderately hard shale.

We performed laterally loaded pile analyses using LPILE to preliminarily estimate the head deflection, maximum moment, and maximum shear force in the drilled shafts. We analyzed 30-inch-diameter drilled piers with W 24 x 62 steel reinforcement. Service loading (unfactored) is evaluated to make sure the shaft deflection is within tolerable limits. Strength loading (factored) is evaluated to verify the shafts satisfies structural code requirements.

Table 3 shows the results of the LPILE analyses. Graphs of deflection, shear, and moment with depth are included in the attachments. The calculated displacement, shear, and moment depends on the stiffness of the pier and hence the final diameter and reinforcement. Analyses should be rerun with the final reinforcement based on the structural design as a check on the displacement, shear, moment, and soil reaction.

Granular soils were encountered in the test borings. Additionally, the "normal" groundwater level is anticipated at 11 to 12½ feet below existing grades. As such, temporary steel casing is anticipated to be required for support of the shaft walls and/or to seal the borehole from groundwater. During concrete placement, as the steel casing is withdrawn, sufficient concrete should be maintained above the bottom of the casing to counteract any hydrostatic head and prevent collapse or "necking" of the shaft. Care must be taken during concreting and removal of any temporary casing to prevent the possibility of soil intrusions. The contractor should submit procedures for shaft installation prior to the start of work.

5.2 Subgrades

After the retaining wall is constructed, the nearby pavement area may need to be repaired. We recommend removing all pavement materials, including the aggregate base, to expose the underlying subgrade.

5.2.1 Subgrades Evaluation

An evaluation of the subgrade soils was completed in general accordance with ODOT Geotechnical Design Manual (GDM) Section 600 (July 21, 2023). As part of this evaluation, the ODOT "Subgrade Analysis" worksheet (V14.6, 02/11/2022) was completed and is attached to this report.

Final pavement grades are assumed to approximate existing grades. Based on the existing pavement cross-sections encountered in the borings, the proposed subgrade is presumed to be 18 to 25 inches below the existing top of pavement grades (represented as a 15 to 2.1 feet cut in the ODOT "Subgrade Analysis" worksheet).

Based on the GDM , soils classified as ODOT A-4b, A-2-5, A-5, A-7-5, A-8a, A-8b, or rock have been designated as being problematic with respect to pavement subgrade support. None of these soil types were encountered at planned subgrade elevations in the borings performed for this exploration.

Based on the GDM criteria, subgrade soils with moisture contents greater than 3 percent above optimum likely indicate the presence of unstable subgrade that may require some form of subgrade modification. Most of the tested subgrade soil samples were greater than 3 percent below the optimum as determined using the GDM criteria. Thus, where moisture contents were dry of optimum, they were appreciably dry of optimum.

City of Willoughby December 2023 CT Project No. 231093 Page 13

The type and thickness of subgrade modification is determined by the GDM criteria based on the average, low SPT N_{60} -value (N_{60L}) of the subgrade soils in a particular portion of the project area, hand penetrometer value, soil type, and moisture content. Based on these criteria, both borings (B-1 and B-2 contained subgrade soils which indicated subgrade modification is likely to be required. Subgrade modification for these borings was indicated to include planned undercutting of 16 to 24 inches of the existing subgrade and replacement with granular engineered fill.

It should be noted that the GDM analyses are used as a pre-construction tool to plan subgrade modification alternatives. Actual subgrade modification will depend on field observations of proof-rolling conditions at the time of construction. Changes in soil moisture content could create more or less favorable subgrade conditions that may result in adjustments to subgrade modification or soil stabilization requirements at the time of construction.

5.2.2 Flexible (Asphalt) Pavement Design

Based on the GDM subgrade analysis, a design CBR value of 8 percent was determined for the project using the ODOT "Subgrade Analysis" spreadsheet. It should be noted that the CBR determination by this spreadsheet is based on the average Group Index of all the evaluated samples

It should also be noted that the design CBR value is based on subgrades compacted to at least 100 percent of the maximum dry density as determined by ASTM D 698 (Standard Proctor) or verified as stable through proof-rolling in accordance with Section 5.5 of this report.

All pavement design and paving operations should conform to ODOT specifications. The pavement and subgrade preparation procedures outlined in this report should result in a reasonably workable and satisfactory pavement. It should be recognized, however, that all pavements need repairs or overlays over time as a result of progressive yielding under repeated loading for a prolonged period.

It is recommended that proof rolling, placement of aggregate base, and placement of asphalt be performed within as short a time period as possible. Exposure of the aggregate base to rain, snow, or freezing conditions may lead to deterioration of the subgrade and/or base materials due to excessive moisture conditions and to difficulties in achieving the required compaction.

5.2.3 Pavement Drainage

Based on the poorly-drained nature of the silty and clayey subgrade soils that are expected throughout the site, it is anticipated that surface water infiltration may collect in the aggregate base course. Without adequate drainage, water will remain in the base for extended periods of time, creating localized wet, soft pockets. The presence of these pockets will increase the likelihood that pavement distress (cracking, potholes, etc.) will develop. Drainage features may include grading the subgrade surface to slope downward to the outside edge of pavements and/or providing longitudinal edge drains connected to storm sewers or other outlets. A system of "finger drains" could also be installed near catch basins within the pavement areas to collect surface water, thus reducing the potential for freezethaw effects on the pavement.

5.3 Construction

5.3.1 Sedimentation and Erosion Control

In planning the implementation of earthwork operations, special consideration should be given to provide measures to prevent or reduce soil erosion and the subsequent sedimentation into nearby waterways. These measures may include some or all of the following:

- 1. Scheduling of earthwork operations such that erodible areas are kept as small as possible and are exposed for the shortest possible time.
- 2. Using special grading practices, along with diversion or interceptor structures, to reduce the amount of run-off water from an erodible area.
- 3. Providing vegetative buffer zones, filter berms, or sedimentation basins to trap sediment from surface run-off water.

A specific and detailed soil erosion and sedimentation control program and permits may be required by local, state, or federal regulatory agencies.

5.3.2 Site and subgrade Preparation

Site and subgrade preparation activities should conform to ODOT Construction and Materials Specifications (CMS) Item 204 specifications. Site preparation activities should include the removal of vegetation, topsoil, root mats, pavements, structures, and other deleterious

non-soil materials from all proposed culvert and roadway replacement areas. The actual amount of required stripping should be determined in the field by a geotechnical engineer or qualified representative.

Upon completion of the clearing and undercutting activities, all areas that are to receive fill, or that have been excavated to proposed final subgrade elevation, should be inspected by a geotechnical engineer. Pavement subgrades should be proof rolled in accordance with ODOT CMS 204.06.

Any unsuitable materials observed during the inspection and proof-rolling operations should be undercut and replaced with compacted fill, or stabilized in place utilizing conventional remedial measures such as discing, aeration, and recompaction. As stated previously, based on the conditions encountered during our exploration, where subgrade soil moisture contents were wet of optimum, they were significantly wet of optimum. As such, scarification and aeration methods may not be feasible to achieve satisfactory proof rolling and stabilization of the predominantly cohesive subgrades. However, scarification and aeration methods may be utilized if areas where granular subgrades wet of optimum are present, provided weather conditions and construction schedule will allow such soil modification.

The GDM subgrade analysis indicates planned over-excavation of unsuitable subgrade soils to a depth of 16 to 18 inches and replacement with new granular engineered fill for the entire extent of the project. Due to the relatively small project area, global chemical stabilization is not anticipated to be economical compared to over-excavation and replacement with granular engineered fill.

5.3.3 Temporary Excavations and Permanent Slopes

The sides of the temporary excavations should be adequately sloped to provide stable sides and safe working conditions. Otherwise, the excavation must be properly braced against lateral movements. In any case, applicable Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) standards must be followed. It is the responsibility of the installation contractor to develop appropriate installation methods and specify pertinent equipment prior to commencement of work, and to obtain the services of a geotechnical engineer to design or approve sloped or benched excavations and/or lateral bracing systems as required by OSHA criteria.

If the excavation is to be performed with sloped banks, adequate stable slopes must be provided in accordance with OSHA criteria. Based on the test borings, it is likely that excavations will encounter a range of soil conditions that include the following OSHA designations:

Type A soils (cohesive soils with unconfined compressive strengths of

City of Willoughby December 2023 CT Project No. 231093 Page 16

3,000 pounds per square foot (psf) or greater),

- Type B soils (cohesive soils with unconfined compressive strengths greater than 1,000 psf but less than 3,000 psf), and
- Type C soils (native granular soils or unstable rock).

For temporary excavations in Type A, B, and C soils, side slopes must be no steeper than $\frac{3}{4}$ horizontal to 1 vertical (¾H:1V), 1H:1V, and 1½H:1V, respectively. For situations where a higher strength soil is underlain by a lower strength soil and the excavation extends into the lower strength soil, the slope of the entire excavation is governed by that required by the lower strength soil. In all cases, flatter slopes may be required if lower strength soils or adverse seepage conditions are encountered during construction.

5.3.4 Construction Dewatering and Groundwater Control

Groundwater conditions encountered during our exploration are summarized in Section 4.3.

During construction, methods should be taken to divert the waterway flow around the construction area.

Based on the soil characteristics and groundwater conditions encountered in the borings, it is our opinion that the "normal" groundwater level can generally be expected at depths on the order of 11 to 12½ feet below existing roadway grades.

If construction does not occur during a particularly wet period, adequate control of groundwater seepage into excavations should be achievable by minor dewatering systems, such as pumping from prepared sumps.

5.3.5 Fill

Material for engineered fill or backfill required to achieve design grades should meet ODOT Item 203 "Embankment Fill" placement and compaction requirements.

The upper profile on-site soils consist of predominantly native cohesive soils. For the cohesive soils, a sheepsfoot roller should provide the most effective soil compaction. Where existing pavement base materials remain or new dense-graded aggregate pavement base materials are placed, a vibratory smooth-drum roller would be required to provide effective compaction.

7.0 QUALIFICATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS

6.0

Our evaluation of design and construction conditions for pavements and to support the design and installation of a drilled shaft wall to stabilize slope movements has been based on our understanding of the site and project information and the data obtained during our field investigation. The general subsurface conditions were based on interpretation of the subsurface data at specific boring locations. Regardless of the thoroughness of a subsurface investigation, there is the possibility that conditions between borings will differ from those at the boring locations, that conditions are not as anticipated by the designers, or that the construction process has altered the soil conditions. This potential is increased at previously developed sites. Therefore, experienced geotechnical engineers should observe earthwork construction to confirm that the conditions anticipated in design are noted. Otherwise, CT assumes no responsibility for construction compliance with the design concepts, specifications, or recommendations.

The design recommendations in this report have been developed on the basis of the previously described project characteristics and subsurface conditions. If project criteria or locations change, a qualified geotechnical engineer should be permitted to determine whether the recommendations must be modified. The findings of such a review will be presented in a supplemental report.

The nature and extent of variations between the borings may not become evident until the course of construction. If such variations are encountered, it will be necessary to reevaluate the recommendations of this report after on-site observations of the conditions.

Our professional services have been performed, our findings derived, and our recommendations prepared in accordance with generally accepted geotechnical engineering principles and practices. This warranty is in lieu of all other warranties either expressed or implied. CT is not responsible for the conclusions, opinions, or recommendations of others based on this data.

Plates

Plate 1.0 Site Location Map Plate 2.0 Test Boring Location Plan

Test Boring Location Plan
River Street Soil Stabilization

APPENDIX A

Logs of Test Borings

APPENDIX B

Legend Key

LEGEND KEY

Unified Soil Classification System Soil Symbols

- 1. Exploratory borings were drilled on September 15 and 18, 2023 utilizing 3¼ -inch inside diameter hollow-stem augers. Rock coring was completed using a NQ sized bit.
- 2. These logs are subject to the limitations, conclusions, and recommendations in the report and should not be interpreted separate from the report.
- 3. The borings were located in the field by CT Consultants, Inc. in accordance with the provided information.
- 4. Ground surface elevation for all borings were obtained by CT via a hand-held GPS device and are reported to the nearest foot.
- 5. Unconfined Compressive Strength (tsf): NP = Non-Plastic

APPENDIX C

Tabulation of Laboratory Test Data

\curvearrowright

CT Consultants, Inc. 1915 N 12th Street

 E 1 OF 1

Ratio |

LAB SUMMARY 231093.GPJ GINT US LAB.GDT 12/11/23

APPENDIX D

Laboratory Test Results

SILT-CLAY BOUNDARY = 0.005 MILLIMETERS

STRAIN, %

STRAIN, %

APPENDIX E

Rock Core Photo Log

CORE PHOTO LOG – B - 1

APPENDIX F

Site Photographs

SITE RECONNAISSANCE PHOTOGRAPHS

Photo 2: Depicting the general site conditions at the crest; looking north along River Street.

SITE RECONNAISSANCE PHOTOGRAPHS

SITE RECONNAISSANCE PHOTOGRAPHS

APPENDIX G

Slope Stability Analysis Outputs

APPENDIX H

L-Pile Analysis Outputs

LPile 2019.11.08, © 2019 by Ensoft, Inc.

== LPile for Windows, Version 2019-11.008 Analysis of Individual Piles and Drilled Shafts Subjected to Lateral Loading Using the p-y Method © 1985-2019 by Ensoft, Inc. All Rights Reserved == This copy of LPile is being used by: Serial Number of Security Device: 562484188 This copy of LPile is licensed for exclusive use by: TTL Associates, Inc., Toledo, OH Use of this program by any entity other than TTL Associates, Inc., Toledo, OH is a violation of the software license agreement. -- Files Used for Analysis -- Path to file locations: \\mtr-fs01.ctc.local\mtr-projects\$\2023\231093\PHASE\06 Geotechnical Analysis\Project Data\Calculations\Lpile\ Name of input data file: HP 10x42 - 30-inch Dia.lp11d Name of output report file: HP 10x42 - 30-inch Dia.lp11o Name of plot output file: HP 10x42 - 30-inch Dia.lp11p Name of runtime message file: HP 10x42 - 30-inch Dia.lp11r -- Date and Time of Analysis --

Date: December 15, 2023 Time: 13:04:36

Cross-sectional Shape = Circular Pile

(Depth of the lowest soil layer extends 0.000 ft below the pile tip)

**** Warning - Possible Input Data Error ****

Values entered for effective unit weights of soil were outside the limits of 20 pcf to 140 pcf.

The maximum input value, in layer 1 , for effective unit weight = 140.00 pcf

This data may be erroneous. Please check your data.

**** Warning - Possible Input Data Error ****

Values entered for effective unit weight of rock were outside the limits of 50 pcf to 150 pcf.

The maximum input value, in layer 1, for effective unit weight = 155.00 pcf

This data may be erroneous. Please check your data.

-- Summary of Input Soil Properties --

36.0000 2.70E-04 -- 100000.

--- p-y Modification Factors for Group Action --

Distribution of p-y modifiers with depth defined using 2 points

Static loading criteria were used when computing p-y curves for all analyses.

-- Distributed Lateral Loading for Individual Load Cases --

Distributed lateral load intensity for Load Case 1 defined using 2 points

Distributed lateral load intensity for Load Case 2 defined using 2 points

-- Pile-head Loading and Pile-head Fixity Conditions -- Number of loads specified = 2 Load Load Condition Condition Axial Thrust Compute Top y Run Analysis No. Type 1 1 2 2 Force, 1bs vs. Pile Length ----- ---- -------------------- ----------------------- ---------------- --------------- ------------ 1 1 V = 0.0000 lbs M = 0.0000 in-1bs 0.00000000 No Yes 2 1 V = 0.0000 lbs M = 0.0000 in-lbs 0.0000000 No Yes V = shear force applied normal to pile axis M = bending moment applied to pile head y = lateral deflection normal to pile axis S = pile slope relative to original pile batter angle R = rotational stiffness applied to pile head Values of top y vs. pile lengths can be computed only for load types with specified shear loading (Load Types 1, 2, and 3). Thrust force is assumed to be acting axially for all pile batter angles. -- Computations of Nominal Moment Capacity and Nonlinear Bending Stiffness -- Axial thrust force values were determined from pile-head loading conditions Number of Pile Sections Analyzed = 1 Pile Section No. 1: ------------------- Moment-curvature properties were derived from elastic section properties -- Layering Correction Equivalent Depths of Soil & Rock Layers -- Top of Equivalent Layer Top Depth Same Layer Layer is F0 F1 Layer Below Below Type As Rock or Integral Integral

Notes: The F0 integral of Layer n+1 equals the sum of the F0 and F1 integrals for Layer n. Layering correction equivalent depths are computed only for soil types with both shallow-depth and deep-depth expressions for peak lateral load transfer. These soil types are soft and stiff clays, non-liquefied sands, and cemented c-phi soil.

-- Computed Values of Pile Loading and Deflection for Lateral Loading for Load Case Number 1 -- Pile-head conditions are Shear and Moment (Loading Type 1) Shear force at pile head $\qquad \qquad = \qquad \qquad 0.0$ lbs Applied moment at pile head $=$ 0.0 in-lbs Axial thrust load on pile head $\qquad \qquad = \qquad \qquad 0.0$ lbs Depth Deflect. Bending Shear Slope Total Bending Soil Res. Soil Spr. Distrib. X y Moment Force S Stress Stiffness p Es*H Lat. Load feet inches in-lbs lbs radians psi* lb-in^2 lb/inch lb/inch lb/inch ---------- ---------- ---------- ---------- ---------- ---------- ---------- ---------- ---------- ---------- 0.00 0.1831 1.28E-05 0.00 -7.25E-04 6.16E-09 9.02E+11 0.00 0.00 47.1510 0.3500 0.1800 415.8723 211.5859 -7.25E-04 0.2001 9.02E+11 0.00 0.00 53.6042 0.7000 0.1770 1777. 454.7922 -7.25E-04 0.8529 9.06E+11 0.00 0.00 62.2083 1.0500 0.1739 4236. 734.1359 -7.25E-04 2.0277 9.09E+11 0.00 0.00 70.8125 1.4000 0.1709 7944. 1050. -7.25E-04 3.7930 9.11E+11 0.00 0.00 79.4167 1.7500 0.1678 13053. 1401. -7.25E-04 6.2165 9.13E+11 0.00 0.00 88.0208 2.1000 0.1648 19714. 1789. -7.25E-04 9.3654 9.16E+11 0.00 0.00 96.6250
2.4500 0.1617 2 2.4500 0.1617 28080. 2213. -7.25E-04 13.3060 9.18E+11 0.00 0.00 105.2292

* The above values of total stress are combined axial and bending stresses.

Output Summary for Load Case No. 1:

-- Computed Values of Pile Loading and Deflection for Lateral Loading for Load Case Number 2 --

Pile-head conditions are Shear and Moment (Loading Type 1)

* The above values of total stress are combined axial and bending stresses.

Output Summary for Load Case No. 2:

Summary of Pile-head Responses for Conventional Analyses

Definitions of Pile-head Loading Conditions:

Load Type 1: Load $1 =$ Shear, V, lbs, and Load $2 =$ Moment, M, in-lbs Load Type 2: Load $1 =$ Shear, V, lbs, and Load $2 =$ Slope, S, radians Load Type 3: Load 1 = Shear, V, lbs, and Load 2 = Rot. Stiffness, R, in-lbs/rad. Load Type 4: Load $1 = Top$ Deflection, y, inches, and Load $2 = Moment, M, in-1bs$

Load Type 5: Load $1 = Top$ Deflection, y, inches, and Load $2 = Slope$, S, radians

Load Load Load Axial Pile-head Pile-head Max Shear Max Moment Case Type Pile-head Type Pile-head Loading Deflection Rotation in Pile in Pile No. 1 Load 1 2 Load 2 lbs inches radians lbs in-lbs ---- ----- ---------- ---------- ---------- ---------- ---------- ---------- ---------- ---------- 1 V, lb 0.00 M, in-lb 0.00 0.00 0.1831 -7.25E-04 -73437. 3533998. 2 V, lb 0.00 M, in-lb 0.00 0.00 0.2885 -0.00114 -115583. 5567579.

Maximum pile-head deflection = 0.2884671628 inches Maximum pile-head rotation = -0.0011438878 radians = -0.065540 deg.

-- Summary of Warning Messages --

The following warning was reported 306 times

**** Warning ****

An unreasonable value was input for friction angle has been specified for a soil layer defined using the sand criteria. The input value is either smaller than 20 degrees or higher than 48 degrees. The input data should be checked for correctness.

The following warning was reported 90 times

**** Warning ****

An unreasonable input value for unconfined compressive strength has been specified for a soil defined using the weak rock criteria. The input value is greater than 500 psi. Please check your input data for correctness.

The analysis ended normally.

APPENDIX I

Subgrade Analysis Output

OHIO DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

OFFICE OF GEOTECHNICAL ENGINEERING

PLAN SUBGRADES Geotechnical Design Manual Section 600

Instructions: Enter data in the shaded cells only. (Enter state route number, project description,county, consultant's name, prepared by name, and date prepared. This information will be transferred to all other sheets. The date prepared must be entered in the appropriate cell on this sheet to remove these instructions prior to printing.)

River Street Soil Stabilization SR 164 - Willoughby Ohio

CT Consultants, Inc.

Prepared By: Imad El Hajjar, EI Date prepared: Thursday, November 16, 2023

> **8150 Sterling Court Mentor OH 44060 216-217-5449 ihajjar@ctconsultants.com Imad El Hajjar, EI CT Consultants, Inc.**

NO. OF BORINGS:

2

 $V.14.6$ $2/11/2022$

Subgrade Analysis

 $V.14.6$

 $2/11/2022$

PID: SR 164 - Wil

No. of Borings: 2 **County-Route-Section:** River Street Soil Stabilization

Geotechnical Consultant: CT Consultants, Inc. **Prepared By:** Imad El Hajjar, EI **Date prepared:** 11/16/2023

Fig. 600-1 – Subgrade Stabilization

