# **Geotechnical Investigation**

# **Veterans Parkway Bridge Approaches Investigation**

Savannah, Georgia

July 20, 2015 Terracon Project No. ES155020

Prepared for: Chatham County Engineering Department Savannah, Georgia

# Prepared by:

Terracon Consultants, Inc. Savannah, Georgia

Offices Nationwide Established in 1965 Employee-Owned terracon.com



Geotechnical 🧧 Environmental 📒 Construction Materials 💻 Facilities

July 20, 2015



Chatham County Engineering Department 124 Bull Street, Suite 430 Savannah, Georgia 31401

Attn: Nathaniel Panther P.E. P: (912) 652 7813 F: (912) 652 7818 E: NPanther@chathamcounty.org

# Re: Geotechnical Investigation Veterans Parkway Bridge Approaches Investigation Chatham County, Georgia Terracon Project No.: ES155020

Dear Mr. Panther:

Terracon Consultants, Inc. (Terracon) has completed the Geotechnical Engineering Investigation for the above-referenced project. The services were performed in general accordance with our proposal No. PES150078 dated February 16, 2015. This report presents the findings of the subsurface exploration and provides geotechnical recommendations for the design and construction of the project.

We appreciate the opportunity to be of service to you. Should you have any questions concerning this report, or if we may be of further service, please contact us.

Sincerely, Terracon Consultants, Inc.

Yombo Hung

Yanbo Huang, Ph.D., E.I.T. Staff Geotechnical Engineer



Guoming Lin, Ph.D., P.E. Senior Principal



Terracon Consultants, Inc.2201 Rowland AvenueSavannah, Georgia 31404P(912) 629 4000F(912) 629 4001terracon.com/savannah

cc: 1 – Client (PDF) 1 – File

Sectio	on		Page
EXEC		E SUMMARY	i
1.0	INTR	RODUCTION	1
2.0	PRO	JECT INFORMATION	1
	2.1	Project Description	1
	2.2	Site Location and Description	2
3.0	SUB	SURFACE CONDITIONS	2
	3.1	Typical Profile	2
	3.2	Groundwater	3
4.0	REC	OMMENDATIONS FOR DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION	4
	4.1	Geotechnical Considerations	4
	4.2	Recommendation for Remediation	5
5.0	GEN	ERAL COMMENTS	6

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

## APPENDICE

#### **APPENDIX A:**

### FIELD EXPLORATION

Exhibit A-1 Site Location Map
Exhibit A-2 Exploration Location Plan
Exhibit A-3 Field Exploration Description
Exhibit A-4 CPT Sounding Cross Section
Exhibit A-5 CPT Sounding Logs
Exhibit A-6 SPT Boring Cross Section
Exhibit A-7 SPT Boring Logs

# **APPENDIX B:**

## SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Exhibit B-1General NotesExhibit B-2Unified Soil Classification SystemExhibit B-3CPT-based Soil Classification

### **APPENDIX C:**

## SUPPORTING INFORMATION

- Exhibit C-1 Differential Settlement Survey
- Exhibit C-2 Photos of Pavement Cores
- Exhibit C-3 Information of Bridge Design
- Exhibit C-4 Information of Approach Slab Design
- Exhibit C-5 Information of Embankment Fill



# **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

This report presents the findings of our Geotechnical Engineering Investigation for the existing Veterans Parkway Little Ogeechee River Bridges Approaches Investigation located on Veterans Parkway in Chatham County, Georgia. The investigation included a field exploration program and engineering evaluation of the subsurface conditions and repair recommendations. Based on the results of the subsurface exploration and analyses, the following geotechnical considerations were identified:

- The project includes two bridges and four approach slabs. The subsurface conditions of the site are relatively consistent at each end of the bridge. At the south end (begin bridges), the soils in the upper 40 feet are loose to medium dense silty sands to sands with silt interbedded with sandy clays, underlain by medium stiff to very stiff silty / sandy clays with thickness of 33 feet. At the north end (end bridges), the soil in the upper 12 to 13 feet are loose to medium dense silty sands, underlain by a layer of sandy clays with thickness of approximately 8 feet.
- The groundwater was encountered at approximately 30 feet below the existing ground surface (BGS) at the south end of bridges (begin bridges) and 16.5 to 25 feet BGS at the north end (end bridges) based on CPT soundings and SPT borings.
- The expansion joints between the approach slabs and the bridge decks were supposed to be one inch wide according to the design plan but were currently at 2.5 to 3 inches wide. In addition, there were differential settlements of 0.25 to one inch between the approach slabs and the bridge decks at the end bents. In general, the differential settlements were larger at the north ends (end bridges) than at the south ends (begin bridges).
- Both the approach slabs and the bridge decks at the end bents are supported on the same pile foundations, so the mechanisms of joint widening and differential settlements were rather perplexing. There are gaps (voids) as large as three inches beneath the approach slabs to the top of the subgrade. Most likely the slab movements were initially caused by the settlements of the embankment fill. The voids beneath the slabs have reduced the frictional resistance and the forces from the traffic may have caused the slabs to slide. The differential settlements may be attributable to the structural damage at bearing supports by repeated traffic loads.
- We explored the repair options with several contractors and a GDOT engineer and would recommend the following two repair options. The first option, commonly referred as mud jacking, will mainly involve using grouting to densify the loose embankment fill in the upper 10 feet, filling the gaps beneath the slabs and lifting up the slabs. The second



option is to demolish the existing approach slabs and reconstruct new slabs after necessary subgrade compaction and repair of bearing supports.

This summary should be used in conjunction with the entire report for design purposes. It should be recognized that details were not included or fully developed in this section, and the report must be read in its entirety for a comprehensive understanding of the findings and recommendations contained herein. The section titled **GENERAL COMMENTS** should be read for an understanding of the report's limitations.

# **GEOTECHNICAL INVESTIGATION**

# Veterans Parkway Bridges Approaches Investigation

Savannah, Georgia Terracon Project No. ES155020 July 20, 2015

# **1.0 INTRODUCTION**

Terracon has completed the Geotechnical Engineering Investigation for the existing Veterans Parkway Little Ogeechee River Bridge Approaches located on Veterans Parkway in Savannah, Georgia. The investigation included a field exploration program and engineering evaluation of the subsurface conditions and foundation recommendations. The field exploration program consisted of two (2) cone penetration test (CPT) soundings to a maximum depth of about 73 feet below the existing ground surface (BGS), and two (2) standard penetration test (SPT) borings to a maximum depth of about 80 feet BGS. The CPT sounding and SPT boring logs along with a site location map and exploration location plan are included in **Appendix A** of this report.

The purpose of this study is to provide subsurface information and geotechnical engineering recommendations relative to:

- subsurface soil conditions
- groundwater conditions

- Differential Settlement Investigation
- Remediation recommendation for the Differential Settlement

# 2.0 **PROJECT INFORMATION**

# 2.1 **Project Description**

The construction of the bridges was completed in 1995. The south end (begin bridges) has at least 35 feet of fills and the north end (end bridges) has at least 12 feet of fills. At both ends, 5 feet of surcharge was placed with loading time of 10 to 11 months and both the filter fabric and wick drains were used during the embankment construction.

ltem	Description
Proposed Improvements	The repair of widened expansion joints and differential settlement at bridge approaches.
Finished floor	South end (begin bridges): 44.13 feet.
elevation	North end (end bridges): 27.37 feet.

#### **Geotechnical Investigation**

Veterans Parkway Bridges Approaches Investigation Savannah, Georgia July 20, 2015 Terracon Project No. ES155020



Item	Description		
	ADT = 16, 800 (1990)		
Decian Troffic Data	ADT = 28, 600 (2010)		
Design Trainc Data	Design speed = 60 mile per hour		
	Trucks = 5%.		
Maximum allowable	Total settlement: 1 inch (assumed).		
settlement	Differential settlement: <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> inches between approach slabs and bridge decks (assumed).		

# 2.2 Site Location and Description

Item	Description
Location	The site is located on Veterans Parkway over the Little Ogeechee River in Chatham County, Georgia.
	Latitude: 31.0017°, Longitude: -81.2004°
Current ground cover and	Existing road with reinforced concrete approach slabs connecting
access conditions	the asphalt pavement and bridge decks.
Existing topography	Relatively level.

Should any of the above information or assumptions be inconsistent with the planned construction, Terracon should be informed so that modifications to this report can be made as necessary.

# 3.0 SUBSURFACE CONDITIONS

# 3.1 Typical Profile

Based on the results of the field exploration, the subsurface conditions at the project site are relatively consistent at each end of the bridges and can be generalized as follows:

Description	Approximate Depth to Bottom of Stratum (feet, BGS)	Material Encountered	Equivalent SPT - N <sub>60</sub>
Pavement	1.5	10 to 11 inches concrete, followed by 2 to 3 inches voids and 2.5 to 5 inches asphalt or piece of concrete.	
Stratum 1	10 to 15	Loose silty sands to sands with silt	4 to 10

## Subsurface Conditions at South End of Bridges (Begin Bridges)

#### **Geotechnical Investigation**



Veterans Parkway Bridges Approaches Investigation Savannah, Georgia July 20, 2015 Terracon Project No. ES155020

DescriptionApproximate Depth to Bottom of Stratum (feet, BGS)		Material Encountered	Equivalent SPT - N <sub>60</sub>
Stratum 2	40	Medium dense to dense silty sands interbedded with sandy clays	10 to 35
Stratum 3	71 to 73	Medium stiff to very stiff silty / sandy clays	5 to 22
Stratum 4	80, termination of SPT borings	Hard sandy clays	30 to 50+

## Subsurface Conditions at North End of Bridges (End Bridges)

Description	Approximate Depth to Bottom of Stratum (feet, BGS)	Material Encountered	Equivalent SPT - N <sub>60</sub>
Pavement	1.5	10 to 11 inches concrete, followed by 2.5 inches voids and 4 inches asphalt.	
Stratum 1	12 to 13	Medium dense silty sands.	10 to 30
Stratum 2	20 to 21	Stiff to very stiff sandy clays	8 to 12
Stratum 3	25	Medium dense silty sands	15 to 30
Stratum 4	33 to 34	Soft to stiff silty/sandy clays	4 to 14
Stratum 5	67 to 70	Medium dense to very dense silty sands interbedded with sandy clays	20 to 50+
Stratum 6	80, termination of SPT borings	Very stiff to hard sandy clays	29 to 50+

Details of the subsurface conditions encountered at each boring location are presented on the individual CPT sounding and SPT boring logs in **Appendix A** of this report. Stratification boundaries on the logs represent the approximate depth of changes in soil types; the transition between materials may be gradual.

# 3.2 Groundwater

Groundwater was measured at approximately 30 feet BGS at the south end of bridges (begin bridges) and 16.5 to 25 feet BGS at the north end (end bridges) during the field exploration. It should be noted that groundwater levels tend to fluctuate with seasonal and climatic variations, as well as with construction activities. As such, the possibility of groundwater level fluctuations should be considered when developing the design and construction plans for the project. The groundwater table should be checked prior to construction to assess its effect on site work and other construction activities.



# 4.0 **RECOMMENDATIONS FOR DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION**

## 4.1 Geotechnical Considerations

The subsurface conditions at this site are considered relatively consistent at each end of bridges. The generalized soil profile is presented in **Section 3.1**.

For the approach slabs at the south end of bridges (begin bridges), the expansion joints between approach slabs and bridge decks have been widen from 1 inch to 2.5~3 inches and the differential settlements at these joints are less than 0.25 inch. From the coring results as shown in **Appendix C**, about 2 to 3 inches of voids were found right below the slabs. The subgrade materials below the voids were approximately 5 inches asphalt or 2.5 inches piece of concrete.

For the approach slabs at the north end of bridges (end bridges), the expansion joints between approach slabs and bridge decks also have been widen from 1 inch to 2.5~3 inches but the differential settlements at these joints are as high as 0.5 to one inch. From the coring results as shown in **Appendix C**, approximately 2.5 inches of voids were found right below the slab and below the voids, it is followed by approximately 4 inches asphalt. In addition, signs of erosion were noted found at the bridge abutment as shown in **Appendix C**.

Since both the approach slabs and the bridge deck at the end bents are supported on same piled foundations, the mechanisms of the differential settlements are rather perplexing. We reviewed all the available design details of the bridges, approach slabs and embankment. We also discussed the problem of differential settlement at the expansion joints between approach slab and bridge deck with local Georgia DOT engineer. From our GDOT engineer and local contractors, we learned the problem of widened joints and differential settlements is a common occurrence for bridges in the area with high embankment fill over weak soils.

The approach slab movements were mostly likely caused initially by consolidation settlement of the embankments. The embankments are underlain by one or more layers of relatively soft clays and the weight of the embankment fill has caused the soft clays to consolidate and settle. The fact the voids beneath the slabs were only 2.5 to 3 inches for the last 20 years suggests the initial ground improvement measures, wick drain, surcharge and waiting time, were largely effective. Without these special measures, the settlements would have been much larger.

The soft clays are relatively deep, at depths of 45 to 55 feet at C1 and 25 to 30 feet at C2. It is likely that these soft clay layers would undergo additional consolidation and cause additional settlements. However, the settlements in the next 20 years should be considerably smaller than 2 inches (mostly likely less than 1 inch). As such, we believe the risk of additional settlement would not justify the expense to treat the deep clay layers even though the deep clay layers were considered the root cause of the slab problems.



The investigation also revealed that the embankment fill in the upper 10 feet were relatively loose. This may have been caused by deep consolidation settlements and/or inadequate compaction during the embankment construction. It is very likely that the loose embankment fills have contributed to the embankment settlements and formation of the voids beneath the approach slabs. We recommend the embankment subgrade in the upper ten feet be densified as part of the slab repair work.

The formation of the voids beneath the slabs resulted in reduction of frictional resistance of the approach slabs. The widening of the expansion joints at the end bents was most likely caused by lateral force exerted by the traveling vehicles. We observed the overall bridge for control and expansion joints and concluded the widening of the expansion joints were unlikely caused by thermal expansion of the bridge structure. Based on discussions with GDOT engineer and other local experienced bridge contractors, the differential settlements between the approach slab and the deck at end bents were likely caused by damage/wearing of the supports from the repeated traffic.

# 4.2 Recommendation for Repair

With the above understandings of the causes of the problem, we discussed the repair options with GDOT engineer and several specialty contractors. Embankment settlements are considered the cause of the slab movements. Embankment settlements were caused primarily by the consolidation settlement of the deep foundation and likely aided by the compression of the loose embankment fill at the upper 10 feet. If a one-time and permanent solution is required to repair the slab, we would recommend grouting be used to improve the deep soft clays as well as the loose embankment fill in the upper 10 feet. However, over a period of 20 years, the embankments have settled up to three inches. Based on the soil consolidation theory and our experience with the soils in this area, we anticipate the embankment will undergo additional settlements but the magnitude of the settlement for the next 20 years should be less than 2 inches and most likely less than one inch. As such, the cost of treating the deep clays may not justify the cost. We recommend the loose sands in the upper 10 feet be improved as part of the repair.

We recommend two repair options for the approach slab. The first option, commonly referred as mud jacking, will mainly involve using grouting to densify the loose embankment fill in the upper 10 feet, filling the gaps beneath the slabs and lifting up the slabs. The second option is to demolish the existing approach slabs and reconstruct new slabs after necessary subgrade compaction and repair of bearing supports.

Grouting work is typically performed by an experienced specialty contractor. The specialty contractor should develop detailed work plan to achieve the required densification, filling and leveling of the approach slab. The contractor should choose the grouting method (jet grouting, compaction ground or chemical grouting) that is suited for the soil conditions and intended



repair. It is very likely that the grouting option would not able to move the slabs lateral to narrow the joints. Also based on the experience of the GDOT engineer Mr. Michael Garner, the mud jacking (grouting) option may not offer a permanent fix but should be attempted as the first option.

For the reconstruction option, the slab should be demolished and the subgrade in the upper 10 feet should be improved. The method of improvement may include grouting, stone columns or excavation and recompaction. The new approach slabs should be poured after necessary structural repair of the slab support. The new slab supports should be constructed in accordance with the current GDOT standard details and specifications as shown in Exhibit C-4-3 in Appendix C. The contractor proposing on the repair work should engage a bridge design engineer to develop the repair details.

Regardless the repair option selected, the repair should also include measures to prevent erosion of the subgrade soils. The expansion joints should include proper sealant to minimize infiltration of water into the subgrade.

# 5.0 GENERAL COMMENTS

Terracon should be consulted to review the final design plans and specifications so comments can be made regarding interpretation and implementation of our geotechnical recommendations in the project design and specifications. Terracon should also be retained to provide observation and testing services during grading, excavation, foundation construction and other earth-related construction phases of the project.

The analyses and recommendations presented in this report are based upon the data obtained from the explorations performed at the indicated locations and from other information discussed in this report. This report does not reflect variations that may occur between exploration locations, across the site, or may be caused due to the modifying effects of construction or weather. Bear in mind that the nature and extent of such variations may not become evident until construction has started or until construction activities have ceased. If variations do appear, Terracon should be notified immediately so that further evaluation and supplemental recommendations can be provided. The scope of services for this project does not include either specifically or by implication any environmental or biological (e.g., mold, fungi, and bacteria) assessment of the site or identification or prevention of pollutants, hazardous materials or hazardous conditions. If the owner is concerned about the potential for such contamination or pollution, please advise so that additional studies may be undertaken.

This report has been prepared for the exclusive use of our client for specific application to the project and site discussed, and has been prepared in accordance with generally accepted



geotechnical engineering practices. No warranties, either expressed or implied, are intended or made. Site safety, excavation support and dewatering requirements are the responsibility of others. In the event that changes in the nature, design, or location of the project as outlined in this report are planned, the conclusions and recommendations contained in this report shall not be considered valid unless Terracon reviews the changes, and then either verifies or modifies the conclusions of this report in writing.

# APPENDIX A FIELD EXPLORATION

Exhibit A-1 Site Location Map
Exhibit A-2 Exploration Location Plan
Exhibit A-3 Field Exploration Description
Exhibit A-4 CPT Cross Section
Exhibit A-5 CPT Logs
Exhibit A-6 SPT Cross Section
Exhibit A-7 SPT Logs



inage countesy of
Google Earth <sup>™</sup>

Project Manager: YH		Project No. ES155020		
Drawn by:	YH	Scale: N.T.S.	llerracon	
Checked by: GL		File Name: ES155020-A1	Consulting Engineers & Scientists	
Approved by:		Date:	2201 Rowland Avenue Savannah, Georgia 31404	
	GL	4-13-15	Phone (912) 629 4000 Fax (912) 629 4001	

SHE LUCATION MAP	
eterans Parkway Bridges Approaches Investigation	
Veterans Parkway	<b>A-1-</b> 1
Chatham County, Georgia	





Image Courtesy of Google Earth<sup>™</sup>

Project Manager:	YH	Project No.	ES155020		
Drawn by:	YH	Scale:	N.T.S.	lierr	JCON
Checked by:	GL	File Name:	ES155020-A2	Consulting Eng	gineers & Scientists
Approved by:		Date:		2201 Rowland Avenue	Savannah, Georgia 31404
	GL		4-13-15	Phone (912) 629 4000	Fax (912) 629 4001

SITE HISTORICAL VIEW, 2/1995	Exhibit:
Veterans Parkway Bridges Approaches Investigation	A-1-3
Chatham County, Georgia	



Image Col	intesy of
Google	Earth™

Project Manager:	YH	Project No. ES155020	
Drawn by:	YH	Scale: N.T.S.	lierracon
Checked by:	GL	File Name: ES155020-A2	Consulting Engineers & Scientists
Approved by:		Date:	2201 Rowland Avenue Savannah, Georgia 31404
	GL	4-13-15	Phone (912) 629 4000 Fax (912) 629 4001

SITE HISTORICAL VIEW, 2/1999	Exhibit:
Veterans Parkway Bridges Approaches Investigation	
Veterans Parkway	A-1-4
Chatham County, Georgia	



#### Geotechnical Engineering Investigation Veterans Parkway Bridges Approaches Investigation - Savannah, Georgia

April 13, 2015 
Terracon Project No.ES155020

# **Field Exploration Description**

The locations of Standard Penetration Test (SPT) borings and Cone Penetration Test (CPT) soundings are determined by Terracon based on the proposed development and were located in the field using hand-held GPS units and in reference to existing features. These locations are shown in the Exploration Location Plan and should be considered approximate.

# **Standard Penetration Testing**

The SPT borings were performed in accordance with ASTM D1586 with an truck-mounted Acker drilling rig using mud rotatory drilling techniques. Samples of the soil encountered in the borings were obtained using splitbarrel sampling procedures. In the split barrel sampling procedure, the number of blows required to advance a standard 2-inch O.D. split barrel sampler the last 12 inches of the typical total 18-inch penetration by means of a 140-pound hammer with a free fall of 30 inches, is the standard penetration resistance value (SPT-N). This value is used to estimate the in situ relative density of cohesionless soils and consistency of cohesive soils. A rope and cathead hammer was used to advance the split-barrel sampler in the borings performed on this site.



llerracon

Source: FHWA NHI-06-088

# **Cone Penetration Testing**

The CPT hydraulically pushes an instrumented cone through the soil while nearly continuous readings are recorded to a portable computer. The cone is equipped with electronic load cells to measure tip resistance and sleeve resistance and a pressure transducer to measure the generated ambient pore pressure. The face of the cone has an apex angle of 60° and an area of 10 cm<sup>2</sup>. Digital data representing the tip resistance, friction resistance, pore water pressure, and probe inclination angle are recorded about every 2 centimeters while advancing through the ground at a rate between 1½ and 2½ centimeters per second. These measurements are correlated to various soil properties used for geotechnical design. No soil samples are gathered through this subsurface investigation technique.

CPT testing is conducted in general accordance with ASTM D5778 "Standard Test Method for Performing Electronic Friction Cone and Piezocone Penetration Testing of Soils."

Upon completion, the data collected were analyzed and processed by the project engineer.



Source: FHWA NHI-06-088













	В	ORING	i LC	)G	NC	). B1						F	Page 1 of 2	2
PF	OJECT: Veterans Parkway Bridges Appr	oaches	C	CLIE	NT:	Chath Savan	am Co nah. G	unt <u></u> ieor	y Engi aia	ineer	ring [	Depai	rtment	
SI	FE: Chatham County, Georgia								0					
ŋ	LOCATION See Exhibit A-2			4SE	Щ			STR	ENGTH	TEST	(9	(	ATTERBERG LIMITS	ES
<b>GRAPHIC LC</b>	DEPTH EL	EVATION (Ft.)	DEPTH (Ft.)	WATER LEVE OBSERVATIO	SAMPLE TYF	FIELD TEST	KEOULIO	TEST TYPE	COMPRESSIVE STRENGTH (psf)	STRAIN (%)	WATER CONTENT (%	DRY UNIT WEIGHT (pcf	LL-PL-PI	PERCENT FIN
	0.9 ASPHALT CONCRETE, Asphalt and binder	-1	_			0.40.0	0.01							
	SILTY SAND (SM), fine grained, brown/gray, medium dense to dense		-		X	6-13-2 10-13 N=3 6-15-1	20/0" 3-19 32 6-16							
			5 —		Д	N=3	31							
			_		X	7-7-14 N=2	4-11 21							
			_  10		X	15-15- N=2	11-13 26							
			_	-		6-4	-9							
			15-			N=1	13							
		-17	_											
	<u>SILTY CLAY (CL-WLJ</u> , gray, sun		_				4							
			20-		Д	4-4 N=	-4 8							
	21.8	-22												
	SILTY SAND (SM), fine grained, gray, loose, with fabric liner	h	_											
					$\times$	5-4-	-3 7							
		27	25-											
	LEAN CLAY (CL), dark gray/black, medium stiff,	-21	_											
	with organics		_		$\checkmark$	4-3	-3							
			30—		$ \rightarrow$	N=	6							
	31.8 SILTY SAND (SM) fine to medium grained, gray	-32	_											
	loose to medium dense	,	_			3.5	5							
					Ą	N=1	10							
	·		_											
			_											
			_ ⊿∩_	[	$\times$	6-6 N=1	-9 15							
	41.8	-42	+0		Ĩ									
	SANDY LEAN CLAY (CL), dark gray, stiff		_											
			_		$\times$	3-4	-5							
/////			45-					Ŧ						
	Straufication lines are approximate. In-situ, the transition may b	e gradual.					Hamme	гтуре	e: Rope a	and Ca	linead			
Advar Mu	d Rotary Se broken set of the set	e Exhibit A-3 for ocedures. e Appendix B fo ocedures and ad	descrip r descrip ditional	otion of otion of data (if	field labo any)	ratory	Notes:							
Aban	donment Method: Se ab	e Appendix C fo breviations.	r explan	ation o	fsym	ibols and								
	WATER LEVEL OBSERVATIONS						Boring Sta	arted:	3/10/201	5	Borin	ig Com	oleted: 3/10/20	015
	measured during drilling	lier	12			חנ	Drill Rig: C	CME-4	15		Drille	er: D. Fr	ancis and No	el
		2201 Sava	Rowland annah, C	d Aveni Georgia	le		Project No	.: ES <sup>,</sup>	155020		Exhi	oit: A	x-7-1	

		BORING	LC	)G	NC	). B1						F	Page 2 of 2	2
PR	OJECT: Veterans Parkway Bridges Ap Investigation	proaches	C	CLIE	NT:	Chath Savan	am Co Inah, G	unty eor	/ Engi gia	ineer	ing D	Depai	rtment	
SIT	E: Chatham County, Georgia						·							
GRAPHIC LOG	LOCATION See Exhibit A-2		DEPTH (Ft.)	WATER LEVEL OBSERVATIONS	SAMPLE TYPE	FIELD TEST	RESULIS	STR STR EST TYPE	COMPRESSIVE D STRENGTH D (psf) H	STRAIN (%)	WATER CONTENT (%)	DRY UNIT WEIGHT (pcf)	Atterberg Limits	PERCENT FINES
	<u>SANDY LEAN CLAY (CL)</u> , dark gray, stiff 46.8 (continued) <u>SILTY SAND (SM)</u> , fine grained, dark gray, medium dense		- - - 50-			N= 4-11 N=2	-14 25		0					
	fine grained, dark gray, very dense		- - 55- -		$\times$	33-4 <sup>-</sup> N=8	1-44 85							
	dark gray, medium dense, with shells		- - 60- -	-	$\times$	8-10 N=2	-19 29							
	66.8	67	- - 65- -		$\times$	14-3( N=(	0-34 64							
	dark gray, hard to very hard, Marl		- - 70 -	-	$\times$	8-12 N=:	-18 30							
			- 75- - -		$\times$	13 N= 50/	3 = '3"							
	80.0 Boring Terminated at 80 Feet	-80	_ 80—		$\mathbf{X}$	9-12 N=:	2-17 29							
								T						
	Strautication lines are approximate. In-situ, the transition m	ay be graduar.					nammer	і уре	. коре а	anu Cati	Uben			
Advan Mud Aband	cement Method: Rotary onment Method:	See Exhibit A-3 for o procedures. See Appendix B for procedures and add See Appendix C for abbreviations.	descrip descrip litional explan	otion of ption of data (if nation o	field Iabor any). f sym	ratory bols and	Notes:							
	WATER LEVEL OBSERVATIONS	76					Boring Sta	rted: 3	3/10/2018	5	Borin	g Comp	oleted: 3/10/20	)15
	measured during drilling	lier	٢٦				Drill Rig: C	ME-4	5		Drille	er: D. Fr	ancis and Noe	el
		2201 R Savai	owland	d Aveni Georgia	le		Project No	.: ES1	55020		Exhit	oit: A	-7-2	

THIS TEST RECORD IS NOT VALID IF SEPARATED FROM ORIGINAL REPORT. GEO SMART LOG-NO WELL SPT.GPJ TERRACON2012.GDT 3/20/15

	BORI	NG L	0_	G	NC	). B2	2					F	Page 1 of 2	2
PF	COJECT: Veterans Parkway Bridges Approaches	S	С	LIE	NT:	Chath Savar	nam Co nnah, G	ount	y Engi gia	ineer	ring [	Depai	rtment	
Sľ	TE: Chatham County, Georgia						·		-					
ŋ	LOCATION See Exhibit A-2			ZN R	Ц			STR	ENGTH	TEST	(9	(	ATTERBERG LIMITS	ES
<b>GRAPHIC LC</b>		(Ft )		WATER LEVE OBSERVATIO	SAMPLE TYF	FIELD TEST	RESULTS	TEST TYPE	COMPRESSIVE STRENGTH (psf)	STRAIN (%)	WATER CONTENT (%	DRY UNIT WEIGHT (pd	LL-PL-PI	PERCENT FIN
<u>م</u> ۵	0.9 Concrete, concrete	-1	_						-					
	ASPHALT CONCRETE, 3" gap and 5" asphalt	<u>-1.5</u>	- - - - -	ŧ		2-1- N= 2-2- N= 2-1-	-1-1 =2 -2-3 =4 -1-1							
		1	- 0- - -	Ĺ	X	1-1- N=	- <u>2</u> -2-1 -3							
		1	- 5- -		$\times$	7-5 N=	5-5 10							
	fine to medium grained, brown, medium dense		_											
	21.8	2	0-	2	X	5-11 N=	-11 22							
	SANDY LEAN CLAY (CL), fine grained, brown, stiff		_											
	26.8	-27	5- -	2	$\times$	9-5 N=	5-6 11							
	<u>SILTY SAND (SM)</u> , fine grained, brown, medium dense	3	- - 0		$\times$	9-11 N=	-18 29							
		-32	_											
	<u>SANDY LEAN CLAY (CL)</u> , brown, very stiff	3	_  5		$\times$	6-8- N=	-13 21							
		-37												
	dense, with clays	4			$\times$	11-1	5-19 34							
	41.8 SANDY LEAN CLAY (CL), gray/red, medium stiff, with organics	-42												
	with organics		_		$\times$	3-3	3-4							
~ / .	Stratification lines are approximate. In-situ, the transition may be gradual	4	<u>о</u> –с	Ż	Ì		Hamme	er Type	e: Rope :	and Cat	thead			
									opo i					
Advar Mu Abano	cement Method:     See Exhibit A       d Rotary     procedures.       See Appendi     procedures a       Jonment Method:     See Appendi	A-3 for des ix B for des and additio ix C for ex s.	scripti script onal d plana	ion of t tion of lata (if ation of	field labo any) f sym	ratory nbols and	Notes:							
	WATER LEVEL OBSERVATIONS						Borina St	arted <sup>.</sup>	3/11/201	5	Borin	a Com	oleted: 3/11/20	)15
	measured during drilling					חנ	Drill Ria <sup>.</sup> (	CMF-4	15		Drille	er: D. Fr	ancis and Nor	3
		2201 Row Savanna	land ah, G	Avenu eorgia	ie		Project No	.: ES	155020		Exhi	oit: A	-7-3	

	I	BORING	i LC	)G	NC	). B2	2					F	Page 2 of 2	2
PR	OJECT: Veterans Parkway Bridges App Investigation	proaches	(	CLIE	NT:	Chath Savar	nam Co nnah, G	unt <u>i</u> eor	y Engi gia	ineer	ing [	Depai	rtment	
SIT	E: Chatham County, Georgia								•					
PHIC LOG	LOCATION See Exhibit A-2		TH (Ft.)	R LEVEL RVATIONS	LE TYPE	DTEST	SULTS	STR BdA	ENGTH BAINE BUSSE	TEST	ATER TENT (%)	Y UNIT SHT (pcf)	ATTERBERG LIMITS	INT FINES
GRAF	<u>DEPTH Е</u>	ELEVATION (Ft.)	DEP	WATE OBSEF	SAMP		й Х	TEST -	COMPRE STREN (ps	STRAII	CONT	DR	LL-PL-PI	PERCE
	46.8 LEAN CLAY (CL), dark gray/black, soft	47	-	-		N=	=/)							
	54.0	53	- - 50-		X	1-2 N=	2-2 =4							
	POORLY GRADED SAND WITH CLAY (SP-SC dark gray, medium dense	-52 -52	- - -	-	$\times$	5-6 N=	6-6							
	56.8 POORLY GRADED SAND WITH SILT (SP-SM) fine grained, gray, medium dense	57 I,		-										
			60- -		X	6-11 N=	1-10 21							
	fine grained, dark gray, loose		- - 65-		$\times$	1-2 N=	2-2							
	<sup>66.8</sup> <u>SILTY SAND (SM)</u> , fine grained, dark gray, medium dense	-67	- - -	-		6.1	3.0							
	71.8 SANDY LEAN CLAY (CL) gray very hard. Ma	-72	70- -	-	Å	N=	<u>22</u>							
	<u>o, ale r en al en cr (en</u> , graf, voly hard, ma		- - 75-	-	X	12- N 50/4	20 = 4"							
	gray, hard, with shell fragments	80	-	-	$\times$	16-1	1-26							
	Boring Terminated at 80 Feet	-80	80-			<u> </u>	<u>.37</u>							
	Stratification lines are approximate. In-situ, the transition may	v be gradual.		<u>ı</u>			Hammer	r Type	e: Rope a	and Cat	head			
Advan Muc Aband	cement Method: Rotary	See Exhibit A-3 for procedures. See Appendix B fo procedures and ad See Appendix C fo	r descrip or descri Iditional or explar	ption of ption of data (if	field f labo f any) of sym	ratory ibols and	Notes:							
		abbreviations.												
$\Box$	wATER LEVEL OBSERVATIONS measured during drilling			ר			Boring Sta	rted:	3/11/201	5	Borin		oleted: 3/11/20	015
		2201   Sava	Rowland	d Aveni Georai	ue a		Project No	.: ES	155020		Exhil	oit: A	-7-4	31

# APPENDIX B SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Exhibit B-1 G	eneral Notes
---------------	--------------

- Exhibit B-2 Unified Soil Classification System
- Exhibit B-3 CPT-based Soil Classification

# **GENERAL NOTES**

#### DESCRIPTION OF SYMBOLS AND ABBREVIATIONS



#### **DESCRIPTIVE SOIL CLASSIFICATION**

Soil classification is based on the Unified Soil Classification System. Coarse Grained Soils have more than 50% of their dry weight retained on a #200 sieve; their principal descriptors are: boulders, cobbles, gravel or sand. Fine Grained Soils have less than 50% of their dry weight retained on a #200 sieve; they are principally described as clays if they are plastic, and silts if they are slightly plastic or non-plastic. Major constituents may be added as modifiers and minor constituents may be added according to the relative proportions based on grain size. In addition to gradation, coarse-grained soils are defined on the basis of their in-place relative density and fine-grained soils on the basis of their consistency.

#### LOCATION AND ELEVATION NOTES

Unless otherwise noted, Latitude and Longitude are approximately determined using a hand-held GPS device. The accuracy of such devices is variable. Surface elevation data annotated with +/- indicates that no actual topographical survey was conducted to confirm the surface elevation. Instead, the surface elevation was approximately determined from topographic maps of the area.

	RELATIVE DENSITY (More than 50% reta Density determined by Sta Includes grave	<b>OF COARSE-GRAINED SOILS</b> ined on No. 200 sieve.) ndard Penetration Resistance ls, sands and silts.	Consistenc visual-ma	CONSISTENCY OF FINE-GF (50% or more passing the No y determined by laboratory sh anual procedures or standard	RAINED SOILS b. 200 sieve.) ear strength testing, field penetration resistance
SMS	Descriptive Term (Density)	Std. Penetration Resistance (blows per foot)	Descriptive Term (Consistency)	Undrained Shear Strength (kips per square foot)	Std. Penetration Resistance (blows per foot)
TER	Very Loose	0 - 3	Very Soft	less than 0.25	0 - 1
TH	Loose	4 - 9	Soft	0.25 to 0.50	2 - 4
LENG	Medium Dense	10 - 29	Medium-Stiff	0.50 to 1.00	5 - 7
S	Dense	30 - 50	Stiff	1.00 to 2.00	8 - 14
	Very Dense	> 50	Very Stiff	2.00 to 4.00	15 - 30
			Hard	above 4.00	> 30

#### **RELATIVE PROPORTIONS OF SAND AND GRAVEL**

Descriptive	Term(s)
of other cor	<u>nstituents</u>
Trace	

With Modifier Percent of Dry Weight < 15 15 - 29 > 30

#### RELATIVE PROPORTIONS OF FINES

Descriptive Term(s) of other constituents Trace With Modifier Percent of Dry Weight < 5 5 - 12 > 12

#### **GRAIN SIZE TERMINOLOGY**

Descriptive Term(s) of other constituents <u>Percent of</u> Dry Weight

Boulders Cobbles Gravel Sand Silt or Clay Over 12 in. (300 mm) 12 in. to 3 in. (300mm to 75mm) 3 in. to #4 sieve (75mm to 4.75 mm) #4 to #200 sieve (4.75mm to 0.075mm Passing #200 sieve (0.075mm)

#### PLASTICITY DESCRIPTION

Term Non-plastic Low Medium Hiah 0 1 - 10 11 - 30 > 30

# llerracon

Exhibit B-1

# UNIFIED SOIL CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM

Criteria f	or Assigning Group Symbo	ols and Group Names Usin	g Laboratory Tests <sup>A</sup>	_	Soil Classification
				Group Symbol	Group Name <sup>в</sup>
Coarse Grained Soils	Gravels	Clean Gravels	$Cu \geq 4 \text{ and } 1 \leq Cc \leq 3^{\text{E}}$	GW	Well-graded gravel <sup>F</sup>
More than 50% retained	More than 50% of coarse fraction retained on	Less than 5% fines <sup>c</sup>	$Cu < 4 \text{ and/or } 1 > Cc > 3^{\text{E}}$	GP	Poorly graded gravel <sup>F</sup>
on No. 200 sieve	No. 4 sieve	Gravels with Fines More	Fines classify as ML or MH	GM	Silty gravel <sup>F,G, H</sup>
		than 12% fines <sup>c</sup>	Fines classify as CL or CH	GC	Clayey gravel <sup>F,G,H</sup>
	Sands	Clean Sands	$Cu \geq 6 \text{ and } 1 \leq Cc \leq 3^{\text{E}}$	SW	Well-graded sand
	50% or more of coarse fraction passes	Less than 5% fines <sup>D</sup>	$Cu < 6$ and/or $1 > Cc > 3^{E}$	SP	Poorly graded sand
	No. 4 sieve	Sands with Fines	Fines classify as ML or MH	SM	Silty sand G,H,I
		More than 12% fines <sup>D</sup>	Fines Classify as CL or CH	SC	Clayey sand <sup>G,H,I</sup>
Fine-Grained Soils	Silts and Clays	inorganic	PI > 7 and plots on or above "A" line <sup>J</sup>	CL	Lean clay <sup>K,L,M</sup>
50% or more passes the No. 200 sieve	Liquid limit less than 50		PI < 4 or plots below "A" line <sup>J</sup>	ML	Silt <sup>K,L,M</sup>
		organic	Liquid limit - oven dried	0	Organic clay <sup>K,L,M,N</sup>
			Liquid limit - not dried	OL	Organic silt <sup>K,L,M,O</sup>
	Silts and Clays	inorganic	PI plots on or above "A" line	СН	Fat clay <sup>K,L,M</sup>
	Liquid limit 50 or more		PI plots below "A" line	MH	Elastic Silt <sup>K,L,M</sup>
		organic	Liquid limit - oven dried	ОН	Organic clay <sup>K,L,M,P</sup>
	es the Liquid limit less than 50 PI < 4 Organic Liquid Liquid Silts and Clays Liquid limit 50 or more Organic PI plot Organic Liquid Liquid S Primarily organic matter, dark in color, and		Liquid limit - not dried	011	Organic silt <sup>K,L,M,Q</sup>
Highly organic soils	Primai	ily organic matter, dark in co	olor, and organic odor	PT	Peat

<sup>A</sup>Based on the material passing the 3-in. (75-mm) sieve

- <sup>B</sup> If field sample contained cobbles or boulders, or both, add "with cobbles or boulders, or both" to group name.
- <sup>C</sup>Gravels with 5 to 12% fines require dual symbols: GW-GM well-graded gravel with silt, GW-GC well-graded gravel with clay, GP-GM poorly graded gravel with silt, GP-GC poorly graded gravel with clay.
- <sup>D</sup>Sands with 5 to 12% fines require dual symbols: SW-SM well-graded sand with silt, SW-SC well-graded sand with clay, SP-SM poorly graded sand with silt, SP-SC poorly graded sand with clay

<sup>E</sup>Cu = 
$$D_{60}/D_{10}$$
 Cc =  $\frac{(D_{30})^2}{D_{10} \times D_{60}}$ 

<sup>F</sup> If soil contains ≥ 15% sand, add "with sand" to group name. <sup>G</sup> If fines classify as CL-ML, use dual symbol GC-GM, or SC-SM. <sup>H</sup>If fines are organic, add "with organic fines" to group name.

- $^{\rm I}$  If soil contains  $\geq$  15% gravel, add "with gravel" to group name.
- <sup>J</sup> If Atterberg limits plot in shaded area, soil is a CL-ML, silty clay.
- <sup>K</sup> If soil contains 15 to 29% plus No. 200, add "with sand" or "with gravel," whichever is predominant.
- $^{\text{L}}$  If soil contains  $\geq$  30% plus No. 200 predominantly sand, add "sandy" to group name.
- $^{\rm M}$  If soil contains  $\geq$  30% plus No. 200, predominantly gravel, add "gravelly" to group name.
- $^{\sf N}\,{\sf PI} \geq 4$  and plots on or above "A" line.
- $^{O}PI < 4$  or plots below "A" line.
- <sup>P</sup> PI plots on or above "A" line.
- <sup>Q</sup>PI plots below "A" line.



# **CPT GENERAL NOTES**

#### **DESCRIPTION OF MEASUREMENTS** AND CALIBRATIONS

To be reported per ASTM D5778: Uncorrected Tip Resistance, q<sub>c</sub> Measured force acting on the cone divided by the cone's projected area

Corrected Tip Resistance, q<sub>t</sub> Cone resistance corrected for porewater and net area ratio effects  $q_t = q_c + U2(1 - a)$ Where a is the net area ratio,

a lab calibration of the cone typically between 0.70 and 0.85 Pore Pressure, U1/U2

Pore pressure generated during penetration U1 - sensor on the face of the cone U2 - sensor on the shoulder (more common)

Sleeve Friction, fs Frictional force acting on the sleeve divided by its surface area

Normalized Friction Ratio, FR The ratio as a percentage of fs to q<sub>1</sub>, accounting for overburden pressure To be reported per ASTM D7400, if collected: Shear Wave Velocity, Vs

Measured in a Seismic CPT and provides direct measure of soil stiffness

Soil Behavior Type Index, Ic Ic =  $[(3.47 - \log(Q_i)^2 + (\log(FR) + 1.22)^2]^{0.5}$  $Q_t = (q_t - \sigma_{v_0}) / \sigma'_{v_0}$ Over Consolidation Ratio, OCR Small Strain Modulus, G<sub>0</sub>  $OCR (1) = 0.25(Q_t)$  $OCR (2) = 0.33(Q_t)$  $G_0 = \rho V s$ Elastic Modulus, Es (assumes  $q/q_{ultimate} \sim 0.3$ , i.e. FS = 3) Undrained Shear Strength, Su  $Es(1) = 2.6 \psi G_0$  $\begin{array}{l} Su = Q_t \, x \, \sigma'_{\, V0} \! / N_{kt} \\ N_{kt} \text{ is a geographical factor (shown on Su plot)} \end{array}$ where  $\Psi = 0.56 - 0.33 log Q_{t,clean sand}$ Es (2) = G<sub>0</sub> Es (3) = 0.015 x  $10^{(0.55/c+1.68)}$ (q<sub>t</sub> -  $\sigma_{V0}$ ) Sensitivy, St Es(4) = 2.5q $St = (q_t - \sigma_{V0}/N_{kt}) \times (1/fs)$ Constrained Modulus, M  $\begin{array}{l} \mbox{Effective Friction Angle, } \varphi' \\ \varphi'(1) = tan^{-1}(0.373[log(q_l/\sigma'_{\vee 0}) + 0.29]) \\ \varphi'(2) = 17.6 + 11[log(Q_l)] \end{array}$ 
$$\begin{split} M &= \alpha_{M}(q_{t} - \sigma_{V0}) \\ \text{For Ic} > 2.2 \text{ (fine-grained soils)} \end{split}$$
 $\alpha_{\rm M} = Q_{\rm t}$  with maximum of 14 For lc < 2.2 (coarse-grained soils)  $\alpha_{M} = 0.0188 \times 10^{(0.55/c + 1.68)}$ Unit Weight

UW = (0.27[log(FR)]+0.36[log(qt/atm)]+1.236) x UWwate  $\sigma_{v_0}$  is taken as the incremental sum of the unit weights SPT N<sub>60</sub>

 $N_{60} = (q_t/atm) / 10^{(1.1268 - 0.2817/c)}$ 

Normalized Tip Resistance, Q

#### REPORTED PARAMETERS

CPT logs as provided, at a minimum, report the data as required by ASTM D5778 and ASTM D7400 (if applicable). This minimum data include tip resistance, sleeve resistance, and porewater pressure. Other correlated parameters may also be provided. These other correlated parameters are interpretations of the measured data based upon published and reliable references, but they do not necessarily represent the actual values that would be derived from direct testing to determine the various parameters. The following chart illustrates estimates of reliability associated with correlated parameters based upon the literature referenced below.

Hydraulic Conductivity, k

For 1.0 < lc < 3.27 k =  $10^{(0.952 - 3.04k)}$ For 3.27 < lc < 4.0 k =  $10^{(-4.52 - 1.37k)}$ 

DESCRIPTION OF GEOTECHNICAL CORRELATIONS



#### WATER LEVEL

The groundwater level at the CPT location is used to normalize the measurements for vertical overburden pressures and as a result influences the normalized soil behavior type classification and correlated soil parameters. The water level may either be "measured" or "estimated:" Measured - Depth to water directly measured in the field

Estimated - Depth to water interpolated by the practitioner using pore pressure measurements in coarse grained soils and known site conditions While groundwater levels displayed as "measured" more accurately represent site conditions at the time of testing than those "estimated," in either case the groundwater should be further defined prior to construction as groundwater level variations will occur over time.

#### **CONE PENETRATION SOIL BEHAVIOR TYPE**

The estimated stratigraphic profiles included in the CPT logs are based on relationships between corrected tip resistance (q<sub>t</sub>), friction resistance (fs), and porewater pressure (U2). The normalized friction ratio (FR) is used to classify the soil behavior type.

Typically, silts and clays have high FR values and generate large excess penetration porewater pressures; sands have lower FRs and do not generate excess penetration porewater pressures. Negative pore pressure measurements are indicative of fissured fine-grained material. The adjacent graph (Robertson et al.) presents the soil behavior type correlation used for the logs. This normalized SBT chart, generally considered the most reliable, does not use pore pressure to determine SBT due to its lack of repeatability in onshore CPTs.



#### **REFERENCES**

Kulhawy, F.H., Mayne, P.W., (1997). "Manual on Estimating Soil Properties for Foundation Design," Electric Power Research Institute, Palo Alto, CA. Mayne, P.W., (2013). "Geotechnical Site Exploration in the Year 2013," Georgia Institue of Technology, Atlanta, GA. Robertson, P.K., Cabal, K.L. (2012). "Guide to Cone Penetration Testing for Geotechnical Engineering," Signal Hill, CA. Schmertmann, J.H., (1970). "Static Cone to Compute Static Settlement over Sand," Journal of the Soil Mechanics and Foundations Division, 96(SM3), 1011-1043.



# APPENDIX C SUPPORTING INFORMATION

- Exhibit C-1 Differential Settlement Survey
- Exhibit C-2 Photo of Pavement Cores
- Exhibit C-3 Information of Bridge Design
- Exhibit C-4 Information of Approach Slab Design
- Exhibit C-5 Information of Embankment Fill



Project Manager: <sub>YH</sub>	Pr	oject No. ES155020	15	BORING LOCATIONS	Exhibit
Drawn by: <sub>YH</sub>	So	cale: N.T.S.	lierracon	Veterans Parkway Bridges Approaches Investigation	
Checked by: GL	FI	le Name:	Consulting Engineers & Scientists	Veterans Parkway	C-1-
Approved by: GL	Da	ate: 4-13-2015	2201 Rowland Avenue         Savannah, Georgia         31404           Phone (912) 629 4000         Fax (912) 629 4001	Chatham County, Georgia	

C1 0 to 10.5" Concrete 10.5" to 12.5 Gap 12.5" to 15" Piece of Concr Underlain by soils	ete	Asphalt	The joi wide, a bridge of than th 0.25 ind Approach Slab	nt is about 3 inches and the surface of deck is slightly higher at of slab (less than ch). Bridge	Traffic Direction	
ז	Project Manager: YH	Project No. ES155020	75	Differential Sett	lement at C1	Exhibit:
	Drawn by: YH	Scale: N.T.S.	llerracon	Veterans Parkway Bridges A	pproaches Investigation	
	Checked by: GL	File Name:	Consulting Engineers & Scientists 2201 Rowland Avenue Savannah Georgia 31404	Veterans P	arkway	C-1-2
	Approved by: GL	uate: 4-13-2015	Phone (912) 629 4000 Fax (912) 629 4001	Chatham Coun	.y, Georgia	











Project Manager:	YH	Project No.	ES155020			Sign of Erosion Under North End of Right Bridge	Exhibit:
Drawn by:	YH	Scale:	N.T.S.	llerr	acon	Veterans Parkway Bridges Approaches Investigation	
Checked by:	GL	File Name:		Consulting Eng	gineers & Scientists		C-1-7
Approved by:	GL	Date:	4-24-2015	2201 Rowland Avenue Phone (912) 629 4000	Savannah, Georgia 31404 Fax (912) 629 4001	Chatham County, Georgia	



I	Project Manager:	ΥH	Project No.	ES155020			Pavement Core Sample at C2	Exhibit:
I	Drawn by:	ΥH	Scale:	N.T.S.	llerr	JCON	Veterans Parkway Bridges Approaches Investigation	
I	Checked by:	GL	File Name:		Consulting Eng	gineers & Scientists		C-2-1
	Approved by:	GL	Date:	4-24-2015	2201 Rowland Avenue Phone (912) 629 4000	Savannah, Georgia 31404 Fax (912) 629 4001	Chatham County, Georgia	





#### LEFT BRIDGE CONSISTS OF

I	-	110'-O" TYPE V PSC BEAM SPANS SP	ECIAL	DESIGN
3	-	82'-0" TYPE V PSC BEAM SPANS SP	ECIAL	DESIGN
2	-	PSC PILE END BENTS SP	ECIAL	DESIGN
9	-	CONCRETE INTERMEDIATE BENTS SP	ECIAL	DESIGN
4	-	CONCRETE PEDESTAL INTERMEDIATE BENTS ON PSC PILES SP	ECIAL	DESIGN
4	-	END POST AND GUARD RAIL ATTACHMENT DETAIL GA. STD. (L = $5'-6''$ W = $1'-1''$ H = $2'-8''$ ) (L = $4'-0''$ W = $1'-1''$ H = $2'-8''$ )	3054	(5-89)
				00 041

▲ 16" AND 20" SQ. PSC PILES ----- GA. STD. 3215 (2-22-84) BAR BENDING DETAILS ----- GA. STD. 3901 (8-69) TYPICAL FILL DETAIL AT END OF BRIDGE - SEE ROADWAY PLANS -- SPECIAL DESIGN TYPICAL FILL DETAIL AT END OF BRIDGE ----- GA. STD. 9037 (4-2-86)

#### RIGHT BRIDGE CONSISTS OF

2 -	123'-0" TYPE V PSC BEAM SPANS SPECIAL DESIGN
I -	110'-0" TYPE V PSC BEAM SPANS SPECIAL DESIGN
2 -	PSC PILE END BENTS SPECIAL DESIGN
8 -	CONCRETE INTERMEDIATE BENTS SPECIAL DESIGN
4 -	CONCRETE PEDESTAL INTERMEDIATE BENTS ON PSC PILES SPECIAL DESIGN
4 -	END POST AND GUARD RAIL ATTACHMENT DETAIL GA. STD. 3054 (5-89) (L = 5'-6'; W = 1'-1'; H = 2'-8'') (L = 4'-0'; W = 1'-1'; H = 2'-8'')
Δ	16" AND 20" SQ. PSC PILES GA. STD. 3215 (2-22-84)
	BAR BENDING DETAILS GA. STD. 3901 (8-69)
	TYPICAL FULL DETAIL AT END OF BRIDGE - SEE ROADWAY PLANS SPECIAL DESIGN

TYPICAL FILL DETAIL AT END OF BRIDGE ----- GA. STD. 9037 (4-2-86)

#### TRAFFIC DATA

TRAFFIC	ADT =	16,800	(1990)
	ADT =	28,600	(2010)
DESIGN SPEED			60 MPH
TRUCKS			5 %





CONSTRUCTION CLEARANCE DIAGRAM

#### GENERAL NOTES

SPECIFICATIONS -	GEORGIA STANDARD	SPECIFICATIONS	DATED 1983	AND	THE	198
SUPPLEMENTAL	SPECIFICATIONS, AS	MODIFIED BY CON	TRACT DOCUMEN	ITS.		

- REINFORCING STEEL ALL REINFORCING STEEL SHALL BE PLACED AND TIED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE GEORGIA STANDARD SPECIFICATIONS. MELDING OF REINFORCING STEEL WILL NOT BE PERMITTED.
- CHAMFER ALL EXPOSED CONCRETE EDGES SHALL BE CHAMFERED 3/4 INCH UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED.
- RAILROAD SIDE DITCHES PRIOR TO THE BEGINNING OF CONSTRUCTION, THE CONTRACTOR SHALL CLEAN THE RAILROAD SIDE DITCHES IN THE CONSTRUCTION AREA IN SUCH A MANNER AS TO PROVIDE POSITIVE DRAINAGE. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL MAINTAIN THE RAILROAD SIDE DITCHES FREE OF SILT AND DEBRIS UNTIL THE FINAL ACCEPTANCE. SEE ROADWAY PLANS FOR EROSION CONTROL AND PAYMENT.
- PROTECTIVE PLATFORMS PROTECTIVE PLATFORMS SHALL BE REQUIRED AT THIS SITE, SEE GEORGIA STANDARD SPECIFICATIONS SECTION 510. CONTRACTOR SHALL MAINTAIN A MINIMUW VERTICAL CLERARNEC OF 222 -07 ABOVE TOP OF RAIL DURING CONSTRUCTION.
- WAITING PERIOD NO WORK SHALL BEGIN AT BENTS I, 2 AND IS FOR THE LEFT BRIDGE AND AT BENTS I, 2 AND 14 FOR THE RIGHT BRIDGE UNTIL THE COMPLETED END FILLS AND THE 5 FOOT SUFCHARGE HAVE BEEN IN PLACE FOR AT LEAST 30 DAYS.

PLAN DRIVING OBJECTIVE - SEE SUBSTRUCTURE DETAILS.

- TEST PILES DRIVE TEST PILES AT THE FOLLOWING LOCATIONS:  $\Delta$ 
  - ONE 16" SQ PSC X 50 FT AT BENT 7 LEFT BRIDGE. ONE 16" SQ PSC X 50 FT AT BENT 13 RIGHT BRIDGE. ONE 20" SQ PSC X 50 FT AT BENT 10 RIGHT BRIDGE.
  - DRIVING DATA PILES ONE DRIVING DATA PILE SHALL BE REQUIRED AT BENTS 10 AND 13 FOR THE LEFT BRIDGE AND AT BENTS 1 AND 7 FOR THE RIGHT BRIDGE.
  - GRODVING CONCRETE THE ENTIRE LENGTH OF THE BRIDGE SHALL BE GROOVED TRANSVERSELY AS PER GEORGIA STANDARD SPECIFICATIONS SECTION 500.11.C.6.C.(2)

MODIFY GEORGIA STANDARD - THE 3/4 INCH EXPANSION JOINT BETWEEN THE APPROACH SLAB AND THE BRIDGE ON GEORGIA STANDARD 9017L SHALL BE CHANGED TO I INCH.

- FOOTINGS SOFT SURFACE SOILS MAY NECESSITATE SPECIAL FORMING OF THE FOOTINGS IN ORDER TO PREVENT THE INTRUSION DE CONCRETE INTO THE SOFT SOILS. COST OF SPECIAL FORMING SHALL BE INCLUDE IN PRICE DID FOR CUY DCL A CONC.
- FOOTING ELEVATIONS THE FOOTING ELEVATIONS, AS SHOWN ON THE PLANS FOR BENTS 3, 6, 7, 8, 13 AND 14 FOR THE LEFT BRIDGE AND BENTS 3, 6, 7, 12 AND 13 FOR THE RIGHT BRIDGE ARE APPROXIMATE ELEVATIONS. THE BOITON OF FOULING FOR THESE BENTS SHALL BE LOCATED AT THE ORIGINAL GROUNDLINE. FOOTINGS FOR ANY BENT SHALL DOT BE RAISED ABOVE THE ELEVATIONS SHOWN ON THE PLANS. FOOTINGS FOR ANY BANL BOT BE RAISED ABOVE THE ELEVATIONS SHOWN ON THE PLANS. FOOTINGS FOR ANY BANT SHALL NOT BE LOWERD MORE THAN THREE FEET WITHOUT THE APPROVAL OF THE STALE BRIDGE ENGINEER. GUANTITIES FOR THE ELEVATIONS, AS SHOWN ON THE PLANS AND SHALL BE ADJUSTED AS NEEDED AT TIME OF CONSTRUCTION BY THE ENGINEER.
- WORKING MATS NO SEPARATE MEAGUREMENT OR PAYMENT WILL BE MADE FOR PLACEMENT OR REMOVAL OF WORK MATS. COST IS TO BE INCLUDED IN THE OVERALL BID SUBMITTEO. SEE ROADWAY DLANS FOR LOCATIONS AND DETAILS OF EARTH MATS.
  - INCIDENTAL ITEMS COST INCIDENTAL TO THE WORK THAT IS NOT SPECIFICALLY COVERED BY THE GEORGIA STANDARD SPECIFICATIONS, SUPPLEMENTAL SPECIFICATIONS, AND/S SPECIAL, FROVISIONS SHALL BE INCLUDED IN THE OVERALL BID SUBMITTED. THIS INCLUDES THE COST OF NEOPRENE BEARING PAOS, DECK DRAINS, 3-PLY WATERFROOFING, AND OTHER INCLOBENTAL ITEMS NECESSARY TO COMPLETE THE WORK.
- ▲ END BENT PILES A 25" DIAMETER PILOT HOLE SHALL BE DRILLED TO A MINIMU ELEVATION OF 3,5 AT END BENTS I AND IS FOR THE LEFT BRIDGE AND END BENTS I AND 14 FOR THE RIGHT BRIDGE AND SLURRY FILLED. SEE SPECIAL PROVISION. ALL COST TO BE INCLUDED IN PRICE BID FOR LIN FT PILOT HOLES.

#### DESIGN DATA

SPECIFICATIONS AASHTO 1983 WITH 1984 THRU 1988 INTERIMS
TYPICAL HS20-44 AND/OR MILITARY LOADING IMPACT ALLOWED
FUTURE PAVING ALLOWANCE 30 LBS. PER SQ. FT
CONCRETE: SUPERSTRUCTURE
REINFORCEMENT STEEL: SUPERSTRUCTURE GRADE 40 FY = 40,000 PSI SUBSTRUCTURE GRADE 40 FY = 40,000 PSI
PRETENSIONING STRANDS: F'S = 270,000 PSI

			VOID ON CONSTRUCTIO
			SUMMARY OF QUANTITIES
PAY ITEM	QUAN	TITY	PAY ITEM
NUMBER	LEFT BRIDGE	RIGHT BRIDGE	
211-0300	188	188	CU YD BRIDGE EXCAVATION, STREAM CROSSING
500-0100	5970	5678	SQ YD GROOVING CONCRETE
500-1005	LUMP		SUPERSTR CONCRETE, CL A, BR NO   LT - ( 2236 )
500-1005		LUMP	SUPERSTR CONCRETE, CL A, BR NO   RT - ( 2120 )
500-3102	1433	1307	CU YD CL A CONC
507-9005	7373	7012	LIN FT PSC BEAMS, AASHTO TYPE V
511-1000	312314	281956	LB BAR REINF STEEL
511-3000	LUMP		SUPERSTR REINF STEEL, BR NO I LT - ( 516473 )
511-3000		LUMP	SUPERSTR REINF STEEL, BR NO I RT - ( 487607 )
520-2216	6325	5640	LIN FT PILING, PSC, 16 IN SQ
520-2220	6690	6460	LIN FT PILING, PSC. 20 IN SQ

511-Λ

Δ

A

PROJECT NUMBER GA. F-111-1(16)

271

Δ	520-2220	6690	6460	LIN FT PILING, PSC, 20 IN SQ
	520-3216	1	z = 1	EACH TEST PILE, PSC, 16 IN SQ
	520-3220		. I	EACH TEST PILE, PSC, 20 IN SQ
Δ				
	520-4216	<u> </u>	1	EACH LOAD TEST, PSC, 16 IN SQ (IF REQD)
	520-4220	Ţ,	1	EACH LOAD TEST, PSC, 20 IN SQ (IF REQD)
	603-2024	3015	3500	SQ YD STN DUMPED RIP RAP, TP 1, 24 IN
2	520-5000	460	350	LIN FT PILOT HOLES



104























2/26/03 11-18-34 AM \\GDDT-DSWI\GDPIDT\DDF\ap TITE Dutnut out dathyd Wi\standard\Fpallsb\9017r orf

Exhibit C-4-3





ىدارى بەرەرىپىدىكە كىلىدىكە ئېچىد بەر ----