

## **REPORT**

Geotechnical Engineering Services Bridge 36 Replacement, Waterbury, VT Waterbury BO 1446(40) - Rev 01

Submitted to:

## **Mr. Stephen Madden**

Geotechnical Project Manager Vermont Agency of Transportation Highway Division, Construction & Materials Bureau 2178 Airport Road Dill Building Unity B Berlin, VT 05641

Submitted by:

## **Golder Associates Inc.**

10 Al Paul Lane, Suite 103, Merrimack, NH 03101

+1 603 668-0880

21497656

June 16, 2022

## **Table of Contents**



## **TABLES (In Text)**



## **TABLES (Attachments)**

Table 1: Boring Locations

Table 2: Summary of Rock Core Quality

Table 3: Summary of Laboratory Soil Index and Classification Test results

### **FIGURES (In Text)**



### **FIGURES (Attachments)**

Figure 1: Site Location Plan

Figure 2: Boring Location Plan

Figure 3: Electrical Resistivity Imaging Bedrock Profile, ERI-1

Figure 4: Electrical Resistivity Imaging Bedrock Profile, ERI-2

Figure 5: Electrical Resistivity Imaging Bedrock Profile, ERI-3

- Figure 6: Interpreted Subsurface Profile A-A'
- Figure 7: Interpreted Subsurface Profile B-B'

Figure 8: Interpreted Subsurface Profile C-C'

### **APPENDICES**

**APPENDIX A** Boring Logs

**APPENDIX B** Rock Core Photographs

**APPENDIX C** Rock Probe Logs

**APPENDIX D** Laboratory Testing Results

**APPENDIX E Calculations** 



## **1.0 PROJECT BACKGROUND**

<span id="page-3-0"></span>Golder Associates USA, Inc. (WSP Golder), a member of WSP, is pleased to submit this report to the Vermont Agency of Transportation (VTrans) for geotechnical engineering services for the replacement of Bridge No. 36 carrying Town Highway 2 (Stowe Street) over Thatcher Brook in the town of Waterbury, Vermont. The site location is shown in Figure 1. The new bridge superstructure, abutments, and wingwalls are proposed to be precast concrete founded on cast-in-place concrete sub-footings. VTrans anticipates that the bridge replacement will consist of a buried structure utilizing an offsite detour to maintain traffic during construction. VTrans provided Golder with electronic survey and plan drawings<sup>1</sup> that detail the location and elevations of the roadway and bridge features. The proposed bridge is approximately 43 feet long, with the face of the proposed abutments located a few feet behind the face of the existing bridge's vertical abutments. The proposed bridge abutments are planned to have fill materials placed from abutment mid-height at a 1V:1.5H slope into Thatcher Brook. This design may narrow Thatcher Brook at high flows as it passes below the proposed bridge.

This report describes the results of the approved scope of work for geotechnical engineering services at Bridge No. 36 provided in our October 19, 2021 proposal and authorized on October 21, 2021 as well as the scope and budget modification to include two additional borings authorized on December 8, 2021. We have provided these services in accordance with our Contract for Geotechnical Engineering Services (PS0836), dated October 20, 2020.

## **2.0 SUBSURFACE INVESTIGATION**

The following sections detail the methods used for the subsurface investigation to support the new bridge design. The methods consist of geotechnical test borings and surficial geophysical surveys.

## **2.1 Geotechnical Borings**

WSP Golder completed four (4) test borings on November 18, November 19, and December 10, 2021. Borings B-101 and B-101A are located in the southbound lane of Stowe Street at proposed Abutment No. 1; boring B-103 is located in the northbound lane of Stowe Street at proposed Abutment No. 1; and boring B-102 is located in the northbound lane of Stowe Street at proposed Abutment No. 2. The field program included Standard Penetration Test (SPT) sampling of coarse-grained and fine-grained materials, and rock coring of the interpreted underlying bedrock. WSP Golder geotechnical engineers monitored drilling activities, selected sampling intervals, logged subsurface conditions encountered, and obtained soil samples and rock core for use in visual description and subsequent laboratory testing and classification. The boring location coordinates and ground surface elevations are summarized in Table 1, as provided by VTrans following survey. Boring locations with respect to existing site features are presented in Figure 2.

WSP Golder subcontracted Platform Environmental Drilling and Remediation Services (Platform) of Montpelier, Vermont to complete the borings using a Geoprobe 7822 DT drill rig. The drilling methods used a 4-inch inside diameter casing at B-101 and 3-inch inside diameter casing at borings B-101A, B-102 and B-103. Platform drove the casings with a percussion hammer and the out-the-end (OTE; i.e., direct push) drilling techniques.

Platform advanced all borings to the bedrock surface or refusal before collecting rock core. Soil sampling was performed in Borings B-101 and B-102 at 5-foot intervals by advancing a 2-inch outside diameter, 2-foot long SPT split spoon sampler below the casing and performing the SPT test in the undisturbed soil before removing the

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Electronic file "z93j040sv.dgn" provided to Golder on December 2, 2021.

sampler and advancing the casing to the next depth. Soil sampling was not conducted in borings B-101A or B-103 as the objective of these borings was to identify top of bedrock and collect rock core, if possible. Approximately 0.7 feet of rock core was obtained from boring B-101, 5 feet of rock core was obtained from boring B-102, and 2.2 feet of rock core was obtained from Boring B-103. Boring B-101A was advanced to approximately 11 feet below ground surface (bgs) where an obstruction crimped the casing preventing further advancement of the boring.

Where soil samples were obtained, Platform conducted SPT using a calibrated automatic hammer system and standard 1.5-inch inside diameter split spoon sampler in accordance with American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM) D1586. Sampling was conducted at 5-foot intervals in the borings to refusal, where the sampler was driven 24 inches by a 140-pound hammer dropped 30 inches. WSP Golder recorded the number of hammer blows required to advance the split spoon sampler through each 6-inch increment. Raw, uncorrected N-values, calculated as the sum of the hammer blows to advance the sampler during the 6-inch to 18-inch interval, are provided on the boring logs (Appendix A) and have not been corrected for overburden, sample size, or other factors. A calibrated hammer energy correction factor of 1.68 provided by Platform for their Geoprobe 7822 DT rig can be used to convert the measured N-values to  $N_{60}$  values for further calculations. WSP Golder collected and stored soil samples in labelled standard VTrans plastic sample bags. Soils identified in boring B-101 consist of loose to very dense, sandy, fine to coarse gravel overlying bedrock. Soils identified in boring B-102 consist of very loose to very dense, fine to medium sand overlying bedrock.

Where rock core was obtained, Platform collected rock core using NX-size (2.15 inch inside diameter) diamondtipped core barrels following refusal of either the casing or split spoon sampler to advance. Platform placed the rock core samples in rigid plastic sleeves for subsequent transportation to the WSP Golder office for further evaluation. WSP Golder recorded Total Core Recovery (TCR) and calculated Rock Quality Designation (RQD) for each core run, and these data are provided on the boring logs (Appendix A). Photographs of the rock core are presented in Appendix B. A detailed summary of rock quality parameters for the recovered rock core is presented in Table 2.

Details of the sampling methods used, field data obtained, and soil and rock conditions encountered during the investigation are presented on the boring logs provided in Appendix A. WSP Golder described the soil samples in the field in general accordance with ASTM D2488. Bedrock lithology was described in the field and revised in the office. A description of the symbols and terms used for the soil and rock descriptions precedes the boring logs.

## <span id="page-4-0"></span>**2.2 Electrical Resistivity Imaging**

To estimate depth to bedrock in areas not easily accessible to drilling equipment, and to facilitate foundation design and construction, WSP Golder conducted three focused, non-intrusive, linear geophysical surveys using electrical resistivity imaging (ERI) as the chosen method for field investigation based on site conditions and the project goals.

## **ERI Background**

ERI geophysical surveys evaluate variations in the electrical properties of subsurface materials by measuring electrical potentials at the surface. Electrical resistivity is a fundamental property of a material that describes how easily the material can transmit electrical current. High values of resistivity imply that the material is resistant to the flow of electricity; low values of resistivity imply that the material transmits electricity with little resistance. Resistivity measurements are made by injecting current into the ground through two current electrodes and measuring the resulting voltage difference at two potential electrodes.

Resistivity  $(\rho)$  is then calculated by:

$$
\rho = k \frac{V}{I}
$$
 (Equation 1: Ohm's Law)  
where:

 $v =$  the voltage potential measured between two points (in volts)

 $I =$  the injected current (in amperes)

 $k = a$  geometric factor which depends on the cross-sectional area and length of the current flow path (in meters)

 $\rho$  = resistivity (ohm-meters; ohm-m)

The primary properties that affect the resistivity of subsurface materials are total porosity, pore interconnectivity and saturation, pore fluid salinity, and clay mineral and metal content. Since most soil- and rock-forming minerals are essentially nonconductive, most current flow takes place through the material's pore water. Therefore, resistivity generally decreases with increasing porosity and water saturation. Clay minerals and certain metallic minerals tend to be conductive because of the availability of free ions. Similarly, dissolved ions in groundwater make the water more conductive to electric current. Thus, electrical resistivity decreases with increasing clay content and ionic strength of the pore fluids. Electrical resistivity and conductivity values of common rocks and soil materials are provided in [Table](#page-6-0) 2-1.

Different electrode configurations (e.g., Wenner, Schlumberger, dipole-dipole, and gradient configuration) can be used to collect ERI data and each produces unique data characteristics due to their geometric configuration. For the dipole-dipole array, current is applied to two adjacent current electrodes (A and B) positioned a predetermined distance apart (distance a). The voltage across two potential electrodes (M and N) is measured simultaneously with the applied current. The current electrodes are always spaced distance "a" apart and the distance between the current and potential electrodes is always a multiple of a (n • a). The strong gradient array takes advantage of multi-channel resistivity systems that can make several measurements simultaneously. This array measures all adjacent dipoles from one transmitter electrode to the other, including the center-most dipole, between two current electrodes. The lateral changes in the potential field of the gradient array are measured between the transmitter dipole A and B. Recording the lateral changes is often referred to as a profiling method, where the potential electrode pairs are at different locations without changing the positioning of the installed electrodes.

Various types of arrays have different strengths and weaknesses. Dipole-dipole arrays are a good choice for horizontal resolution of vertical or laterally discontinuous targets due to the increased data coverage and discrimination of small and sensitive targets. Dipole-dipole arrays can produce poor results in areas that have electrical noise due to the low signal strength. Strong gradient arrays produce high quality, but lower resolution



<span id="page-6-0"></span>data. WSP Golder combined ERI results from both the dipole-dipole array and the strong gradient array to generate high resolution ERI profiles. For more information, refer to Sirles (2006)<sup>2</sup> or USACE (1995)<sup>3</sup>.

<span id="page-6-1"></span>



Note:  $1000$ /ohm-m = mS/m. Adapted from USACE  $(1995)^3$  $(1995)^3$  $(1995)^3$ 

## **ERI Field Procedures**

A WSP Golder geophysicist collected subsurface data generated along three ERI profiles at the site, shown in Figure 2. Upon arrival to the site, the field geophysicist determined the original survey line positions identified in the proposal were not feasible or would not yield quality data. These profiles were adjusted from the original locations based on the encountered field conditions and the depth and velocity of the running water in Thatcher Brook. The three new locations were selected to collect high quality data as near to the boring locations as possible and across the site to image bedrock depth trends.

WSP Golder conducted the electrical resistivity surveys using a SuperSting R8/IP 8-channel automatic resistivity imaging system manufactured by Advanced Geosciences, Inc. (AGI) of Austin, Texas. With this system, 56 electrodes were connected to 18-inch stainless steel stakes that were inserted into the ground at a spacing of ten feet. A contact resistance test was performed prior to surveying to identify any potential problems that may affect

<sup>3</sup> U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (1995). Geophysical Exploration for Engineering and Environmental Investigations, EM 1110-1-1802, 208 pp. https://www.publications.usace.army.mil/Portals/76/Publications/EngineerManuals/EM\_1110-1-1802.pdf, Accessed 2022 January 28.



 $2$  Sirles, P.C. 2006 Use of Geophysics for Transportation Projects NCHRP Synthesis of Highway Practice No. 3657, Transportation Research Board, Washington DC, 117pp. Online: http://onlinepubs.trb.org/onlinepubs/nchrp/nchrp\_syn\_357.pdf (accessed June 2, 2021)

the recorded data. The area around several stakes were moistened with saltwater to improve the coupling between the stakes and the ground and reduce the measured contact resistance. The electrodes were attached to a multi-core cable, which was connected to an electronic switching unit. A 12-volt deep cycle battery was used to power the SuperSting. The switching unit automatically selected the appropriate electrodes for each measurement. Measurements were initiated along the line and were incrementally moved through the electrodes until readings were taken at every position along the line. [Figure](#page-7-0) 2-1 shows the setup. Line 1 and Line 3 were 205 feet in length and Line 2 was 170 feet in length.

Each electrode stakeout was surveyed using a Garmin GPS unit receiver that had a site-specific accuracy of +/- 4 feet. Electrode positions are labeled by ERI line number and electrode number. Each line begins with electrode 01 at 0 feet. Figure 2 shows the location of the ERI lines and electrodes.

Once the resistivity data were collected, the geophysicist downloaded the raw data to a laptop computer for processing, and interpretation. The resistivity value measured in the field is not true resistivity of the subsurface, but an "apparent resistivity" value that is a combination of the subsurface materials and their contained fluids along the entire path of the electrical current. To determine the true subsurface resistivity, we processed the apparent resistivity values using inversion and forward modeling techniques using AGI's EarthImager2D™ inversion software. The software program uses a smooth model inversion technique to generate a model of actual two-dimensional resistivity values along the profile. Details of the inversion process may be found in Advanced Geosciences, Inc. EarthImager2D Instruction Manual. This program produces an image of modeled resistivity values along the profile, which can then be contoured to evaluate spatial trends in subsurface resistivity values.



**Figure 2-1: Setup of electrical resistivity imaging (ERI) system along ERI Line 2. Photo date November 5, 2021, view to the west.**

## <span id="page-7-0"></span>**ERI Results**

The quality of the data collected was considered good due to the strong contrast between subsurface materials. Resistivity values were generally low, ranging from 3 to 175 ohm-meters, which indicate conductive soil and bedrock subsurface material. The profiles show a characteristic two-layer model with a surficial layer of higher resistivity sandy soil or alluvium overlying a low resistivity layer representing bedrock. The bedrock layer at this site is a metamorphic greenschist.

ERI Line 1 (Figure 2, Figure 3) was oriented from west to east in the northern portion of the site, with electrode 01 at the west end, and electrode 42 at the east end. Bedrock depth is estimated to be approximately 5 feet to 9 feet bgs and relatively flat lying across the profile. Boring B-102 was drilled in the road approximately 10 feet east of electrode 42, where it encountered bedrock (metamorphic greenschist) at a depth of 18.3 feet bgs. The difference between ERI line and boring bedrock is likely related to rapid decrease in bedrock elevation toward the stream basin.

ERI Line 2 [\(Figure](#page-7-0) 2-1, Figure 2, Figure 4) was oriented from west to east in the southern portion of the site, with electrode 01 at the west end, and electrode 35 at the east end. Bedrock depth is estimated to be approximately 8 feet to 11 feet bgs and relatively flat lying across most of the profile. Boring B-101 was drilled in the road approximately 10 feet north-northeast of electrode 35, where it encountered bedrock (metamorphic greenschist) at a depth of 15.3 feet bgs. Bedrock was observed along Thatcher Brook at a similar depth that is imaged in ERI Line 2.

ERI Line 3 (Figure 2, Figure 5) was oriented from west to east in the northern portion of the site, with electrode 01 at the west end, and electrode 42 at the east end. Bedrock depth was approximately 5 feet to 12 feet bgs and relatively flat lying across most of the profile. Boring B-101 was drilled in the road approximately 55 feet west of electrode 1, where it encountered bedrock (metamorphic greenschist) at a depth of 15.3 feet bgs.

## **Geophysical Borehole Utility Clearance**

WSP Golder performed geophysical utility clearance for the boring locations using electromagnetic radiodetection (RD) and Ground Penetrating Radar (GPR) surficial geophysical techniques. The utility clearance was carried out by investigating a ten-foot box around each proposed boring location first using RD. The RD was used to sweep the proposed area to detect possible utilities within the proposed boring locations. GPR data were then collected in orthogonal directions over the proposed area to identify potential utilities. No subsurface utilities were detected within the areas investigated for the proposed boring locations.

## **2.3 Rock Probes**

VTrans completed (5) rock probes (BH-1 through BH-5) between April 27, 2022 and May 4, 2022 to further characterize the varying bedrock surface at the project site. The rock probe logs provided to WSP Golder<sup>4</sup> are included in Appendix C. Approximately 10 feet of rock core was obtained at each completed rock probe location. The locations of these rock probes are presented in Table 1. A detailed summary of rock quality parameters for the recovered rock cores is also presented in Table 2.

## **3.0 LABORATORY TESTING**

The VTrans Soils Laboratory conducted testing of collected soil samples in accordance with applicable American Association of State Highway Transportation Officials (AASHTO) testing procedures. Geotechnical laboratory tests were performed on representative SPT split spoon soil samples collected from the borings to assist in soil classification. The types and number of each of the laboratory tests conducted on soil samples are summarized in [Table](#page-9-0) 3-1. Measured index and classification test results from soil samples are summarized in Table 3. Soil testing results are included on the boring logs in Appendix A. Complete laboratory testing results are provided in Appendix D.

<sup>4</sup> Electronic file "Waterbury BO 1446(40) Rock Probe Logs.pdf" provided to WSP Golder on May 19, 2022.



<span id="page-9-0"></span>

<b>Laboratory Test</b>	<b>Test Standard</b>	<b>No. Tests Completed</b>
Grainsize (sieve)	AASHTO T 88	1 2
<b>Moisture Content</b>	AASHTO T 265	ィク

**Table 3-1: Soil Laboratory Testing**

## **4.0 SUBSURFACE CONDITIONS**

The following descriptions summarize the major stratigraphic units encountered at the site during the geophysical testing and the geotechnical boring program. Figure 6 provides our interpreted stratigraphic profile along the centerline of the existing bridge showing existing stationing of Stowe Street, subsurface soils, and the bedrock surface. Figure 7 and Figure 8 provide our interpreted stratigraphic cross-sections of subsurface soils and bedrock along the centerline of the existing Abutment No. 1 and Abutment No. 2, respectively.

**Very dense Sands and Gravels**: Very dense Sands and Gravels were encountered in the shallow subsurface in the vicinity of Abutments No. 1 and No. 2 and is differentiated from the underlying layer by higher SPT N-values. WSP Golder interprets this layer to be directly below pavement at 0.3 feet bgs at Abutment No. 1 and 0.9 feet bgs at Abutment No. 2. The layer was observed to be approximately 1.3 feet thick at Abutment No. 1 and 0.7 feet thick at Abutment No. 2. Split spoon refusal was encountered in this layer at both borings B-101 and B-102.

**Loose Sands and Gravels**: Loose Sands and Gravels were encountered below the very dense Sands and Gravels in borings B-101 and B-102. WSP Golder interprets this layer to extend to approximately 2.5 feet bgs at Abutment No. 1 and to approximately 11 feet bgs at Abutment No. 2. The layer was observed to range in thickness from approximately 0.5 feet near Abutment No. 1 to 7 feet near Abutment No. 2. N-values for this layer ranged from 7 to 9 with an average of 8.

**Medium dense Sands and Gravels**: Medium dense Sands and Gravels were encountered 8 feet bgs at boring B-101 near Abutment No. 1, and 11 feet bgs at boring B-102 near Abutment No. 2. We interpret this layer to extend to approximately 14 feet bgs at both abutments. The layer ranges in thickness from approximately 3 feet at Abutment No. 1 to 6 feet at Abutment No. 2. N-values for this layer ranged from 14 to 24 with an average of 19.

**Very dense Sand**: Very dense Sand was encountered at 14 feet bgs in boring B-101 located at Abutment No. 1. We interpret this layer to extend to top of bedrock, with a layer thickness of approximately 1.3 feet.

**Very loose Silt**: A very loose Silt was encountered at 14 feet bgs in boring B-102 located at the location of Abutment No. 2. WSP Golder interprets the thickness of this layer to be approximately 4.5 feet, extending to the top of bedrock. The split spoon was able to be advanced with the weight of the hammer in this layer.

**Concrete:** Concrete was encountered at 14 feet bgs in boing B-103 located at Abutment No.1. Concrete was cored a thickness of 1.0 feet, after which top of the bedrock was encountered.

**Bedrock:** WSP Golder encountered the bedrock surface in borings B-101 through B-103 and in rock probes BH-1 through BH-5. The bedrock lithology consists of green, gray and grayish green, very fine grained, slightly weathered to fresh schist and phyllite. The bedrock encountered in the borings and rock probes varies in depth from 10 feet bgs to 18.3 feet bgs. Bedrock was encountered at 15.3 feet bgs in B-101, 15.0 feet bgs in B-103 and at BH-1 which is located to the southwest from Abutment No. 1. Bedrock was encountered at 12.8 feet bgs in BH-5 located to the southeast of Abutment No. 1. B-102, near Abutment No. 2, encountered bedrock at 18.3 feet bgs, BH-2 located to the northwest of Abutment No. 2, encountered bedrock at 10 feet bgs and BH-3 also located to the northwest of Abutment No. 2 encountered bedrock at 18 feet bgs. We collected 0.7 feet of rock core from B-101, 5.0 feet of rock core from B-102, and 2.2 feet of rock core from B-103 in up to 5-foot runs. VTrans collected 10 feet of rock core from each of the rock probe locations (BH-1 through BH-5). Results from electrical resistivity imaging (Section [2.2\)](#page-4-0) indicate that the bedrock at the site varied in depth from 5 feet bgs to 12 feet bgs. Table 2 provides detailed information about the recovery, TCR, RQD, rock mass rating (RMR), and descriptions of lithology, rock mass, and discontinuities.

**Groundwater:** WSP Golder measured the groundwater levels in borings B-101 and B-102 upon encountering refusal and before the start of rock coring. In boring B-101, no groundwater was detected to the top of bedrock. In boring B-102, groundwater was measured at 15.5 feet bgs. Groundwater levels were measured in borings B-101A and B-103 after the completion of the drilling. In boring B-101A, groundwater was measured at 7.4 feet bgs. In boring B-103, groundwater was detected at 12.6 feet bgs. Groundwater levels measured after completion of rock probes BH-1 through BH-5 ranged between 4.2 feet bgs and 14 feet bgs. Groundwater levels shown on the subsurface profiles (Figure 6, Figure 7, and Figure 8) were interpreted using the water level measurements from both the borings (B-10X) and probes (BH-X).

## **5.0 GEOTECHNICAL RECOMMENDATIONS**

WSP Golder's geotechnical analyses and recommendations are based on the plan and profile drawings<sup>[1](#page-3-0)</sup> of the existing site topography and existing bridge features provided to Golder by VTrans.

## **5.1 Engineering Properties**

WSP Golder used the geotechnical data collected from the geotechnical boring program to develop design parameters for the in-situ soils and rock. Soil parameters are based on correlation of SPT N60 values with effective friction angles for in situ soil, on typical values for fill materials, and on values from AASHTO. The recommended design parameters are summarized in [Table](#page-10-0) 5-1 for both in situ soils and proposed construction materials. The recommended design parameters are summarized in [Table](#page-11-0) 5-2 for bedrock.

<span id="page-10-0"></span>

### **Table 5-1: Engineering Properties of In Situ Soil and Construction Materials**

Notes: <sup>1</sup>Rankine, assuming a flat surface behind a wall; <sup>2</sup>Correlated from SPT N<sub>60</sub> values corrected for hammer efficiency. <sup>3</sup>Formed or precast concrete against clean sand or silty sand-gravel mixture; <sup>4</sup>Formed or precast concrete against clean gravel or gravel-sand mixture from AASHTO (2020).



<span id="page-11-0"></span>

<b>Rock Type</b>	<b>Rock Mass</b>	<b>RQD</b>	<b>Friction</b>	<b>Unconfined Compressive</b>	<b>Coefficient of</b>
	<b>Rating</b>	(%)	Angle $(°)^1$	Strength $(ksf)^2$	Friction <sup>3</sup>
Schist and Phyllite	55	46	69	1.600	0.7

**Table 5-2: Engineering Properties of Rock**

Notes: <sup>1</sup>Correlated based on the RMR (Rock Mass Rating); <sup>2</sup>Correlated based on field classification strength tests; <sup>3</sup>Assumes concrete sliding on rock.

## **5.2 Frost**

The 90% reliability predicted frost penetration depth below a paved surface at the site is 60 inches or 5 feet per the VTrans Pavement Design Guide<sup>5</sup>. We recommend a minimum frost penetration depth of 5 feet for design at the site where foundations are bearing on soil.

## **5.3 Lateral Earth Pressure**

Abutments and wingwalls will be founded on spread footings. We recommend the abutments and wingwalls be designed to resist lateral earth pressures that may develop as a result of active earth pressure. We also recommend that granular backfill meeting the requirements of VTrans Standard Specification for Construction for Item 204.30, Granular Backfill for Structures be placed behind the abutment walls during construction. Rankine earth pressure coefficients are presented in [Table](#page-10-0) 5-1 and calculations are provided in Appendix D.

## **5.4 Abutment and Wingwall Foundations**

We understand that the bridge abutments and wingwalls are intended to consist of precast concrete founded on sub-footings bearing on bedrock. Boring B-103, located approximately 6.7 feet behind the east side of existing Abutment No. 1, encountered concrete on top of the bedrock surface at 14 feet to 15 feet bgs. Boring B-101, located approximately 12.2 feet behind the west side of existing Abutment No. 1, encountered the top of bedrock at 15.3 feet bgs. Rock probe BH-1, located approximately 20 feet behind the west side wingwall of the existing Abutment No. 1 encountered bedrock at a depth of 15 feet bgs at El. 489.2 feet. At the BH-5 rock probe which was located 42 feet to the east of the Abutment No.1 east wingwall, bedrock was encountered at depth of 12.8 feet bgs at El. 493.4 feet. The sloping of bedrock in the vicinity of Abutment No. 1 downstream from east to west (El. 493.4 to El. 489.2) indicates that the proposed sub-footings for the wingwalls and Abutment No. 1 will need to be constructed to match this bedrock slope.

Boring B-102, located approximately 19 feet behind the east side of existing Abutment No. 2, encountered the top of bedrock at 18.3 feet bgs, or El. 490.7 feet. At rock probe BH-2 bedrock was encountered at a depth of 10 feet bgs at El. 491.9 feet and at 18 feet bgs at El. 488.7 feet at BH-3, both of these rock probes were located behind the Abutment No. 2 west wingwall in the north to northwest direction. At the BH-4 rock probe which was located approximately 30 feet to the north from the Abutment No. 2 east wingwall, bedrock was encountered at a depth of 15 feet bgs at El. 494.9 feet. Similarly, to the bedrock slope at Abutment No. 1, the bedrock in the vicinity of Abutment No. 2 also slopes downstream from east to west (El. 495.0 to El. 490.7) the proposed sub-footings for the wingwalls and Abutment No. 2 will need to be constructed to match the bedrock slope. Bedrock elevation

<sup>5</sup> Vermont Agency of Transportation (2002). Flexible Pavement Design Procedures for use with the 1993 AASHTO Guide for Design of Pavement Structures. http://vtrans.vermont.gov/sites/aot/files/highway/documents/highway/PavementMgmtDesignGuide.pdf, Accessed 2021 January 25.



across the site ranges between El. 488.8 feet and El. 495.0 feet. We recommend footings for proposed bridge Abutment No.1 and Abutment No. 2 and wingwalls be placed on clean rock at or below the existing bedrock elevation.

WSP Golder estimated the spread footing geotechnical bearing resistance for proposed abutment dimensions from the schematic<sup>6</sup> provided by VTrans in the request for proposals using geotechnical design parameters determined using soil and bedrock data from the boring logs, and design procedures outlined in AASHTO (2020) for spread footings on rock. WSP Golder's calculation of estimated bearing resistance is based on an assumed effective footing width of 8 feet, the engineering properties of the bedrock, and the assumption that the footing or sub-footing will bear directly on the bedrock. Our recommended nominal geotechnical bearing resistance is 151.2 ksf for the strength limit state. We recommend a resistance factor of 0.45 be used at the strength limit state, which results in a factored bearing resistance of 68.0 ksf. To limit settlements to less than one inch, WSP Golder recommends a service limit state bearing resistance of 70 ksf be used for design of the spread footing. Since the service limit state bearing resistance is greater than the strength limit state bearing resistance, a limiting value for bearing resistance of 68.0 ksf should be used. Calculations are provided in Appendix E for Abutment No. 1 (Abutment No. 2 has similar footing dimensions and results).

Assuming the cast-in-place concrete sub-footing bears on bedrock, a sliding coefficient (tan δ) of 0.70 is recommended per AASHTO LRFD Table C3.11.5.3-1, provided the bedrock subgrade is prepared under dry conditions, can be visually inspected, and the slope of the bedrock shallower than 4H:1V in any direction. We recommend a resistance factor of 0.8 for sliding at the strength limit state. Additional sliding resistance can be provided by doweling the sub-footing to the bedrock.

Sliding between the precast concrete footing and cast-in-place concrete sub-footing should be treated as described in AASHTO LRFD Section 5.7.4 for the concrete surface conditions outlined therein. Sliding resistance can be improved by intentionally roughening the concrete surfaces and applying grout between the surfaces to improve full contact between the precast footing and cast-in-place sub-footing.

## **5.5 Settlement**

Bedrock was encountered between 10 feet to 18.3 feet bgs and is overlain by coarse-grained sands and gravels. Assuming the proposed abutments and wingwalls will be founded on or within bedrock, settlement is anticipated to be negligible.

## **5.6 Scour Recommendations**

<span id="page-12-0"></span>VTrans' Preliminary Hydraulics Memorandum<sup>7</sup> indicates that the existing bridge with its 39-foot-wide clear span "does not meet state stream equilibrium standards for bankfull width", where bankfull width is estimated to be between 45 feet and 50 feet upstream and recommends "a minimum clear span of 45 feet for any new structure." The Me[m](#page-12-0)orandum<sup>7</sup> shows a potential bridge geometry where abutments have a 45-foot clear span from the abutment mid-height to the bridge deck with fill materials placed on a slope of 1V:1.5H from the mid-height of the abut[m](#page-12-0)ents to the stream bed. The Memorandum<sup>7</sup> additionally identifies a preliminary design scour depth of 2.5

<sup>7</sup> Vermont Agency of Transportation, Internal Technical Memorandum from Boisvert C. to Stone, L. and Wark, N. dated January 22, 2020 entitled: Waterbury BO 1446(40), Pin# 93J040, Waterbury, TH-2, Br36, over Thatcher Brook, Site location: Stowe Street and VT-100 Intersection, Coordinates: 44°20'40.1"N 72°44'49.1"W.



<sup>6</sup> Stantec, Waterbury BO 1446(40), z93j040borplanREVISED.pdf, dated 9/23/2021, provided by VTrans in the Work Order Request via email on September 29, 2021.

feet; recommends VTrans Specification 706.04 (Stone Fill, Type IV) be used to protect the stream channel banks; and notes that a final scour analysis will be performed during final design. WSP Golder supports VTrans' planned final hydraulic analyses of the proposed structure and fills, and recommends the evaluation considers: that the height of the bridge deck has sufficient freeboard during flooding for the new trapezoidal-shaped section at the bridge; that the velocity of the brook during flooding to design the sloped fill materials to resist erosion and scour; and possible ice jamming and its effects on the fill materials in the brook.

## **6.0 GENERAL CONSTRUCTION CONSIDERATIONS**

## **General Subgrade Improvement**

All areas proposed for embankment fill placement related to the wingwall or abutment construction should be cleared, grubbed, and stripped of existing vegetation and topsoil. During the grubbing and stripping process, unsuitable materials exposed at the subgrade level, such as wood, logs, tree stumps, forest mat materials, organic silt, peat, soft clay, cinders, debris fill, or other materials that may compress, decay or collapse should be removed. Subgrade surfaces should be prepared in accordance with VTrans Specification 203.12 (Subgrade) which requires a firm, unyielding surface compacted to attain at least 95 percent of the maximum dry density as determined by AASHTO T99, Method C. Where hand-guided equipment is used, such as a small vibratory plate compactor, the loose lift thickness shall not exceed 6 inches and cobbles larger than 4 inches should be removed from the fill prior to placement.

## **Rock Removal Recommendations**

Golder recommends the planned spread footing be founded on the in-situ bedrock, or on a sub-footing supported on the bedrock. Rock excavation should be conducted carefully to prevent overbreakage and the removal of rock beyond the limits of excavation.

Where bedrock removal is needed for construction of the abutment sub-footing, the removal method should be limited to mechanical methods only and blasting methods (such as close-in blasting) should be avoided. Mechanical methods should consist of perforation drilling, line drilling, broaching, hydraulic splitting, ripping, use of hydraulic hammers/breakers, use of expansive agents, or other mechanical means of rock removal, as approved by the Engineer.

The bedrock subgrade that will bear foundation concrete for the abutment sub-footing should be cleaned of loose rock, soil, and dust and pressure washed. Cleaning of rock surfaces should consist of the removal of all organic materials, soil, dust, and loose rock. Cleaning may be performed with high-pressure air jets, water jets, brooms, or by any other method acceptable to the Engineer. The bedrock subgrade should consist of a reasonably level surface and be free of projections that cannot be spanned by footing reinforcement or that reduce the concrete cover over reinforcement by more than 30%. Where rock has been overexcavated to achieve a level bearing surface or a concrete sub-footing is specified, concrete having a minimum 28-day compressive strength of 3,000 psi should be placed on the cleaned bedrock surface to the foundation bearing elevation.

## **Sub-footing Doweling Recommendations**

Where dowels are required to increase sliding resistance between the bedrock and concrete sub-footing, holes for the reinforcement should be at least 1 inch greater in diameter than the dowel when Type IV mortar is used per VTrans Specification 507.06, Placing Dowels. Where approved adhesives are used, the manufacturer's recommendations should be followed for hole sizing. The Contractor should flush the drill holes of all drill cuttings and debris with compressed air prior to the installation of the rock dowels.



## **Abutment and Wingwall Construction**

Structural Fill for use in abutment construction should meet the requirements of VTrans Specification 704.08 for "Granular Backfill for Structures" and satisfy the gradation limits shown on VTrans Specification Table 704.08A. Structural Fill should be placed in accordance with VTrans Specification 204.05 (Backfill) and should be placed in layers not exceeding 6 inches in thickness, and compacted to at least 95 percent of its AASHTO T99, Method C maximum dry density. To verify consistency of material properties, gradation tests (ASTM D422, AASHTO T27) should be performed at a 1/1,000 cubic yard frequency, and moisture density testing to establish target densities (ASTM D698, AASHTO T99) should be performed at a 1/10,000 cubic yard frequency during construction. In addition, to verify in-place compacted density and moisture content, confirmatory field moisture and density tests (ASTM D6938, AASHTO T310) should be performed at a frequency of three (3) locations per lift, or at the discretion of the geotechnical engineer.

## **Construction Observation**

The recommendations contained herein are based on the known and predictable behavior of properly engineered and constructed foundations. We recommend observation of the subsurface conditions during construction, subgrade preparation for spread footings, and spread footing installation to verify that the procedures and techniques used during construction are in accordance with our recommendations contained herein.

## **7.0 CLOSING**

This report was prepared for VTrans specifically to provide general geotechnical foundation recommendations for the proposed replacement of Bridge 36 over Thatcher Brook in Waterbury, Vermont. We performed the site investigation and compiled our recommendations in accordance with generally accepted soil, bedrock, and foundation engineering practices in this geographical area and under similar time and financial constraints. The professional services provided by WSP Golder for this project include only the geotechnical aspects of the subsurface conditions at this site. Our general geotechnical recommendations are based, in part, on information obtained from the referenced subsurface explorations completed at the discrete locations described in this memorandum. Variations in the nature and extent of subsurface conditions between explorations should be expected. WSP Golder makes no other warranty, either express or implied.



## Signature Page

**Golder Associates Inc.**

Melissa E. Landon, PhD, PE Jay R. Smerekanicz, PG, CPG *Lead Consultant Geotechnical Engineer Senior Lead Consultant, Geologist* 

Christopher C. Benda, PE *Director, Geotechnical Engineer*

MA/MEL/CCB/JRS

Golder and the G logo are trademarks of Golder Associates Corporation

https://golderassociates.sharepoint.com/sites/153945/project files/6 deliverables/final report/vtrans waterbury br36 bo1446(40) report golder-21497656 6.16.22.docx



## **Tables**



### Table 1: Bedrock Depths from Borings Nearby Abutments Geotechnical Investigation and Recommendations Bridge No. 36 Replacement, Waterbury, VT Waterbury BO 1446(40)



#### **Notes**

1. Borings B-101 and B-102 were performed by Platform Environmental Drilling and Remediation Services (Platform) from November 18 to 19, 2021. Borings B-101A and B-103 were performed by Platform on December 10, 2021.

2. Rock Probes BH-1 through BH-5 were performed by VTrans from April 26 to May 4, 2022.

3. All boring (B-10X & BH-X) locations are illustrated in Figure 2 of the Geotechnical Services Report.

4. As-Drilled elevations for B-101 and B-102 are derived from the survey file received from VTrans on December 2, 2021 entitled: z93j040sv.DNG. As-drilled locations and elevations for B-101A and B-103 were provided in an email from VTrans on December 20th, 2021.

5. As-Drilled location and elevations for BH-1 through BH-5 are derived from the electronic file received from VTrans on May 19, 2022 entitled: Waterbury BO 1446 (40).PDF.

6. Boring logs with descriptions of the soil and rock encountered at the site are provided provided in Appendix A.

7. An obstruction crimped the casing at 11.1 ft below ground surface and the boring was terminated.

Prepared By: ATM/MA Checked By: BK/FCT Reviewed By: MEL

Geotechnical Investigation and Recommendations Bridge No. 36 Replacement, Waterbury, VT Waterbury BO 1446(40)



#### Table 2: Summary of Rock Core Quality

 Geotechnical Investigation and Recommendations Bridge No. 36 Replacement, Waterbury, VT Waterbury BO 1446(40)

No. **Midpoint** Depth Below Bedrock Surface Surface (ft) Length Length Length Designation Weathering<sup>4</sup><br>(ft) Start End Midpoint (ft) (ft) % (ft) % (-) (-) Estimated Field Strength<sup>5</sup> Rock Mass Rating  $[RMR]^6$ (-) (in) (ft) (-) (ft) Start End Midpoint (ft) (ft) % (ft) % (-) (-) (-) (-) Core **Size** Depth Below Ground Surface (ft) Existing **Ground Surface** Elevation<sup>1</sup> Test Boring **Designation** RQD<sup>3</sup> Physical Rock Parameters Lithologic, Rock Mass and Discontinuity Description<sup>7</sup> Run **Run 2 Run 2 Run 2 Run 2 Run 2 Run 2 Run** 2 Run 2 BH-5 NX (2.16) 506.2 R1 15.3 12.8 17.8 15.3 5.0 5.0 100% 1.75 35% Fair Slightly Weathered (W2) **Moderately** Hard 55  $BH-5$  NX (2.16) 506.2 R2 20.3 17.8 22.8 20.3 5.0 5.0 100% 1.55 31% Fair Very Slightly Weathered (W2) **Moderately** Hard 55 17.8-22.8 ft: Dark-gray & white to white & green-gray, fine-grained, very slightly weathered (W2), moderately hard (R3), graphitic PHYLLITE; discontinuities steeply dipping (65° - 80°), close to moderately close joint spacing; [CARBONACEOUS PHYLLITE MEMBER, OTTAUQUECHEE FORMATION] 12.8-17.8 ft: Gray & white, fine-grained, slightly weathered (W2), moderately hard (R3), graphitic PHYLLITE; discontinuities steeply dipping (65° - 75°), close to moderately close joint spacing; [CARBONACEOUS PHYLLITE MEMBER, OTTAUQUECHEE FORMATIONI

Notes:

1. As-Drilled elevations for B-101 and B-102 are derived from the survey file received from VTrans on December 2, 2021 entitled: z93j040sv.DNG. The As-drilled elevation for B-103 was provided in an email from VTrans on Dec 2021.

2. As-Drilled elevations for BH-1 through BH-5 are derived from the rock probe logs provided to Golder on May 19, 2022 in electronic file entitled: Waterbury BO 1446 (40) Rock Probe Logs.

3. TCR = total core recovery. Total core recovery is the length of core recovered divided by the length of the run.

4. RQD = rock quality designation. RQD is the total length of intact, full diameter core pieces recovered with a length greater than or equal to 4 inches measured along the core axis. The percent RQD is the total length of that vertical discontinuities are not included in determination of RQD.

5. Weathering and Estimated Field Strength for Golder Borings B-101, -102 and -103 based on Tables II.4 and II.3 (respectively) in Willey, 2004 (based on ISRM, 1981).

6. Rock Mass Rating (RMR) System (Bieniawski, 1989) assigns numerical ratings to six parameters, including the strength of the intact rock, the RQD, the discontinuity spacing, groundwater conditions, and orientation of dis give the RMR value. The rating adjustment for joint orientation was assigned a value of 0; correlation of geologic field mapping data of exposed rock outcrops with the rock core samples and proposed foundation type may all orientation, and thus a modification to the RMR value shown on this table.

7. Mapped bedrock formation taken from: Bedrock Geologic Map of Vermont By Nicholas M Ratcliffe (USGS), Rolfe S Stanley (Univ. of Vermont), Marjorie H. Gale (Vermont Geological Survey), and Gregory J. Walsh (USGS), 2011.

8. ft = feet, in = inches Prepared by: BK/ATM/MA Checked by: MEL Reviewed by: JRS



## Table 3: Summary of Laboratory Soil Index and Classification Testing Results Geotechnical Investigation and Recommendations Bridge No. 36 Replacement, Waterbury, VT Waterbury BO 1446(40)



### Notes:

1. Test boring (B-10X) locations are illustrated in the plan titled "Waterbury BO 1446(40) Boring Locations with Ground & Bedrock Elevations.pdf".

2. As-drilled elevations for B-101 and B-102 are derived from electronic file "z93j040sv.dgn" received by Golder on December 2, 2021 from VTrans.

3. Laboratory testing was performed by VTrans Construction and Materials Bureau Central Laboratory

4. The particle size testing was done in accordance with AASHTO T 88, Standard Method of Test for Particle Size Analysis of Soils and the moisture contest testing was done in accordance with AASHTO T 265 Standard Method of Test for Laboratory Determination of Moisture Content of Soils .

5. AASHTO and USCS symbols assigned based on interpreted laboratory test results provided by VTrans on December 14, 2021.

6. Complete laboratory soil test results are provided in Appendix C.



Reviewed By: CCB



## Figures







#### VERMONT AGENCY OF TRANSPORTATION 219 N MAIN ST, BARRE, VT 05641 CLIENT FROJECT AND THE RESERVE OF THE RESERVE OF THE RESERVE OF THE RESERVE OF THE PROJECT OF THE RESERVE OF THE RESE



## VTRANS BRIDGE 36 REPLACEMENT, WATERBURY, VT, BO 1446(40)

#### **SITE LOCATION MAP** TITLE



 $\begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}$ 

IF THIS MEASUREMENT DOES NOT MATCH WHAT IS SHOWN, THE SHEET SIZE HAS BEEN MODIFIED FROM: ANSI A

21497656 PROJECT NO.

CONTROL REV.

 $\overline{\mathbf{r}}$ 

0

 $\begin{array}{c}\n1 \text{ in } \\
1 \text{ in } \\
1 \text{ in } \\
0\n\end{array}$ 



VTRANS BRIDGE 36 REPLACEMENT, WATERBURY, VT, BO 1446(40)

# **BORING LOCATION PLAN** TITLE



# NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

- 1. BASEMAP IS TAKEN FROM ELECTRONIC FILE "z93j040sv.dgn" PROVIDED TO GOLDER BY VTRANS ON DECEMBER 2, 2021.
- 2. THE AS-DRILLED GOLDER BORING LOCATIONS FOR BORINGS B-101 AND B-102 SHOWN IN THIS FIGURE ARE DERIVED FROM ELECTRONIC FILE "z93j040sv.dgn" PROVIDED TO GOLDER BY VTRANS ON DECEMBER 2, 2021.
- 3. THE AS-DRILLED GOLDER BORING LOCATIONS FOR BORINGS B-101A AND B-103 SHOWN IN THIS FIGURE WERE PROVIDED TO GOLDER BY VTRANS VIA EMAIL ON DECEMBER 20, 2021
- 4. THE PROPOSED ABUTMENT FEATURES SHOWN ARE DERIVED FROM ELECTRONIC FILE "bridge footing.dgn" PROVIDED TO GOLDER BY STANTEC ON FEBRUARY 9, 2022.
- 5. THE AS-DRILLED VTRANS ROCK PROBE LOCATIONS FOR BH-1 THROUGH BH-5 SHOWN IN THIS FIGURE ARE DERIVED FROM THE INFORMATION FOUND IN THE ELECTRONIC FILE "WATERBURY BO 1446 (40) ROCK PROBE LOGS.PDF" PROVIDED TO GOLDER BY VTRANS ON MAY 19, 2022.





3. THIS GENERALIZED SUBSURFACE PROFILE IS INTENDED TO CONVEY TRENDS IN SUBSURFACE CONDITIONS. THE **And an International Struck And A**nd IDEALIZED AND HAVE BEEN DEVELOPED BASED ON **ANDRELIZED AND AND AND AND AND AND HOTEL** BOUNDARIES BETWEEN STRATA ARE APPROXIMATE AND IDEALIZED AND HAVE BEEN DEVELOPED BASED ON INTERPRETATIONS OF WIDELY SPACED EXPLORATIONS. ACTUAL SOIL AND ROCK TRANSITIONS MAY VARY AND ARE PROBABLY MORE ERRATIC. FOR MORE SPECIFIC INFORMATION REFER TO BORING LOGS.



1  $3\frac{1}{3}$ 

 $\begin{array}{c}\n1 \text{ in } \\
1 \text{ in } \\
1 \text{ in } \\
0\n\end{array}$ 

0

## VERMONT AGENCY OF TRANSPORTATION 219 N MAIN ST, BARRE, VT 05641

VTRANS BRIDGE 36 REPLACEMENT, WATERBURY, VT, BO 1446(40) CLIENT PROJECT



**ELECTRICAL RESISTIVITY IMAGING PROFILE, ERI-1** TITLE

CONSULTANT





# NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

1. THE GOLDER GEOPHYSICS ERI POINT LOCATIONS SHOWN IN THIS FIGURE ARE APPROXIMATE AND ARE BASED



GREENISH GRAY, FINE-GRAINED, FRESH, VERY STRONG, SCHIST BROWN, LOOSE TO VERY DENSE, FINE TO COARSE SAND AND GRAVEL, TRACE TO SOME SILT (SAND AND GRAVEL)



3. THIS GENERALIZED SUBSURFACE PROFILE IS INTENDED TO CONVEY TRENDS IN SUBSURFACE CONDITIONS. THE NON SUBSURFACE TRENDS IN SUBSURFACE CONDITIONS. THE BOUNDARIES BETWEEN STRATA ARE APPROXIMATE AND IDEALIZED AND HAVE BEEN DEVELOPED BASED ON INTERPRETATIONS OF WIDELY SPACED EXPLORATIONS. ACTUAL SOIL AND ROCK TRANSITIONS MAY VARY AND ARE PROBABLY MORE ERRATIC. FOR MORE SPECIFIC INFORMATION REFER TO BORING LOGS.



1  $4 \frac{1}{1}$ 

 $\begin{array}{c}\n1 \text{ in } \\
1 \text{ in } \\
1 \text{ in } \\
0\n\end{array}$ 

0

## VERMONT AGENCY OF TRANSPORTATION 219 N MAIN ST, BARRE, VT 05641

VTRANS BRIDGE 36 REPLACEMENT, WATERBURY, VT, BO 1446(40) CLIENT PROJECT



**ELECTRICAL RESISTIVITY IMAGING PROFILE, ERI-2** TITLE

CONSULTANT





# NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

1. THE GOLDER GEOPHYSICS ERI POINT LOCATIONS SHOWN IN THIS FIGURE ARE APPROXIMATE AND ARE BASED



GREENISH GRAY, FINE-GRAINED, FRESH, VERY STRONG, SCHIST

BROWN, LOOSE TO VERY DENSE, FINE TO COARSE SAND AND

VTRANS BRIDGE 36 REPLACEMENT, WATERBURY, VT, BO **ELECTRICAL RESISTIVITY IMAGING PROFILE, ERI-3**



REV.<br>1 FIGURE<br>5

 $\begin{array}{c}\n1 \text{ in } \\
1 \text{ in } \\
1 \text{ in } \\
0\n\end{array}$ 

0





# NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION



BROW DENSE, FINE TO COARSE SAND AND

IE SILT (SAND AND GRAVEL)

GRAINED, FRESH, VERY STRONG, SCHIST

EACE

VATER SURFACE

RFACE

**BANK FULL WIDTH WATER** 

TIONS AND ELEVATIONS FOR BORINGS B-101 AND B-102 SHOWN IN THIS IC FILE "z93j040sv.dgn" PROVIDED TO GOLDER BY VTRANS ON

ID ELEVATIONS FOR BORINGS B-101A AND B-103 SHOWN IN THIS FIGURE IS VIA EMAIL ON DECEMBER 20, 2021 **CATIONS SHOWN IN THIS FIGURE ARE APPROXIMATE AND ARE BASED** 



![](_page_27_Picture_631.jpeg)

## VERMONT AGENCY OF TRANSPORTATION 219 N MAIN ST, BARRE, VT 05641

![](_page_27_Picture_632.jpeg)

CONSULTANT

![](_page_27_Picture_633.jpeg)

NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

5. THE GROUNDWATER TABLE SHOWN IN THIS FIGURE IS INTERPRETED FROM FIELD MEASUREMENTS DURING

6. THIS GENERALIZED SUBSURFACE PROFILE IS INTENDED TO CONVEY TRENDS IN SUBSURFACE CONDITIONS. THIS GENERALIZED SUBSURFACE PROFILE IS INTENDED TO CONVET TRENDS IN SUBSURFACE CONDITIONS. THE BOUNDARIES BETWEEN STRATA ARE APPROXIMATE AND IDEALIZED AND HAVE BEEN DEVELOPED BASED ON INTERPRETATIONS OF WIDELY SPACED EXPLORATIONS. ACTUAL SOIL AND ROCK TRANSITIONS MAY VARY AND ARE PROBABLY MORE ERRATIC. FOR MORE SPECIFIC INFORMATION REFER TO BORING LOGS. 7. WATER LEVEL IN THATCHER BROOK IS BASED ON VTRANS PRELIMINARY HYDRAULIC ANALYSIS ESTIMATED

- ON MEASUREMENTS TAKEN BY GOLDER ASSOCIATES IN THE FIELD. 4. SEE BORING LOGS FOR DETAILED LITHOLOGICAL DESCRIPTIONS.
- DRILLING AND ACTUAL FIELD CONDITIONS WILL VARY.
- 
- UPSTREAM BANK FULL WIDTH. ROAD AND DOES NOT SHOW THE EXISTING BRIDGE ABUTMENTS.
- ARE FROM THE CENTERLINE OF THE EXISTING ROADWAY.
- BY VTRANS ON JANUARY 12, 2022.
- 

8. THIS FIGURE DEPICTS THE INTERPRETED SUBSURFACE CONDITIONS AT THE CENTERLINE OF THE EXISTING

![](_page_27_Picture_634.jpeg)

9. THE STATIONING SHOWN ON THIS FIGURE IS THE EXISTING STOWE ST STATIONING AND OFFSET DISTANCES

10. PROPOSED GRADES WERE TAKEN FROM DWG TITLED "z93j040\_corridor\_Default-3D.dwg" PROVIDED TO GOLDER

11. THE PROPOSED ABUTMENT AND SUPERSTRUCTURE FEATURES SHOWN ARE DERIVED FROM ELECTRONIC FILE "BRIDGE FOOTING.DGN" PROVIDED TO GOLDER BY STANTEC ON FEBRUARY 9, 2022.

![](_page_27_Figure_1.jpeg)

![](_page_27_Picture_635.jpeg)

12. THE AS-DRILLED VTRANS ROCK PROBE LOCATIONS FOR BH-1 THROUGH BH-5 SHOWN IN THIS FIGURE ARE DERIVED FROM THE INFORMATION FOUND IN THE ELECTRONIC FILE "WATERBURY BO 1446 (40) ROCK PROBE LOGS.PDF" PROVIDED TO GOLDER BY VTRANS ON MAY 19, 2022.

![](_page_28_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_28_Picture_579.jpeg)

0

![](_page_28_Picture_580.jpeg)

![](_page_28_Picture_581.jpeg)

VERMONT AGENCY OF TRANSPORTATION 219 N MAIN ST, BARRE, VT 05641 CLIENT PROJECT

CONSULTANT

![](_page_28_Picture_582.jpeg)

![](_page_28_Picture_38.jpeg)

NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

## **LEGEND**

1. THE AS-DRILLED GOLDER BORING LOCATIONS AND ELEVATIONS FOR BORINGS B-101 AND B-102 SHOWN 11. THE AS-DRILLED VTRANS ROCK PROBE LOCATIONS FOR BH-1 THROUGH BH-5 SHOWN IN THIS FIGURE ARE DERIVED FROM THE INFORMATION FOUND IN THE ELECTRONIC FILE "WATERBURY BO 1446 (40) ROCK PROBE LOGS.PDF" PROVIDED TO GOLDER BY VTRANS ON MAY 19, 2022.

IED GROUNDWATER SURFACE UPSTREAM BANK FULL WIDTH WATER LEVEL OF THATCHER BROOK

IN THIS FIGURE ARE DERIVED FROM ELECTRONIC FILE "z93j040sv.dgn" PROVIDED TO GOLDER BY

2. THE AS-DRILLED BORING LOCATIONS AND ELEVATIONS FOR BORING B-103 SHOWN IN THIS FIGURE WAS

3. THE GOLDER GEOPHYSICS ERI POINT LOCATIONS SHOWN IN THIS FIGURE ARE APPROXIMATE AND ARE BASED ON MEASUREMENTS TAKEN BY GOLDER ASSOCIATES IN THE FIELD.

5. THE GROUNDWATER TABLE SHOWN IN THIS FIGURE IS INTERPRETED FROM FIELD MEASUREMENTS

- VTRANS ON DECEMBER 2, 2021.
- PROVIDED TO GOLDER BY VTRANS VIA EMAIL ON DECEMBER 20, 2021
- 4. SEE BORING LOGS FOR DETAILED LITHOLOGICAL DESCRIPTIONS.
- DURING DRILLING AND ACTUAL FIELD CONDITIONS WILL VARY.
- REFER TO BORING LOGS.
- ESTIMATED UPSTREAM BANK FULL WIDTH.
- EXISTING ROAD AND DOES NOT SHOW THE EXISTING BRIDGE ABUTMENTS.
- ABUTMENT NO. 1.
- 10. THE PROPOSED ABUTMENT AND SUPERSTRUCTURE FEATURES SHOWN ARE DERIVED FROM

DOSE TO VERY DENSE, FINE TO COARSE SAND AND

RACE TO SOME SILT (SAND AND GRAVEL)

GRAY, FINE-GRAINED, FRESH, VERY STRONG, SCHIST LITE (BEDROCK)

**EXPOUND SURFACE** 

![](_page_28_Figure_2.jpeg)

![](_page_28_Picture_583.jpeg)

6. THIS GENERALIZED SUBSURFACE PROFILE IS INTENDED TO CONVEY TRENDS IN SUBSURFACE CONDITIONS. THE BOUNDARIES BETWEEN STRATA ARE APPROXIMATE AND IDEALIZED AND HAVE BEEN DEVELOPED BASED ON INTERPRETATIONS OF WIDELY SPACED EXPLORATIONS. ACTUAL SOIL AND ROCK TRANSITIONS MAY VARY AND ARE PROBABLY MORE ERRATIC. FOR MORE SPECIFIC INFORMATION

7. WATER LEVEL IN THATCHER BROOK IS BASED ON VTRANS PRELIMINARY HYDRAULIC ANALYSIS

8. THIS FIGURE DEPICTS THE INTERPRETED SUBSURFACE CONDITIONS AT THE CENTERLINE OF THE

9. THE OFFSET DISTANCES SHOWN IN THIS FIGURE ARE FROM THE LOCATION OF THE EXISTING

ELECTRONIC FILE "BRIDGE FOOTING.DGN" PROVIDED TO GOLDER BY STANTEC ON FEBRUARY 9, 2022.

## **NOTE(S)**

![](_page_29_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_29_Picture_604.jpeg)

![](_page_29_Picture_605.jpeg)

VERMONT AGENCY OF TRANSPORTATION 219 N MAIN ST, BARRE, VT 05641 CLIENT PROJECT

CONSULTANT

![](_page_29_Picture_606.jpeg)

0

 $1" = 10'$ 

0

FEET

10 20

# NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

1. THE AS-DRILLED GOLDER BORING LOCATIONS AND ELEVATIONS FOR BORINGS B-101 AND B-102 SHOWN IN THIS FIGURE ARE DERIVED FROM ELECTRONIC FILE "z93j040sv.dgn" PROVIDED TO GOLDER

2. THE AS-DRILLED BORING LOCATIONS AND ELEVATIONS FOR BORINGS B-101A AND B-103 SHOWN IN THIS FIGURE WERE PROVIDED TO GOLDER BY VTRANS VIA EMAIL ON DECEMBER 20, 2021 3. THE GOLDER GEOPHYSICS ERI POINT LOCATIONS SHOWN IN THIS FIGURE ARE APPROXIMATE AND

- BY VTRANS ON DECEMBER 2, 2021.
- ARE BASED ON MEASUREMENTS TAKEN BY GOLDER ASSOCIATES IN THE FIELD.
- 4. SEE BORING LOGS FOR DETAILED LITHOLOGICAL DESCRIPTIONS.
- 5. THE GROUNDWATER TABLE SHOWN IN THIS FIGURE IS INTERPRETED FROM FIELD MEASUREMENTS
- DURING DRILLING AND ACTUAL FIELD CONDITIONS WILL VARY. 6. THIS GENERALIZED SUBSURFACE PROFILE IS INTENDED TO CONVEY TRENDS IN SUBSURFACE
- INFORMATION REFER TO BORING LOGS. ESTIMATED UPSTREAM BANK FULL WIDTH.
- 
- 9. THE OFFSET DISTANCES SHOWN IN THIS FIGURE ARE FROM THE LOCATION OF THE EXISTING
- ABUTMENT NO. 2. 10.THE PROPOSED ABUTMENT AND SUPERSTRUCTURE FEATURES SHOWN ARE DERIVED FROM

CONDITIONS. THE BOUNDARIES BETWEEN STRATA ARE APPROXIMATE AND IDEALIZED AND HAVE BEEN DEVELOPED BASED ON INTERPRETATIONS OF WIDELY SPACED EXPLORATIONS. ACTUAL SOIL AND ROCK TRANSITIONS MAY VARY AND ARE PROBABLY MORE ERRATIC. FOR MORE SPECIFIC

7. WATER LEVEL IN THATCHER BROOK IS BASED ON VTRANS PRELIMINARY HYDRAULIC ANALYSIS

8. THIS FIGURE DEPICTS THE INTERPRETED SUBSURFACE CONDITIONS AT THE CENTERLINE OF THE EXISTING ROAD AND DOES NOT SHOW THE EXISTING BRIDGE ABUTMENTS.

ELECTRONIC FILE "BRIDGE FOOTING.DGN" PROVIDED TO GOLDER BY STANTEC ON FEBRUARY 9, 2022.

11.THE AS-DRILLED VTRANS ROCK PROBE LOCATIONS FOR BH-1 THROUGH BH-5 SHOWN IN THIS FIGURE ARE DERIVED FROM THE INFORMATION FOUND IN THE ELECTRONIC FILE "WATERBURY BO 1446 (40) ROCK PROBE LOGS.PDF" PROVIDED TO GOLDER BY VTRANS ON MAY 19, 2022.

## **NOTE(S)**

## **LEGEND**

BROWN, LOOSE TO VERY DENSE, FINE TO COARSE SAND AND

![](_page_29_Figure_3.jpeg)

![](_page_29_Figure_2.jpeg)

**APPENDIX A**

## Boring Logs

![](_page_30_Picture_4.jpeg)

![](_page_31_Picture_599.jpeg)

BORING LOG VTRANS WATERBURY BRIDGE NO. 36.GPJ VERMONT AOT.GDT 6/16/22

![](_page_32_Picture_304.jpeg)

BORING LOG VTRANS WATERBURY BRIDGE NO. 36.GPJ VERMONT AOT.GDT 6/16/22 BORING LOG VTRANS WATERBURY BRIDGE NO. 36.GPJ VERMONT AOT.GDT 6/16/22

![](_page_33_Picture_411.jpeg)

BORING LOG VTRANS WATERBURY BRIDGE NO. 36.GPJ VERMONT AOT.GDT 6/16/22

![](_page_34_Picture_308.jpeg)

![](_page_35_Picture_355.jpeg)

BORING LOG VTRANS WATERBURY BRIDGE NO. 36.GPJ VERMONT AOT.GDT 6/16/22
# Rock Core Photographs



**Rock Core Photographs Geotechnical Investigation and Recommendations Bridge No. 36 Replacement, Waterbury, VT Waterbury BO 1446(40)**





*B-101 Run 1: 15.5 - 16.5 ft bgs*



**Rock Core Photographs Geotechnical Investigation and Recommendations Bridge No. 36 Replacement, Waterbury, VT Waterbury BO 1446(40)**





*B-102 Run 1: 18.5 - 23.5 ft bgs*



**Rock Core Photographs Geotechnical Investigation and Recommendations Bridge No. 36 Replacement, Waterbury, VT Waterbury BO 1446(40)**





*B-103 Run 1: 15.0 - 19.0 ft bgs*



**APPENDIX C**

# Rock Probe Logs













**APPENDIX D**

# Laboratory Testing Results





#### State of Vermont Agency of Transportation Construction and Materials Bureau Central Laboratory



#### Test Results

T-88 Sieve Analysis T-265 Moisture Content



Comments: 0





#### Test Results

T-88 Sieve Analysis T-265 Moisture Content



Comments: 0

 $< 75$ um  $< N_0.200$ 





#### Test Results

T-88 Sieve Analysis T-265 Moisture Content



Comments: 0

 $< 75$ um  $< N_0.200$ 





#### Test Results

T-88 Sieve Analysis T-265 Moisture Content



Comments: 0

 $< 75$ um  $< N_0.200$ 





#### Test Results

T-88 Sieve Analysis T-265 Moisture Content



Comments: 0





#### Test Results

T-88 Sieve Analysis T-265 Moisture Content



Comments: 0





#### Test Results

T-88 Sieve Analysis T-265 Moisture Content



Comments: 0





#### Test Results

T-88 Sieve Analysis T-265 Moisture Content



Comments: 0



#### State of Vermont Agency of Transportation Construction and Materials Bureau Central Laboratory



#### Test Results

T-88 Sieve Analysis T-265 Moisture Content



Comments: 0

 $< 75$ um  $< N_0.200$ 





#### Test Results

T-88 Sieve Analysis T-265 Moisture Content



Comments: 0





#### Test Results

T-88 Sieve Analysis T-265 Moisture Content



Comments: LAB NOTE: Some wood was within sample.





#### Test Results

T-88 Sieve Analysis T-265 Moisture Content



Comments: LAB NOTE: Some wood was within sample.

 $< 75$ um  $< N_0.200$ 

**APPENDIX E**

# **Calculations**







### **OBJECTIVE**

Calculate the nominal and factored bearing capacity of the proposed spread footing on bedrock at Abutment No. 1.

#### METHOD

Use the method described in the AASHTO LRFD Bridge Design Specifications, 9th Ed, 2020 and the empirical correlations from Wyllie, D.C. Foundations on Rock to calculate the bearing capacity for both the strength limit and service limit states.

#### **REFERENCES**

1. AASHTO LRFD Bridge Design Specifications, 9th Ed. 2020 (LRFD).

2. Stantec, Waterbury BO 1446(40), z93j040borplanREVISED.pdf, dated September 23, 2021, provided by VTrans in the Work Order Request via email on September 29, 2021.

3. Wyllie, D.C. 1999. Foundations on Rock, 2nd ed. E&FN Spon, NY.

4. Appendix A - boring logs and Appendix C - rock probe logs from Waterbury Bridge 36 Geotechnical Services Report GAUI-21497656.

5. Golder Associates, Waterbury Bridge 36 Geotechnical services Report GAUI-21497656, Table 2 Summary of Rock Core Quality Table



Figure 1: Proposed Abutment Dimensions (from Reference 2)

#### ASSUMPTIONS

1. Unconfined compressive strength of 1600 ksf (~11300 psi) was used for the strength of the bedrock (Schist and Phyllite) in the analysis of Abutment No.1 based on averaging unconfined compressive strengths, correlating from rock core descriptions from the WSP Golder boring logs and VTrans rock probe logs ("Very Hard Rock" correlating to 15000 to 35000 psi, "Hard Rock" correlating to 7500 to 15000 psi, and "Medium Hard Rock" correlating to 3500 to 7500 psi; References 4 and 5).

2. Embedment depth of zero conservatively assumed since the footing will be bearing on bedrock and frost protection is not needed.

3. For the purposes of this evaluation a load eccentricity of 2 feet and an effective footing width of 8 feet has been assumed.





#### CALCULATION

#### A. Determine the bearing resistance at the strength limit state.

As per AASHTO LRFD (Ref. 1) Article 10.6.3.2.2, the nominal bearing resistance of rock should be determined using empirical correlation with the geomechanics RMR system. Since AASHTO LRFD does not directly address bearing resistance on bedrock, this analysis will use Wyllie (1999) Foundations on Rock (Ref. 3) to calculate the unfactored bearing resistance based on correlation to the average RMR value determined for the abutment.

Since the footing is anticipated to be on flat bedrock (Ref. 3), the procedure in Ref. 3 Section 5.2.2 will be used.

1. Use the average RMR value determined for the bedrock at Bridge 36 to calculate the rock mass friction angle and cohesion.

Rock mass friction angle, φ'<sub>i</sub>:

(Ref. 3, Eqn 3.16) (Ref. 3, Eqn 3.17) (Ref. 3, Eqn 3.18) ϕ୧ᇱ = arctan 1 4hcosଶθ − 1 ଵ/ଶ <sup>h</sup> = 1 + <sup>16</sup> mσᇱ + sσ୳(୰) 3mଶσ୳(୰) θ = 1 3 90 + arctan 1 hଷ − 1 ଵ/ଶ

where:

σ' = vertical effective normal stress on bedrock









As per AASHTO LRFD (Ref. 1) Article 10.6.2.5.2, if the recommended value of bearing resistance exceeds either the unconfined compressive strength of the rock or the nominal resistance of the concrete, the bearing resistance shall be taken as the lesser of those values. The nominal resistance of concrete shall be taken as 0.3 ${f\mathstrut}_{c}$  .

> $f'_{c}$  = 3500 psi = 504 ksf (assumed)<br> $q_{\text{n}}$  concrete = 0.3 $f'$  = 151 ksf 151  $\mathsf{q}_{\mathsf{n},\mathsf{concrete}}$  and  $\mathsf{q}_{\mathsf{n},\mathsf{calculated}}$  and  $\mathsf{q}_{\mathsf{u}(\mathsf{r})}$ 151 443.1 1600 ksf  $q_{n,\text{concrete}} = 0.3f'_{c} =$

> > Thus, use  $q_n =$  **151.2** ksf

3. Calculate the factored bearing resistance.

$$
\mathbf{q}_{\mathbf{r}} = \mathbf{\Phi}_{\mathbf{b}} \mathbf{q}_{\mathbf{n}}
$$

where:

 $φ_b$  = bearing resistance factor

0.45 (Ref. 1, Table 10.5.5.2.2-1, "Footings on rock")

 $q_r =$ 68.0 ksf





Use AASHTO LRFD (Ref. 1) Table C10.6.2.5.1-1 to determine the presumptive bearing resistance at the service limit state.

Type of Bearing Material: Weathered or broken bedrock of any kind, except argillaceous rock (shale)

70 ksf Bearing Resistance Recommended Value of Use = Note: This bearing resistance is settlement limited (1.0 inch as per AASHTO LRFD Section 10.6.2.5.1) and applies only at the service limit state.

1.0 (Ref. 1, Section 10.5.5.1) Resistance factor for the service limit state:

> 70 ksf Factored bearing resistance =

### **CONCLUSIONS**

1. For the proposed spread footing at Abutment No. 1, the recommended nominal bearing resistance is 151.2 ksf for the strength limit state. A resistance factor of 0.45 is recommended for use at the strength limit state; this results in a factored bearing resistance of 68.0 ksf.

2. The recommended value of use for the presumptive bearing resistance at the service limit state is 70 ksf based on LRFD Table C10.6.2.5.1-1. This bearing resistance is settlement limited (1.0-inch) and applies only at the service limit state. The resistance factor for the service limit state is 1.0 based on LRFD Section 10.5.5.1.





#### Reference 3, Table 3.7 Interpolation



Table 3.7 Approximate relationship between rock mass quality and material constants (Hoek and Brown, 1988)



https://golderassociates.sharepoint.com/sites/153945/Project Files/5 Technical Work/Abutment Bearing Capcity/21497656 Bridge 36\_Abutment Bearing Capacity Update 20220616

# CALCULATIONS





#### Reference 3, Table 5.4 interpolation



# Table 5.4 Correction factors for foundation shapes  $(L = \text{length}, B = \text{width})$







#### OBJECTIVE

Calculate the nominal and factored bearing capacity of the proposed spread footing on bedrock at Abutment No. 2.

#### METHOD

Use the method described in the AASHTO LRFD Bridge Design Specifications, 9th Ed, 2020 and the empirical correlations from Wyllie, D.C. Foundations on Rock to calculate the bearing capacity for both the strength limit and service limit states.

### **REFERENCES**

1. AASHTO LRFD Bridge Design Specifications, 9th Ed. 2020 (LRFD).

2. Stantec, Waterbury BO 1446(40), z93j040borplanREVISED.pdf, dated September 23, 2021, provided by VTrans in the Work Order Request via email on September 29, 2021.

3. Wyllie, D.C. 1999. Foundations on Rock, 2nd ed. E&FN Spon, NY.

4. Appendix A - boring logs and Appendix C - rock probe logs from Waterbury Bridge 36 Geotechnical Services Report GAUI-21497656.

5. Golder Associates, Waterbury Bridge 36 Geotechnical services Report GAUI-21497656, Table 2 Summary of Rock Core Quality Table



Figure 1: Proposed Abutment Dimensions (from Reference 2)

#### ASSUMPTIONS

1. Unconfined compressive strength of 1600 ksf (~11300 psi) was used for the strength of the bedrock (Schist and Phyllite) in the analysis of Abutment No.2 based on averaging unconfined compressive strengths, correlating from rock core descriptions from the WSP Golder boring logs and VTrans rock probe logs ("Very Hard Rock" correlating to 15000 to 35000 psi, "Hard Rock" correlating to 7500 to 15000 psi, and "Medium Hard Rock" correlating to 3500 to 7500 psi; References 4 and 5).

2. Embedment depth of zero conservatively assumed since the footing will be bearing on bedrock and frost protection is not needed.

3. For the purposes of this evaluation a load eccentricity of 2 feet and an effective footing width of 8 feet has been assumed.





#### CALCULATION

#### A. Determine the bearing resistance at the strength limit state.

As per AASHTO LRFD (Ref. 1) Article 10.6.3.2.2, the nominal bearing resistance of rock should be determined using empirical correlation with the geomechanics RMR system. Since AASHTO LRFD does not directly address bearing resistance on bedrock, this analysis will use Wyllie (1999) Foundations on Rock (Ref. 3) to calculate the unfactored bearing resistance based on correlation to the average RMR value determined for the abutment

Since the footing is anticipated to be on flat bedrock (Ref. 3), the procedure in Ref. 3 Section 5.2.2 will be used.

1. Use the average RMR value determined for the bedrock at Bridge 36 to calculate the rock mass friction angle and cohesion.

Rock mass friction angle, φ'<sub>i</sub>:

(Ref. 3, Eqn 3.16) (Ref. 3, Eqn 3.17) (Ref. 3, Eqn 3.18) θ = 3 h<sup>ଷ</sup> − 1 ଵ/ଶ ϕ୧ᇱ = arctan 1 4hcosଶθ − 1 ଵ/ଶ <sup>h</sup> = 1 + <sup>16</sup> mσᇱ + sσ୳(୰) 3mଶσ୳(୰) 1 90 + arctan 1

where:

σ' = vertical effective normal stress on bedrock









2. Calculate the nominal bearing resistance.

$$
q_n = C_{f1} s^{1/2} \sigma_{u(r)} \left[ 1 + \left( m s^{-1/2} + 1 \right)^{1/2} \right]
$$
 (Ref. 3, Eqn 5.4)

where:



As per AASHTO LRFD (Ref. 1) Article 10.6.2.5.2, if the recommended value of bearing resistance exceeds either the unconfined compressive strength of the rock or the nominal resistance of the concrete, the bearing resistance shall be taken as the lesser of those values. The nominal resistance of concrete shall be taken as 0.3 ${f\mathstrut}_{c}$ .



Thus, use  $q_n =$ 151.2 ksf

3. Calculate the factored bearing resistance.

$$
\mathbf{q}_{\mathbf{r}} = \mathbf{\Phi}_{\mathbf{b}} \mathbf{q}_{\mathbf{n}}
$$

where:

 $φ_b$  = bearing resistance factor

0.45 (Ref. 1, Table 10.5.5.2.2-1, "Footings on rock")

 $q_r =$ 68.0 ksf





#### B. Determine the bearing resistance at the service limit state.

Use AASHTO LRFD (Ref. 1) Table C10.6.2.5.1-1 to determine the presumptive bearing resistance at the service limit state.

Type of Bearing Material: Weathered or broken bedrock of any kind, except argillaceous rock (shale)

70 ksf Bearing Resistance Recommended Value of Use = Note: This bearing resistance is settlement limited (1.0 inch as per AASHTO LRFD Section 10.6.2.5.1) and applies only at the service limit state.



#### **CONCLUSIONS**

1. For the proposed spread footing at Abutment No. 2, the recommended nominal bearing resistance is 151.2 ksf for the strength limit state. A resistance factor of 0.45 is recommended for use at the strength limit state; this results in a factored bearing resistance of 68.0 ksf.

2. The recommended value of use for the presumptive bearing resistance at the service limit state is 70 ksf based on LRFD Table C10.6.2.5.1-1. This bearing resistance is settlement limited (1.0-inch) and applies only at the service limit state. The resistance factor for the service limit state is 1.0 based on LRFD Section 10.5.5.1.





# **Attachment 1**

#### Reference 3, Table 3.7 Interpolation



Table 3.7 Approximate relationship between rock mass quality and material constants (Hoek and Brown, 1988)



https://golderassociates.sharepoint.com/sites/153945/Project Files/5 Technical Work/Abutment Bearing Capcity/21497656 Bridge 36\_Abutment Bearing Capacity Update 20220616





### Reference 3, Table 5.4 interpolation



Table 5.4 Correction factors for foundation shapes  $(L = length, B = width)$ 




**golder.com**