

ADDENDUM NUMBER 2

Project Number 89005566

Project Title Kenneth Road Bridge Replacement Federal Job #BRO-B048(50)

ISSUE DATE: <u>10/23/2019</u>

Bidders are hereby notified that the Bidding and Contract Documents for the above project, for which Bids are to be received on 10/29/2019, are amended as follows:

Information to Bidders The following is provided to Bidders for information only:

1. The Design Professional has conducted soil investigations and geotech reports for design purposes only. The geotech reports do not constitute the contractor's investigation of site conditions and was not included with the contract documents. The geotech reports have been requested by bidders and are included with this addenda. The geotech reports are deemed as not suitable for contractor's use, contractor is using them at their risk and the reports are merely suggestive of the nature of the tested material, not representative of entire site conditions. Acknowledgment of this addenda shows acceptance of all risks associated with any use.

Q1.	Will Stay in Place Metal Decking be allowed as an option of forming for the bridge
	deck?
A1.	Yes
Q2.	Will Precast Concrete Panels be allowed as an option for the bridge deck?
A2.	No. Cast-in-Place deck only.
Q3.	Will alternate mix designs be allowed in place of the KCMO SA1 mix for the
	substructure and superstructure concrete? le. MoDOT Class B, B1, B2?
A3.	No. Use KCMO SA-1 mix.
Q4.	Is the estimated quantity for deck concrete figured with the use of concrete panels?
A4.	The estimated quantity for the deck concrete is in square yard.

NOTE: Bidders must acknowledge receipt of this Addendum by listing the number and date, where provided, on the Bid Form - Document 00410.

REPORT OF SUBSURFACE EXPLORATION AND GEOTECHNICAL ENGINEERING EVALUATION

The Design Professional has conducted a soil investigation and geotech report for design purposes only. The geotech report does not constitute the contractor's investigation of site conditions and was not included with the contract documents. The geotech report has been requested by bidders and is included with this addenda. The geotech report is deemed as not suitable for contractor's use, contractor is using it at their risk and the report is merely suggestive of the nature of the tested material, not representative of entire site conditions. Acknowledgement of this addenda shows acceptance of all risks associated with any use.

KENNETH ROAD BRIDGE REPLACEMENT KANSAS CITY, MISSOURI TSI PROJECT NUMBER 20152024

SHAFER, KLINE & WARREN, INC. 11250 Corporate Avenue Lenexa, Kansas 66219



8248 NW 101st Terrace, #5 Kansas City, Missouri 64153

May 13, 2016



May 13, 2016

Mr. Gary Strack, PE SHAFER, KLINE & WARREN, INC. 11250 Coroporate Avenue Lenexa, Kansas 66219

Re: Report of Subsurface Exploration and Geotechnical Engineering Evaluation Kenneth Road Bridge Replacement Kansas City, Missouri TSi Project No. 20152024

Dear Mr. Strack:

TSi Geotechnical, Inc. (TSi) has completed the authorized subsurface exploration and geotechnical engineering evaluation for the referenced project and is pleased to submit this report of our findings to Shafer, Kline & Warren, Inc. (SKW). The purpose of our scope was to determine subsurface conditions at specific exploration locations and to gather data on which to prepare geotechnical recommendations for the design and construction of the proposed replacement of the Kenneth Road Bridge over the Blue River in Kansas City, Missouri and Overland Park, Kansas. This report describes the exploration procedures used, documents the data obtained, and presents our evaluations and recommendations relative to the geotechnical engineering aspects of the project.

We appreciate the opportunity to assist you with this project. If you have any questions, or if we may be of further service to you, please call us.

Respectfully submitted, **TSI GEOTECHNICAL, INC.**

Jim Jacobe, PE Project Manager



Denise Hervey /JAJ Denise B. Hervey, PE 5/13/16 Principal

8248 NW 101" Terr, #5 Kansas City, MO 64153 816.599.7965 (tel) 816.599.7967 (fax)

www.tsigeotech.com

1.0 Scope of Services	1
2.0 SITE AND PROJECT DESCRIPTIONS	2
 3.0 FIELD EXPLORATION AND LABORATORY TESTING 3.1 Field Exploration	3
 4.0 SUBSURFACE CONDITIONS 4.1 Generalized Subsurface Profile	5
 5.0 ENGINEERING ASSESSMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 5.1 Driven Steel Piles 5.2 Foundation – Drilled Shafts 5.3 Deep Foundation Lateral Loads 5.4 Slope Stability 5.5 Swelling Clay Considerations 5.6 Pavement Design 5.7 Seismic Site Classification 	
 6.0 SITE PREPARATION AND EXCAVATION CONSIDERATIONS 6.1 Subgrade Preparation 6.2 Subgrade Protection 6.3 Fill and Backfill Materials 6.4 Fill and Backfill Placement 	
7.0 CONSTRUCTION OBSERVATION AND TESTING	15
8.0 REPORT LIMITATIONS	16
Appendix A – Site and Boring Location Plan, Figure 1	
Appendix B – Boring Logs General Notes Unified Soil Classification System	
Appendix C – Laboratory Test Results	
Appendix D – Rock Core Photographs	
Appendix E – Pavement Core Photographs	
Appendix F – Global Stability Analysis Results, Figure 2	

SUBSURFACE EXPLORATION AND GEOTECHNICAL ENGINEERING EVALUATION KENNETH ROAD BRIDGE REPLACEMENT KANSAS CITY, MISSOURI

1.0 SCOPE OF SERVICES

This report summarizes the results of a geotechnical study performed for the proposed replacement of the Kenneth Road Bridge over Blue River in Kansas City, Missouri and Overland Park, Kansas. The study was performed in general accordance with TSi's proposal to SKW, dated December 23, 2014, which identified the following items for inclusion in this study report:

- Subsurface conditions at the boring locations;
- Laboratory test results;
- Influence of groundwater on the project;
- Pavement subgrade recommendations;
- Recommendations for fill materials, placement, and compaction;
- Slope stability recommendations;
- Foundation recommendations for the bridge structure; and,
- Seismic site classification per MoDOT guidelines.

2.0 SITE AND PROJECT DESCRIPTIONS

The existing bridge is located along West Kenneth Road near the Kansas and Missouri State Line. The existing bridge is currently closed to traffic over the Blue River. The project will include the replacement of the existing bridge and the realignment of Kenneth Road.

The general location of the project site is shown below. The Site and Boring Location Plan, Figure 1 in Appendix A, provide a more detailed plan of the project area.



3.0 FIELD EXPLORATION AND LABORATORY TESTING

3.1 FIELD EXPLORATION

TSi conducted an exploration program from December 11, 2015 to December 16, 2015 consisting of ten soil borings designated as Borings B-01 to B-10. The logs from this exploration are included in Appendix B. The approximate locations of the borings are indicated on the Site and Boring Location Plans, Figure 1 in Appendix A. The boring locations were selected by SKW and staked in the field by the project surveyor prior to TSi mobilization.

All of the borings were drilled using a CME-550 ATV-mounted drill rig to advance hollow stem auger drilling tools to the requested depth or auger refusal. A geotechnical specialist from TSi directed the exploration procedures in the field, maintained a field log of the conditions encountered in the borings, and collected and classified the samples recovered. Split-spoon samples were recovered from the borings using a 2-inch outside-diameter, split-barrel sampler, driven by an automatic hammer in accordance with ASTM D 1586. The split-spoon samples were placed in plastic bags for later testing in the laboratory. Three-inch Shelby tube samples were preserved by sealing the entire sample in the tube. Borings were backfilled with auger cuttings and the pavement replaced with quick setting concrete. Any excess cuttings were removed from the site.

Borings B-02, -04,-06, and -07 were advanced below auger refusal, and 10 to 30 feet of the underlying rock was sampled using NX size diamond-bit rock coring methods. The rock core recovered was placed in a cardboard box and taken to the laboratory for examination and testing. Percent recovery and Rock Quality Designation (RQD) values were calculated for each rock core sample and are noted on the boring logs. The RQD is the percentage of the total length of rock cored that consists of sound pieces that are a minimum of 4.0 inches in length. The RQD is a general indication of the integrity of the in-situ rock mass. Based on RQD, rock quality can be described as excellent (90 to 100), good (75 to 90), fair (50 to 75), poor (25 to 50), or very poor (0 to 25). TSi photographed the rock core samples and have included the photographs in Appendix D of this report.

The results of the field tests and measurements were recorded on field logs and appropriate data sheets by TSi's geotechnical specialist. Those data sheets and logs contain information concerning the exploration methods, samples attempted and recovered, indications of the presence of various subsurface materials, and the observation of groundwater. The field logs and data sheets contain the engineer's interpretations of the conditions between samples, based on the performance of the exploration equipment and the cuttings brought to the surface. The final logs included in this report were based on the field logs, modified as appropriate based on the results of laboratory testing of soil samples. A copy of the final logs are included in Appendix B.

3.2 LABORATORY TESTING

A laboratory testing program was conducted by TSi to determine selected engineering properties of the obtained soil samples. The following laboratory tests were performed on the samples recovered from the borings:

- Visual description by color and texture of each sample (ASTM 2488);
- Natural moisture content of each sample (ASTM D 2216);
- Atterberg limits on selected cohesive samples (ASTM D 4318);
- Grain size analysis using hydrometer of selected granular samples (ASTM D 422);
- Unit weight on selected cohesive samples (ASTM D 7263);
- Unconfined compression on selected cohesive samples (ASTM D 2166);
- Direct shear (ASTM D 698);
- Standard Proctor compaction of selected samples (ASTM D 698); and
- California Bearing Ratio (CBR) (ASTM D 1883).

The results of select laboratory tests are summarized on the Boring Logs. Results of the standard Proctor, CBR, direct shear, and sieve analyses are included in Appendix C. The analyses and conclusions contained in this report are based on field and laboratory test results and on the interpretations of the subsurface conditions as reported on the logs. Only data pertinent to the objectives of this report have been included on the logs; therefore, these logs should not be used for other purposes.

4.0 SUBSURFACE CONDITIONS

Details of the subsurface conditions encountered at the boring locations are shown on the logs in Appendix B. The general subsurface conditions encountered and their pertinent engineering characteristics are described in the following paragraphs. Conditions represented by the borings should be considered applicable only at these locations on the dates shown; the reported conditions may be different at other locations or at other times.

4.1 GENERALIZED SUBSURFACE PROFILE

Four borings were drilled on the west side of the bridge, with six borings being drilled on the east side. Borings B-01, -02 and -07 encountered asphaltic concrete pavement at the surface. Beneath the pavement, borings B-01 and B-02, encountered lean to fat clay (CL or CH, in accordance with the Unified Soil Classification System) to depths of 19.0 feet. Borings B-03 and B-04 encountered fill at the surface, consisting of gravel and sand with varying amounts of clay which continued to a depth of approximately 19.0 feet. Underlying the fill, lean clay was encountered to an approximate depth of 23.0 feet. Borings B-05, -06, -08, -09, and -10 encountered clayey soils with organics at the surface, and underlying the surficial soils lean clays with varying amounts of sand and gravel were encountered to depths ranging from 15.0 to 17.0 feet. All borings encountered lean clay underlying surface top soil or asphaltic concrete, the clay continued to depths of 15.0 to 18.0 feet.

The standard penetration test (N) values in the clay ranged from weight of hammer to 10 blows per foot (bpf). Moisture content of the clay ranged from 22% to 37%. Atterberg limits tests on samples of clay resulted in liquid limits (LL) of 38 to 51, and plasticity indexes (PI) of 23 to 37. Dry unit weights of the clay range from 84 to 103 pounds per cubic feet (pcf). Undrained shear strengths of the clay range from 0.14 to 0.74 tons per square feet (tsf). N values in the fill ranged from 10 to 16 bpf. Moisture content of the fill ranged from 2% to 9%.

Two standard penetration tests were performed in shale with values of 39 and 40 bpf. Limestone and shale bedrock was encountered in all borings except B-08 and B-10. Limestone encountered was moderately hard to hard, and moderately to slightly weathered, with intermitted shale bands of varying thickness. Shale encountered was moderately weathered, and moderately hard. Table 1 below contains the apparent depth and elevation where bedrock was first encountered as well as the depth and elevation of auger refusal. Approximately 10 feet of bedrock core was recovered from borings B-02 and B-07, and approximately 30 feet of bedrock core was recovered from borings B-04 and B-06. Recoveries in the bedrock cored ranged from 96 to 100%. Rock Quality Designation (RQD) of the bedrock cored ranged from 85 to 100%.

Boring Location	Bedrock Depth (ft.)	Bedrock Elevation (ft.)	Auger Refusal Depth (ft.)	Auger Refusal Elevation (ft.)
B-01	19.0	852.9	22.5	849.4
B-02	19.0	851.9	22.0	848.9
B-03	23.5	847.9	24.0	847.4
B-04	22.8	847.1	22.8	847.1
B-05	16.0	848.5	16.0	848.5
B-06	15.5	848.0	15.5	848.0
B-07	18.5	850.4	18.5	850.4
B-08	15.0	850.5	15.0	850.5
B-09	15.5	852.3	16.0	851.8
B-10	17.0	851.8	17.0	851.8

TABLE 1.BEDROCK AND AUGER REFUSAL DEPTHS AND ELEVATIONS

Three pavement cores, B-01, -02, and -07 are summarized in Table 2 below. All cores were drilled in the roadway. Photographs of the pavement cores are included in Appendix D.

TABLE 2.PAVEMENT THICKNESS

Boring Location	Asphalt (in)
B-01	9.5
B-02	10.8
B-07	7.5

4.2 GROUNDWATER

Groundwater was observed in all borings except B-06 during drilling. Table 3 below lists the groundwater depths and elevations observed while drilling. The presence or absence of groundwater at a particular location does not necessarily mean that groundwater will be present or absent at that location at other times. Seasonal variations, water levels in the adjacent Blue River, and other unknown considerations will cause fluctuations in water levels and the presence of water in the soils.

Boring Location	Groundwater Depth (ft.)	Groundwater Elevation (ft.)
B-01	17.5	854.4
B-02	16.5	854.4
B-03	17.5	853.9
B-04	17.0	852.9
B-05	12.5	852.0
B-06	NE	NE
B-07	16.0	852.9
B-08	12.0	853.5
B-09	13.5	854.3
B-10	14.0	854.8

TABLE 3.GROUNDWATER DEPTH AND ELEVATION

NE = Not Encountered

5.0 Engineering Assessments and Recommendations

5.1 DRIVEN STEEL PILES

TSi understands that the abutments of the replacement bridge may be supported on steel H piles driven to practical refusal on bedrock. The capacity of piles driven to practical refusal in limestone will be controlled by the structural capacity of the pile. Table 4 presents structural capacities of common pile sections as presented in the MoDOT EPG 751.36.3:

		GRA	ADE 50	GRA	DE 36
Section	End Area (in2)	Structural Nominal Resistance (kips)	Structural Factored Compression Resistance (\$=0.5) (kips)	Structural Nominal Resistance (kips)	Structural Factored Compression Resistance (\$\$\\$=0.5\$) (kips)
HP 10x42	12.4	620	310	446	220
HP 12x53	15.5	775	380	558	275
HP 14x73	21.4	1070	535	770	385

TABLE 4.STRUCTURAL STEEL HP PILE CAPACITIES

Based on previous experience, we expect that all of the H-piling will penetrate through the onsite soils and weathered bedrock and achieve refusal in the less weathered portions of the underlying bedrock. We anticipate pile tip elevations will vary from approximately 846.0 to 848.5 feet across the bridge. Piles installed with a minimum center-to-center spacing of three diameters do not require a reduction in individual axial pile capacity due to group action.

For pile groups, a spacing of at least three pile diameters, center-to-center, is recommended so that the axial capacity of the pile group will be equivalent to the sum of the individual pile capacities. A minimum pile length of 10 feet is required below the bottom of the pile cap or below the natural ground surface, whichever is lower.

Pile driving resistance should be closely monitored. We recommend PDA testing of the piles. If PDA testing is not performed, TSi should be notified to provide driving criteria based on project specific hammer and cap properties. Because the piling will be driven into bedrock, we recommend driving the piling with protective points to reduce the potential for damage to the pile during driving.

The structural loads will result in some compression of the bedrock beneath the driven piles. Based on the general character of bedrock on the site and assuming the foundations are properly installed, the maximum anticipated settlement of these foundations due to the structural loads should be less than 0.5 inch, not including elastic settlement of the steel pile itself. Differential settlements across the structure should be less than 0.3 inch. The majority of this settlement should take place during construction as the structural loads are applied to the foundations.

5.2 FOUNDATION – DRILLED SHAFTS

TSi understands that the bents may be supported by drilled shafts. TSi anticipates that little or no grading will be performed adjacent to the abutment locations. As such, downdrag loading has not been considered.

Based on the MoDOT EPG 751.37, drilled shafts in the limestone can be supported by a combination of side-friction and end-bearing resistance. Table 5 below summarizes the factored geotechnical resistances that could be used for proportioning the abutments and intermediate bent drilled shafts for this project. Per MoDOT standards, tip resistance is based on strength of rock extending twice the shaft diameter below the tip of the shaft. Resistance factors are based on a component of resistance, strength of material and testing method as outlined in the MoDOT EPG 751.37. Resistance factors are also based on the number of field or laboratory tests performed and a structure classification of "Bridges on Major Roads."

Material	Resis	earing tance sf)	Side Resistance (ksf)					
	Nominal	Factored	Nominal	Factored				
Fill/Clay	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A				
Shale $(avg q_u = 319 ksf)$	N/A	N/A	17.0	5.9 (\$=0.35)				
Limestone ($avg q_u = 517 ksf$)	78.5	33.8 (\$=0.43)	21.6	9.9 (\$=0.46)				

TABLE 5Drilled Shaft Design Parameters

ksf = kips per square foot

Each shaft should be cast the same day it is completed and approved. The base of each shaft should be cleaned of loose rock or soil material using a cleanout bucket. The shaft should continually be pumped as necessary to prevent the accumulation of water. No more than one inch of water accumulation on the shaft base should be allowed at the time of concrete placement.

The design capacity of drilled shafts is intimately tied to installation procedures and observations during construction. Drilled shafts should be installed in accordance with the latest version of Section 701 of the Missouri Standard Specification for Highway Construction. TSi should be retained to review the plans and specifications related to drilled pier construction, especially the estimation of bearing elevations in bid-issue drawings. It is considered essential that a representative of TSi be on-site during all phases of drilled shaft construction. The drilled shaft construction should be performed by an experienced, knowledgeable contractor, familiar with the subsurface conditions in the area of the project site. Rock bits or core barrels will be required to continue the pier excavations into the harder shale and limestone units.

5.3 DEEP FOUNDATION LATERAL LOADS

The lateral load capacity of the drilled shafts and steel H piles will vary based on the dimensions, depth to bedrock, and condition of the bedrock. Foundations subjected to lateral loads should be designed and analyzed for lateral deflection using the LPILE Version 6 computer program by Ensoft, Inc., or an equivalent program. This program analyzes pile deflection as a function of the design loads, foundation properties and subsurface conditions.

Recommended parameters for use in the evaluation of lateral load capacity and deflection are presented in Table 6. Based on the commentary for EPG 751.37.5, TSi understands that probabilistic calibrations for laterally loaded foundations have not been completed at this time. As such, the values provided herein are based on our analysis of the existing subsurface conditions and were estimated, or calculated, based on generally accepted engineering correlations. The lateral design parameters below assume that no interaction of loading will occur between the drilled shafts or H-pile foundations. This condition can be achieved if the foundations are spaced at least 3 diameters apart (center-to-center spacing) in a direction perpendicular to the applied loading and at least 7 diameters apart (center-to-center spacing) in a direction parallel to the applied loading. If the foundations are more closely spaced than this, then a reduction in the lateral design parameters would apply.

Material	L-PILE Material Type ^{Note 1}	Effective Unit Weight ^{Note 2} γ', pcf	Undrained Cohesion psf	Effective Angle of Internal Friction \$\overline{0}\$ degrees	Soil Modulus Parameter k, pci	E ₅₀ Value ^{Note 3}
Soft Clay / Existing Fill	1	120 (55)	250	N/A	N/A	0.02
Stiff Clay	3	125 (60)	700	N/A	500	0.007
Highly Weathered Shale (N≤50)	9	130 (65)	3,000	N/A	2,000	0.0005
Shale Bedrock	9	135 (70)	N/A	N/A	N/A	$\begin{array}{l} q_u = 500 \ psi \\ RQD = 80\% \\ E_r = 25,000 \ psi \\ K_rm = 0.0005 \end{array}$
Limestone Bedrock	6	140 (75)	N/A	N/A	N/A	$q_u = 1,500 psi$

TABLE 6 LPILE PARAMETERS

¹ Material Type: 1 = Soft Clay, 3 = Stiff Clay, 9 = Weak rock

² Use first value above water table and value in parentheses below water table.

³ Version 6 of LPILE requires input of unconfined compressive strength (q_u), Young's Modulus (E_r), K_rm and RQD, for weak rock models.

5.4 SLOPE STABILITY

Global stability analysis was performed for the banks at the bridge abutments. The slope stability analysis was based on borings located near the east bank of the Blue River. The analysis was performed with SLOPE/W using an allowable stress design (ASD) method where a factor of safety (FS) greater than 1.3 is generally considered acceptable for long term, drained conditions, and a FS less than 1.0 is generally considered unstable. Analysis was performed on a 2.5 Horizontal to 1 Vertical (2.5H:1V) slope to evaluate what effect a 5-foot thick rip rap blanket would have on the stability of the slope. The results of the analysis indicated a FS of 1.302. Figure 2, located in Appendix A, illustrates the results of our global stability analysis.

5.5 SWELLING CLAY CONSIDERATIONS

High plasticity (fat) clay soils will likely be exposed during excavation at the site. The fat clay is of concern with regard to its potential for volume change. This concern applies to this material whether it is in its natural condition or used as fill material. This material tends to swell when it absorbs water and to shrink when it dries out. Some relatively simple design and construction considerations are recommended that will help to maintain the natural moisture content of the fat clays. Avoiding conditions that could result in excessive wetting or drying of the fat clay will reduce its potential for volume change. The following design and construction precautions are recommended:

- 1. Fat clay material should not be used as fill within 18 inches of the pavement section.
- 2. Fat clay used as fill should be placed and compacted wet of its optimum moisture content, as discussed in Section 6.4 of this report.
- 3. Positive surface drainage should be provided during and after construction to prevent ponding of water in and around any exposed subgrade and finished pavements.

5.6 PAVEMENT DESIGN

TSi recommends a well-graded aggregate base, such as MoDOT Type 5, directly underlying the pavements with a minimum thickness of 6 inches.

A California Bearing Ratio (CBR) test of the native soil was conducted on a combined sample of subgrade soil from 0 to 2 feet across the site. This test resulted in a CBR of 3.2. The CBR test results are included in Appendix C of this report. Based on the general character of the on-site subsurface conditions and assuming a properly prepared subgrade, a CBR value of 2.5 is considered appropriate for use in designing the flexible pavement sections for the site.

Rigid pavement design can be based on a modulus-of-subgrade reaction (k) of 75 pounds per cubic inch (pci) for the subgrade. These values for rigid and flexible pavement design are based on the requirement that the pavement subgrade is prepared in accordance with the recommendations provided in this report.

5.7 SEISMIC SITE CLASSIFICATION

Based on MoDOT EPG Figure 751.9.1.3.3, the project site is located within Seismic Performance Category (SPC) "A". As such, the soils at the site are not considered susceptible to liquefaction or substantial settlement or loss in strength when subject to the design earthquake loading. The seismic analysis and design procedures outlined in MoDOT EPG 751.9.1 are not required for this project.

6.0 SITE PREPARATION AND EXCAVATION CONSIDERATIONS

6.1 SUBGRADE PREPARATION

Construction areas should be stripped of existing pavement, organic soil, and any deleterious materials prior to site excavation and grading. Care should be taken during stripping to prevent excessive disturbance of the underlying soil. After the removal of these materials, and where further excavation is not required, the exposed subgrade should be proofrolled. Proofrolling is accomplished by passing over the subgrade with proper equipment, such as a loaded tandem-axle dump truck or scraper, and observing the subgrade for pockets of excessively soft, wet, disturbed, or otherwise unsuitable soils. Any unacceptable materials thus found should be excavated and either recompacted or replaced with new structural fill.

Prior to placing fill in any area, the subgrade should be scarified to a depth of about 6 inches, the moisture content adjusted to near its optimum moisture content, and the subgrade recompacted in accordance with recommendations made in subsequent sections of this report. The recommended proofrolling and/or scarification and recompaction may be waived if, in the opinion of a geotechnical engineer, this procedure would be detrimental or unnecessary. Following satisfactory preparation of the subgrade, controlled fill material may be placed.

6.2 SUBGRADE PROTECTION

Construction areas should be properly drained in order to reduce or prevent surface runoff from collecting on the exposed subgrade. Any ponded water on the exposed subgrade should be removed immediately. Temporary stormwater swales and collection areas may be required to control surface water flow into low areas of the site.

To prevent unnecessary disturbance of the subgrade soils, heavy construction vehicles should be restricted from traveling through the finished subgrade. If areas of disturbed subgrade develop, they should be properly repaired in accordance with the recommendations in this report.

The clay soils present at the site are highly susceptible to disturbance from construction traffic, especially during rainy weather. Consideration should be given to leaving cut areas 1 to 2 feet higher than planned subgrade until immediately before paving operations are planned. The extra material that is left in place would protect the final subgrade from disturbance.

Immediately prior to construction of the pavement, it is recommended that the exposed subgrade be evaluated to determine whether moisture contents are within the recommended range and to identify areas disturbed by construction operations. Moisture conditioning of wet or dry areas is recommended prior to construction of the pavement section. Areas disturbed by construction traffic should be reworked.

6.3 FILL AND BACKFILL MATERIALS

In general, fills should consist of low to moderate plasticity clay or well-graded granular materials with a maximum particle size of 1.5 inches. Some of the clays present on the site have moderate plasticity, but there is no practical method of classifying and separating this material during construction. However, the soils encountered in the borings are suitable for use in the deeper fill areas except within 18 inches of the pavement section. Fill materials from off-site sources should be approved prior to their use. Soil with decayable material such as wood, trash, metal, or vegetation is typically not acceptable.

Some of the fill material may require the addition of moisture prior to compaction. This should be performed in a controlled manner using a tank truck with a spray bar, and the moistened soil should be thoroughly blended with a disk or pulverizer to produce a uniform moisture content. Repeated passages of the equipment may be required to achieve a uniform moisture content. If fill is placed during the winter season, fill materials should be carefully observed to see that no ice or frozen soils are placed as fill or remain in the base materials upon which fill is placed.

Some of the fill material may require moisture reduction prior to compaction. During warm weather, moisture reduction can generally be accomplished by disking, or otherwise aerating the soil. When air-drying is not possible, a moisture-reducing chemical additive, such as lime or Class C fly ash, may be used as a drying agent.

6.4 FILL AND BACKFILL PLACEMENT

Cohesive fill should be compacted to a dry density of at least 95% of the standard Proctor maximum dry density (ASTM D 698) of the soil. Granular material, such as crushed limestone, placed for structure or pavement support, should be compacted to at least 100% of the standard Proctor maximum dry density. The moisture content of low plasticity clay or granular fill at the time of compaction should be within $\pm 2\%$ of the optimum moisture content of the material as determined by the standard Proctor compaction test. The moisture content to 4% above optimum. Fill should be placed in loose lifts not in excess of 8 inches thick, and compacted to the aforementioned criterion. However, it may be necessary to place fill in thinner lifts to achieve the recommended compaction when using small hand-operated equipment.

7.0 CONSTRUCTION OBSERVATION AND TESTING

It is recommended that TSi be retained during construction to perform testing and observation services for the following items:

- observation and documentation of the exposed soil after stripping existing pavements and/or topsoil during scarification, compaction, and proofrolling;
- observation and documentation of the installation of foundation elements;
- testing of asphalt and concrete materials used for paving and structures; and
- placement and compaction of fill materials.

These Quality Assurance services should help verify the design assumptions and maintain construction procedures in accordance with the project plans, specifications, and good engineering practice.

8.0 REPORT LIMITATIONS

This geotechnical report has been prepared for the exclusive use of **SHAFER**, **KLINE & WARREN**, **INC.** for the specific application to the subject project. The information and recommendations contained in this report have been made in accordance with generally accepted geotechnical and foundation engineering practices; no other warranties are implied or expressed.

The assessments and recommendations submitted in this report are based in part upon the data obtained from the borings. The nature and extent of variations between the borings may not be evident at this time. If variations appear evident at a later date, it may be necessary to re-evaluate the recommendations of this report.

We emphasize that this report was prepared for design purposes only and may not be sufficient to prepare an accurate construction bid. Contractors reviewing this report should acknowledge that the information and recommendations contained herein are for design purposes.

If conditions at the site have changed due to natural causes or other operations, this report should be reviewed by TSi to determine the applicability of the analyses and recommendations considering the changed conditions. The report should also be reviewed by TSi if changes occur in the structure location, size, and type, in the planned loads, elevations, grading and site development plans or the project concepts.

TSi requests the opportunity to review the final plans and specifications for the project prior to construction to verify that the recommendations in this report are properly interpreted and incorporated in the design and construction documents. If TSi is not accorded the opportunity to make this recommended review, we can assume no responsibility for the misinterpretation of our recommendations.

APPENDIX A

Site and Boring Location Plan



Approved by: JJ

• Core Location



APPENDIX B

Boring Logs General Notes Unified Soil Classification System

				RING NO. B-01 on: Kenneth Road Bridg Kansas City, MO	ge	8 M	248 N (ansas	City, M	st Terr IO 64		5 -7967 F	AX			al, in
Depth, feet	Samples	Sample #	Graphic Log	Surface El.: 871.9 Location: Northing: 9 Easting: 27	/58122.67	Recovery %	RQD	Penetration Blows Per 6 inches	Hand Penetrometer TSF	Undrained Shear Strength, TSF	Unit Dry Weight, Ib/cu ft.	Water Content, %	Liquid Limit	Plastic Limit	Plasticity Index
				Asphaltic concrete (9.5")										
				Poorly graded grave	el (GP)										
 _ 5 _	-	ST-1		Gray and brown, fat	CLAY (CH)	94			1.75	0.42	100	23	51	14	37
 - 10-	-	ST-2				67			0.75	0.74	103	24			
 _ 15_		SS-3		- silty below 13.5 ft. Gray, shaley, lean C	CLAY (CL)	100		2 2 2	0.50			26			
		00.4		⊻		100		7	. 4.5			00			
-20- 		SS-4		SHALE, gray, claye		100		13 26	>4.5			22			
 -25-	-			Boring terminated a											
Com Date Date Engin Proje	Bori Bori neer/ ect No		rted: npleteo gist:	12/15/15	Remarks: Boring dril Groundwa ft. north fro 22.5 ft.	ter ob	serv	ed at	17.5	ft. di	uring	drilliı	ng. C	ffset	7.5

				RING NO. B-02 on: Kenneth Road Bridge Kansas City, MO	TSi Geotechnical 8248 NW 101st Terrace, #5 Kansas City, MO 64153 (816) 599-7965 (816) 599-7967 F,						AX	AX geotechnical,			
Depth, feet	Samples	Sample #	Graphic Log	Surface El.: 870.9 Location: Northing: 978935.47 Easting: 2758146.89	Recovery %	RQD	Penetration Blows Per 6 inches	Hand Penetrometer TSF	Undrained Shear Strength, TSF	Unit Dry Weight, Ib/cu ft.	Water Content, %	Liquid Limit	Plastic Limit	Dlacticity Index	
				Asphaltic concrete (8.0")											
-				Brown and gray, lean CLAY (CL)			34	0.50			00				
5 — 		SS-1			67		4	2.50			22				
- 0-		ST-2			83			0.50	0.48	100	24				
_ !5-		ST-3			83			0.50	0.53	99	26	40	14		
_				∑ Gray, shaley, lean CLAY (CL)											
		SS-4		SHALE, clayey, gray	100		7 16 24	>4.5			24				
_ 		RUN1		SHALE, dark gray to gray, moderately hard, moderately to slightly weathered, thin to thick bedded - 0.5" shaley clay seam at 22.2 ft.	99	90									
Date Date Engir Proje	Bori Bori neer/ ect No		ted: nplete jist:	32.00 12/15/15 d: 12/15/15 FH 20152025 epresent approximate strata boundaries. Boring drill Groundwat refusal at 2	er ob	serv	VE 5 ed at	50, u 16.5	sing 5 ft. d	HSA uring	and drilli	auto ng. A	SPT. uger		

	LOG OF BORING NO. B-02						TSi Geotechnical 8248 NW 101st Terrace, #5						Ŵ		
Pro	ject	Desc	riptio	on: Kenneth Road Br Kansas City, MO	idge		Kansa	NVV 101 s City, N 599-796	MO 64	153		٩X		IS	il, inc.
Depth, feet	Samples	Sample #	Graphic Log	Surface El.: 870.9 Location: Northing Easting: MATERIAL DE	ı: 978935.47 2758146.89	Recovery %	RQD	Penetration Blows Per 6 inches	Hand Penetrometer TSF	Undrained Shear Strength, TSF	Unit Dry Weight, Ib/cu ft.	Water Content, %	Liquid Limit	Plastic Limit	Plasticity Index
 		RUN2		LIMESTONE, gra hard to hard, sligh fine crystalline, m bedded, with inter shale, calcareous gray, moderately weathered, thin b banded <i>(continued</i>)	mittent layers of , medium to dark hard, slightly edded to	99	99								
		n Dent	h.	Boring terminated		drilled w	dith C	ME 5	50	sina	HSA ;	and a	auto	SPT	
Completion Depth: 32.00 Completion Depth: 32.00 Date Boring Started: 12/15/15 Date Boring Completed: 12/15/15 Engineer/Geologist: FH Project No.: 20152025							uger								

	OG OF BORING NO. B-03 roject Description: Kenneth Road Bridge Kansas City, MO Surface El.: 871.4 Location: Northing: 978897.07 Basting: 2758154.95						8 H	8248 N Kansas	eotech W 101 S City, N 99-796	st Terr IO 64	153	5 -7967 F.	AX		N ISI otechnic	;a1, i
Depth, feet	Samples	Sample #	Graphic Log	Location: Northing	g: 978897.07 2758154.99		Recovery %	RQD	Penetration Blows Per 6 inches	Hand Penetrometer TSF	Undrained Shear Strength, TSF	Unit Dry Weight, Ib/cu ft.	Water Content, %	Liquid Limit	Plastic Limit	Plasticity Index
				Gravel with sand	(FILL)											
	X	SS-1					56		6 7 9				8			
	X	SS-2		- trace clay below	/ 8.5 ft.		44		2 5 5				9	30	14	1
5-	X	SS-3		- trace sand below	w 13.5 ft.		17		16 8 4				2			
	X	SS-4		☑ Dark brown and g CLAY (CL)	gray, silty, le	ean	67		WOH WOH WOH	0.50			26			
	×	SS-5		SHALE, gray, cla Boring terminated			83		50/2"	>4.5			23			
)ate)ate :ngir Proje	Borin Borin heer/ ect No		ted: npleteo jist:	24.00 12/15/15 d: 12/15/15 FH 20152025 epresent approximate stra	Remarks:	Boring drill Groundwat ft. north-no Auger refus	er ob rthwe	est fro	ed at om B	17.5	i ft. di	uring	drilliı	ng. O	ffset	9.



				RING NO. B-04 on: Kenneth Road Br Kansas City, MO		8 M	248 N Cansas	eotechi W 101 City, N 99-796	st Terr /IO 64	153	5 -7967 F.	AX		ISI Detechnical, ind		
Depth, feet	Samples	Sample #	Graphic Log	Surface El.: 869.9 Location: Northing Easting: MATERIAL DE	g: 978924.3 2758488.8		Recovery %	RQD	Penetration Blows Per 6 inches	Hand Penetrometer TSF	Undrained Shear Strength, TSF	Unit Dry Weight, Ib/cu ft.	Water Content, %	Liquid Limit	Plastic Limit	Plasticity Index
·		RUN2		SHALE, Dark gra hard, aphanite LIMESTONE, gra weathered, very f medium to thin be - 1" shaley clay so - with intermittent calcareous shale	y, hard, slig ine crystalli edded eam at 25.4 bands of	ghtly ne,	100	86								
· _		RUN3					100	100								
35 — - _ _ _		RUN4		LIMESTONE, ligh slightly weathered crystalline, mediu - 2" gray shaley c ft.			100	94								
40 — - _ _ _		RUN5		- 0.25" shale sear 39.6 ft. - 4.5" shale seam medium hard at 4	-	-	100	92								
45 — - _ _ _		RUN6		- 6" clayey shale soft at 45.5 ft.	seam, dark	gray,	- 98-	-97-								
Date B Date B Engine Project	orir orir er/(n Depting Starf ng Starf ng Com Geologi	ted: ipleteo ist:	53.00 12/16/15 12/16/15 FH 20152025 epresent approximate stra	Remarks:	Boring drill Groundwat 16.0 ft. sou	er ob	serv	ed at	17.0	ft. d	uring	drilliı	ng. C	ffset	

	00	G C)F I	BO	RING NO. B-04	1		TSi Geotechnical 8248 NW 101st Terrace, #5 Kansas City, MO 64153									
Pr	oje	ct D	esc	riptic	on: Kenneth Road Bi Kansas City, MO	ridge		k	Cansas	City, N	<i>I</i> O 64	153		~~		<u>ís</u> i	
								(816) 5	99-796			7967 F/	4.X	geo	otechnica	al, inc.
Depth, feet	Samples		Sample #	Graphic Log	Surface El.: 869.9 Location: Northing Easting:		5 2	Recovery %	RQD	Penetration Blows Per 6 inches	Hand Penetrometer TSF	Undrained Shear Strength, TSF	Unit Dry Weight, Ib/cu ft.	Water Content, %	Liquid Limit	Plastic Limit	Plasticity Index
					MATERIAL DI	ESCRIPTION				BIG	На	Rh I		8			H
					SHALE, medium moderately hard, weathered, thin b banded <i>(continue</i>)	to dark gra slightly edded to d)	у,										
					Boring terminated	d at 53.0 ft.											
-55-																	
-60-																	
	-																
-65-																	
	-																
5/13/16	-																
70																	
GINT KENN	-																
P75 Completion Depth: 53.00 Remarks: Boring drille Completion Depth: 12/16/15 Groundwat Date Boring Completed: 12/16/15 16.0 ft. sou Project No.: 20152025 20152025								er ob	serv	ed at	17.0	ft. dı	uring o	drillir	ıg. O	ffset	ft.

				RING NO. B-05 on: Kenneth Road Bridge Kansas City, MO		8 M	[Si Ge 3248 N (ansas 816) 59	W 101: City, N	st Terr 10 64	153	5 -7967 F.	AX			al, inc	
Depth, feet	Samples	Sample #	Graphic Log	Surface El.: 864.5 Location: Northing: 978 Easting: 2758 MATERIAL DESCRI	286.54 PTION		Recovery %	RQD	Penetration Blows Per 6 inches	Hand Penetrometer TSF	Undrained Shear Strength, TSF	Unit Dry Weight, Ib/cu ft.	Water Content, %	Liquid Limit	Plastic Limit	Plasticity Index
 - 5 - 		ST-1		Brown, lean CLAY, wit and organics Dark brown, lean CLA organics		/	48			0.25	0.32	91	28			
 - 10- 		ST-2 ST-3					65 60			0.25	0.35	88 83	31 38	47	19	28
 15				✓ - with weathered limes 14.0 ft.												
				LIMESTONE, gray, we Boring terminated at 1												
25 Completion Depth: 16.00 Completion Depth: 12/15/15 Date Boring Started: 12/15/15 Date Boring Completed: 12/15/15 Engineer/Geologist: FH Project No.: 20152025 The stratification lines represent approximate strata boundaries.											ng. O	ffset				

				RING NO. B-06 on: Kenneth Road Bridge Kansas City, MO	8 H	3248 N Kansas	eotech W 101 S City, I 99-796	st Terr MO 64	153	5 -7967 F	AX			a1,
Depth, feet	Samples	Sample #	Graphic Log	Surface El.: 863.5 Location: Northing: 978902.55 Easting: 2758315.60 MATERIAL DESCRIPTION	Recovery %	RQD	Penetration Blows Per 6 inches	Hand Penetrometer TSF	Undrained Shear Strength, TSF	Unit Dry Weight, lb/cu ft.	Water Content, %	Liquid Limit	Plastic Limit	Directiontry Index
				Brown, lean CLAY with roots and trace organics Brown, lean CLAY (CL), trace organics										
_ _ 5 — _		SS-1			44		4 4 4	3.00			15			
		ST-2		- dark brown below 8 ft.	83			0.75	0.37	85	34			
		ST-3		- gray below 13.0 ft.	42				0.14	84	33			
		RUN1		LIMESTONE, gray, medium hard, slightly weathered, fine crystalline, medium bedding SHALE, calcareous, gray to dark gray, moderately hard, moderately weathered, thin to medium bedded	100	96								
20-				LIMESTONE, gray, hard, slightly weathered - 0.5" shale seam at 18.4 ft. LIMESTONE, medium to dark gray, with intermittent seams of calcareous shale, slightly weathered, medium to thin bedded										
		RUN2			100	93								
ate ate ngir	Borii Borii	on Dept ng Star ng Con Geolog o.:	ted: plete	45.50 12/14/15 d: 12/15/15 FH 20152025 Remarks: Boring drill Groundwa northeast f	ter no	ot obs	serve	d dui	ring c	Irilling	g. Off	fset 1	SPT. 2.5 f	t.

				RING NO. B-06 on: Kenneth Road Bridge Kansas City, MO	8 H	3248 N Kansas	eotechi W 101 S City, N 99-796	st Terr IO 64	153	5 -7967 F.	AX			al, ind
Depth, feet	Samples	Sample #	Graphic Log	Surface El.: 863.5 Location: Northing: 978902.55 Easting: 2758315.60	Recovery %	RQD	Penetration Blows Per 6 inches	Hand Penetrometer TSF	Undrained Shear Strength, TSF	Unit Dry Weight, lb/cu ft.	Water Content, %	Liquid Limit	Plastic Limit	Plasticity Index
 		RUN3		LIMESTONE, medium to dark gray, with intermittent seams of calcareous shale, slightly weathered, medium to thin bedded <i>(continued)</i>	100	88								
 - 35-		RUN4			98	98								
		RUN5		SHALE, dark gray LIMESTONE, gray, hard to moderately hard, slightly weathered, fine crystalline, thin to medium bedded, trace shale - shale seam at 38.3 ft. SHALE, dark gray, moderately hard	100	85								
-40- 		RUN6		LIMESTONE, gray, weathered - shale seam, gray, hard at 39.7 ft. SHALE, dark gray, moderately hard - limestone seam at 42.1 ft.	98	92								
-45- 				Boring terminated at 45.5 ft.										
Date Date Engir Proje	Bori Bori neer/ ct No		ted: ipleteo ist:	45.50 12/14/15 d: 12/15/15 FH 20152025 epresent approximate strata boundaries. Remarks: Boring dri Groundwa northeast	ater no	ot obs	serve	d dur	ring c	Irilling	. Off			

				RING NO. B-07 on: Kenneth Road Bridge Kansas City, MO	8 H	3248 N Kansas	eotech W 101 City, N 99-796	st Terr MO 64	153	5 -7967 F	AX		ISI		
Depth, feet	Samples	Sample #	Graphic Log	Surface El.: 868.9 Location: Northing: 979946.46 Easting: 2758377.01 MATERIAL DESCRIPTION	Recovery %	RQD	Penetration Blows Per 6 inches	Hand Penetrometer TSF	Undrained Shear Strength, TSF	Unit Dry Weight, Ib/cu ft.	Water Content, %	Liquid Limit	Plastic Limit	Placticity Index	
				Asphatlic Concrete (7.5")											
	-			Brown, lean CLAY (CL)											
		ST-1			92			1.50	0.45	99	25	46	19	2	
		ST-2			71			0.75	0.37	89	30				
_ 15		SS-3		- sandy below 13.5 ft. - gray below 14.4 ft. ⊊	100		1 2 1				31				
_		SS-4			83						12				
_ 20-		RUN1		LIMESTONE, light gray, hard, slightly weathered, trace fossils and shale seams SHALE gray moderately hard	96	96	50/1"								
		RUN2		SHALE, gray, moderately hard, slightly weathered, sandy LIMESTONE, gray, hard, slightly weathered - with shale seams below 21.8 ft. - 2" pitting at 22.0 ft. - 2" soft shale seam at 23.6 ft.	98	98									
Date Date Engii Proje	Bori Bori neer/ ect No	on Depi ng Star ng Con Geolog o.:	ted: nplete jist:	28.50 12/11/15 d: 12/11/15 JAK 20152025 epresent approximate strata boundaries.	led wi ter ob	th Cl serv	ME 5 ed at	50, u 16.0	sing ft. d	HSA uring	and drilli	auto ng.	SPT		

				DIX Kenneth Road Bri Kansas City, MO										al, inc.		
Depth, feet	Samples	Sample #	Graphic Log	Surface El.: 868.9 Location: Northing :	2758377.01		Recovery %	RQD		er	Undrained Shear Strength, TSF	Unit Dry Weight, Ib/cu ft.	Water Content, %	Liquid Limit	Plastic Limit	Plasticity Index
		RUN3		LIMESTONE, gray weathered(<i>continu</i>		y	100	100								
				Boring terminated												
0 −50 − Com L Date Date 00 Engii	50 Completion Depth: 28.50 Completion Depth: 12/11/15 Date Boring Started: 12/11/15 Date Boring Completed: 12/11/15 Engineer/Geologist: JAK Project No.: 20152025															


	LOG OF BORING NO. B-09 Project Description: Kenneth Road Bridge Kansas City, MO						TSi Geotechnical 8248 NW 101st Terrace, #5 Kansas City, MO 64153 (816) 599-7965 (816) 599-7967 FAX					AX	TSI geotechnical, inc.			
Depth, feet	Samples	Sample #	Graphic Log	Surface El.: 867.8 Location: Northing Easting: MATERIAL DE	j: 978821.10 2758481.44	0 8	Recovery %	RQD	Penetration Blows Per 6 inches	Hand Penetrometer TSF	Undrained Shear Strength, TSF	Unit Dry Weight, Ib/cu ft.	Water Content, %	Liquid Limit	Plastic Limit	Plasticity Index
			<u>x¹1₈</u> x	Brown, lean CLA trace organics	Y with roots	s and										
 - 5 - 		SS-1		Brown, lean CLA	Y (CL)		44		2 3 2				27			
 		ST-2		Gray, sandy lean) wib	79			0.50	0.41	96	28	42	17	25
		SS-3		coarse gravel	ULAT (UL)	, wiii	100		13				33			
-15- 				LIMESTONE, gra Boring terminated		ed			7							
Date Date Engii Proje	Bori Bori neer/ ect No	on Dept ng Star ng Con Geolog o.:	ted: nplete ist:	16.00 12/11/15 d: 12/11/15 JAK 20152025 epresent approximate stra	Remarks:	Boring drille Groundwate refusal at 1	er ob	serv	ME 5 ed at	50, u 13.5	sing ft. di	HSA a	and drillii	auto ng. A	SPT. uger	

The stratification lines represent approximate strata boundaries. In situations, the transition may be gradual.

				RING NO. B-10 on: Kenneth Road Bridge Kansas City, MO		TSi Geotechnical 8248 NW 101st Terrace, #5 Kansas City, MO 64153 (816) 599-7965 (816) 599-7967 FAX					AX	TSI geotechnica ¹ , inc.			
Depth, feet	Samples	Sample #	Graphic Log	Surface El.: 868.8 Location: Northing: 978845.57 Easting: 2758501.69	Recovery %		RQD	Penetration Blows Per 6 inches	Hand Penetrometer TSF	Undrained Shear Strength, TSF	Unit Dry Weight, lb/cu ft.	Water Content, %	Liquid Limit	Plastic Limit	Plasticity Index
		SS-1		Brown, lean CLAY (CL) with ro and trace organics dark brown, lean CLAY (CL)	pots 56			1 2 3	0.50			24			
 _ 10 _ 		ST-2		Brown and gray, lean CLAY, tr sand, trace organics	race				0.75	0.41	96	26	46	18	28
 - 15		SS-3		Ϋ́	100	þ		1 1 1	0.25			30			
				Boring terminated at 17.0 ft.											
Date Date Engir Proje	Borii Borii heer/ ect No	on Dept ng Star ng Con Geolog o.:	ted: nplete jist:	12/14/15 G d: 12/14/15 ft	Boring drilled v Groundwater c west-northw efusal at 17.0	bse est	erve	ed at	14.0	ft. di	uring	drilliı	ng. O	ffset	4.0

The stratification lines represent approximate strata boundaries. In situations, the transition may be gradual.



GENERAL NOTES

The number of borings is based on: topographic and geologic factors; the magnitude of structure loading; the size, shape, and value of the structure; consequences of failure; and other factors. The type and sequence of sampling are selected to reduce the possibility of undiscovered anomalies and maintain drilling efficiency. Attempts are made to detect and/or identify occurrences during drilling and sampling such as the presence of water, boulders, gas, zones of lost circulation, relative ease or resistance to drilling progress, unusual sample recovery, variation in resistance to driving split-spoon samplers, unusual odors, etc. However, lack of notation regarding these occurrences does not preclude their presence.

Although attempts are made to obtain stabilized groundwater levels, the levels shown on the Logs of Boring may not have stabilized, particularly in more impermeable cohesive soils. Consequently, the indicated groundwater levels may not represent present or future levels. Groundwater levels may vary significantly over time due to the effects of precipitation, infiltration, or other factors not evident at the time indicated.

Unless otherwise noted, soil classifications indicated on the Logs of Boring are based on visual observations and are not the result of classification tests. Although visual classifications are performed by experienced technicians or engineers, classifications so made may not be conclusive.

Generally, variations in texture less than one foot in thickness are described as layers within a stratum, while thicker zones are logged as individual strata. However, minor anomalies and changes of questionable lateral extent may appear only in the verbal description. The lines indicating changes in strata on the Logs of Borings are approximate boundaries only, as the actual material change may be between samples or may be a gradual transition.

Samples chosen for laboratory testing are selected in such a manner as to measure selected physical characteristics of each material encountered. However, as samples are recovered only intermittently and not all samples undergo a complete series of tests, the results of such tests may not conclusively represent the characteristics of all subsurface materials present.

NOTATION USED ON BORING LOGS

~

Approxima	TE PROPORTIONS	PARTICLE SIZE				
TRACE	<15%	BOULI	DERS	>12 Inches		
WITH	15-30%	Cobbi	LES	12 Inches – 3 Inches		
MODIFIER	>30%	GRAVEL				
			Coarse	3 Inches $-\frac{3}{4}$ Inch		
			Fine	³ / ₄ Inch – No. 4 Sieve (4.750 mm)		
		SAND				
Clay or clayey m	ay be used as major		Coarse	No. 4 – No. 10 Sieve (2.000 mm)		
material or modif	fier, regardless of		Medium	No. 10 – No. 40 Sieve (0.420 mm)		
relative proportio	ons, if the clay content is		Fine	No. 40 – No. 200 Sieve (0.074 mm)		
sufficient to dom	inate the soil properties.	SILT		No. 200 Sieve - 0.002 mm		
		CLAY		< 0.002 mm		
material or modified relative proportion	fier, regardless of ons, if the clay content is	SILT	Fine Coarse Medium	 ³/₄ Inch – No. 4 Sieve (4.750 mm) No. 4 – No. 10 Sieve (2.000 mm) No. 10 – No. 40 Sieve (0.420 mm) No. 40 – No. 200 Sieve (0.074 mm) No. 200 Sieve - 0.002 mm 		

PENETRATION – BLOWS

Number of impacts of a 140-pound hammer falling a distance of 30 inches to cause a standard split-barrel sampler, 1 3/8 inches I.D., to penetrate a distance of 6 inches. The number of impacts for the first 6 inches of penetration is known as the seating drive. The sum of the impacts for the last 12 inches of penetration is the Standard Penetration Test Resistance or "N" value, blows per foot. For example, if blows = 6-8-9, "N" = 8+9 or 17.

OTHER NOTATIONS

Recovery % – length of recovered soil divided by length of sample attempted.

- 50/2" Impacts of hammer to cause sampler to penetrate the indicated number of inches
- WR Sampler penetrated under the static loading of the weight of the drill rods
- WH Sampler penetrated under the static loading the weight of the hammer and drill rods
- HSA Hollow stem auger drilling method
- FA Flight auger drilling method
- RW Rotary wash drilling methods with drilling mud
- AH Automatic hammer used for Standard Penetration Test sample
- SH Safety hammer with rope and cathead used for Standard Penetration Test sample

GRAPHIC SYMBOLS

- ∇ Depth at which groundwater was encountered during drilling
- Depth at which groundwater was measured after drilling
- Standard Penetration Test Sample, ASTM D1586
 - 3-inch diameter Shelby Tube Sample, ASTM D1587
- **G** Sample grabbed from auger
- NX Size rock core sample



UNIFIED SOIL CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM, (ASTM D-2487)

Maj	ior Divi	sions	Group Symbols		Typical Names	La	boratory Classification	Criteria		
	on is)	eve size) eve size) Clean gravels (Little or no fines) AD AD		W	Well-graded gravels, gravel- sand mixtures, little or no fines	coarse- ols ^b	$C_u = \frac{D_{60}}{D_{10}}$ greater than 4; $C_c = (I)$	$\frac{D_{30})^2}{2 \times D_{60}}$ between 1 and 3		
ize)	vels vels coar t 4 si		G	Р	Poorly graded gravels, gravel- sand mixtures, little or no fines	e size), e	Not meeting all gradation re	equirements for GW		
. 200 sieve s			GM ^a	d	Silty gravels, gravel-sand-silt mixtures	Determine percentages of sand and gravel from grain-size curve.Depending on percentage of fines (fraction smaller than No. 200 sieve size), coarse- Grained soils are classified as follows:Less than 5 per centGW, GP, SW, SPMore than 12 per centGM, GC, SM, SC5 to 12 per centBorderline cases requiring dual symbols ^b	Atterberg limits below "A" line or P.1. less than 4	Above "A" line with P.1. between 4		
ils 1an No	ore tha larger	Gravels with fines Appreciable amour of fines)		u		ain-siz r than] SW, SH SM, SG		and 7 are <i>borderline</i> cases requiring use of dual symbols		
uined so larger tl	M)	Grav GC		С	Clayey gravels, gravel-sand- clay mixtures	el from grain-size ion smaller than N GW, GP, SW, SP GM, GC, SM, SC Borderline cases r	Atterberg limits below "A" line with P.1. greater than 7	of dual symbols		
Coarse-grained soils aterials is larger that	tion is ze)	Clean sands ttle or no fines)	SV	N	Well-graded sands, gravelly sands, little or no fines	nd gravel s (fractior lows: G G B C	$C_u = D_{60}$ greater than 6; $C_c = (I_{c})$	$C_c = (D_{30})^2$ between 1 and 3 $D_{10} \times D_{60}$		
C half of ma	(More than half of materials is Sands (More than half of coarse fraction is smaller than No. 4 sieve size) ands with fines preciable amount (Little or no fines) of fines) and B MS MS MS MS MS MS MS MS MS MS MS MS MS		Р	Poorly graded sands, gravelly sands, little or no fines	Determine percentages of sand and gravel from grain-size curve. Depending on percentage of fines (fraction smaller than No. 200 Grained soils are classified as follows: Less than 5 per cent GW, GP, SW, SP More than 12 per cent GM, GC, SM, SC 5 to 12 per cent Borderline cases requirir	Not meeting all gradation requ	irements for SW			
Aore than	fore than h Sands 1 half of co 1	Sands with fines (Appreciable amount of fines)	SM ^a	d	Silty sands, sand-mix mixtures	Determine percentages Depending on percenta Grained soils are classi Less than 5 per cent More than 12 per cent 5 to 12 per cent	Atterberg limits about "A" line or P.I. less than 4	Limits plotting in hatched zone with		
<	ore thai smallei	Sands with fines ppreciable amou of fines)		u		mine pe ading o ed soils han 5 p than 12 2 per ce	inte of F.I. less than 4	P.I. between 4 and 7 are <i>borderline</i> cases requiring use		
	(M	San (Appr	SC		Clayey sands, sand-clay mixtures	Detern Deper Grain Less t More 5 to 1	Atterberg limits about "A" line with P.I. greater than 7	of dual symbols		
	ML ML		Inorganic silts and very fine sands, rock flour, silty or clayey fine sands, or clayey silts with slight plasticity							
200 sieve size)	Silts and cl	Silt (Liq		Silts and cl (Liquid limit than 50) OT		L	Inorganic clays of low to medium plasticity, gravelly clays, sandy clays, silty clays, lean clays	60 For class	ssification of fine-grained sails e-grained fraction of coarse-grained	
1 No. 20						Ŭ		Ŭ		L
Fine-grained soils erials is smaller than	ned soils maller than		М	Н	Inorganic silts, micaceous or diatomaceous fine sandy or silty soils, elastic silts	A Equation of A - line Horizontal at PI=4 to LL=25.5, then PI=0.73 (LL-20) Then PI=0.73 (LL-20) Equation of U ² -line CH O ^R V Equation of U ² -line V Then PI=0.9 (LL-8) V CH O ^R V Then PI=0.9 (LL-8)				
Fine-grained soils (More than half of materials is smaller than No.	Silts and cla	Silts and clays (Liquid limit greater than 50) CH		H	Inorganic clays of medium to high plasticity, organic silts	10-	CL TM	OH		
1 half of 1	1 half of 1		OH (Lig		Organic clays of medium to high plasticity, organic silts	0 10 16 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100 LIQUID LIMIT (LL)				
(More than	(More than organic soils soils		Peat and other highly organic soils							
aD	L C M	1014		. 1 1*	visions of d and u are for roads and			1		

^aDivision of GM and SM groups into subdivisions of d and u are for roads and airfields only. Subdivision is based on Atterberg limits; suffix d used when L.L. is 26 or less and the P.1. is 6 or less; the suffix u used when L.L. is greater than 28.

^bBorderline classifications, used for soils possessing characteristics of two groups, are designated by combinations of group symbols. For example: GW-GC, well-graded gravel-sand mixture with clay binder.

T:\Geotechnical Group\Notes for Geotech Reports\Unified Soil Classifications System2.doc

APPENDIX C

Laboratory Test Results



8248 NW 101st Terrace, #5 Kansas City, MO 64153 816-599-7965 816-599-7967 Fax

Date: 1/18/2016 Project Name: Kenneth Road Bridge TSi Project No.: 20152024

COMPRESSIVE STRENGTH DATA

							Wet				
		Sample		Sample	Sample		Unit	Sample			
Boring	Sample	Depth	Date	Diameter	Length	Moisture,	Weight	Area	Load	Compressive	Compressive
No.	Name	(ft)	Tested	(in)	(in)	%	(lbs/ft ³)	(sq in)	(lbs)	Strength (psi)	Strength (ksf)
B-2	C-01	22.5	1/11/16	1.85	4.03	4.6	158.08	2.69	2,175	808	116
B-2	C-02	26.3	1/11/16	1.85	3.81	7.0	145.90	2.69	8,005	2,981	429
	• • •										
B-4	C-01	24.0	1/11/16	1.85	3.95	3.1	157.19	2.68	4,495	1,679	242
B-4	C-02	29.0	1/11/16	1.85	4.06	1.9	159.41	2.67	6,510	2,434	351
B-4	C-03	31.0	1/11/16	1.85	3.85	2.5	150.63	2.68	11,745	4,388	632
B-4	C-04	35.0	1/11/16	1.86	4.08	5.4	151.16	2.71	4,560	1,680	242
B-4	C-05	41.5	1/11/16	1.85	4.08	1.6	155.43	2.69	7,310	2,721	392
B-4	C-06	52.0	1/11/16	1.85	3.83	6.1	118.65	2.69	12,450	4,630	667
B-6	C-01	16.8	1/11/16	1.85	4.12	3.4	158.20	2.70	10,130	3,754	541
B-6	C-02	22.3	1/11/16	1.85	3.74	11.6	133.80	2.70	9,860	3,653	526
B-6	C-02 C-03	26.5	1/11/16	1.85	4.01	2.5	153.80	2.70	20,780	7,695	1,108
		32.5	1/11/16				163.18	2.70	,	,	634
B-6	C-04			1.86	4.32	0.7			11,970	4,402	
B-6	C-05	36.0	1/11/16	1.86	4.53	0.3	164.99	2.71	11,655	4,301	619
B-6	C-06	46.6	1/11/16	1.85	3.65	7.1	125.37	2.70	4,465	1,655	238
B-7	C-01	19.9	1/11/16	1.85	4.16	3.8	159.06	2.68	6,990	2,612	376
B-7	C-02	21.0	1/11/16	1.86	3.64	0.9	162.30	2.70	12,135	4,490	647
B-7 B-7	C-02 C-03	25.9	1/11/16	1.86	4.20	11.8	132.75	2.70	7,375	2,718	391
	'				-	-			,	, -	

Note:* Compressive strength of rock cores were determined by trimming samples to 90 degree planes at each end and breaking in concrete strength machine per ASTM C39



Braun Intertec Corporation 11529 West 79th Street Lenexa Kansas 66214 Phone: 913-962-0909

	Phone: 913-962-0909
Proctor Report	Report No: PTR:W16-000069-S1 Issue No: 1
Client: Alan Rau TSi Geotechnical 8248 NW 101st Terrace #5 Kansas City, MO, 64153 Project: B1506400 TSI On-Call 2015 Local on-call laboratory testing Shawnee Mission, KS, 66214 TR: Elaine Dubray, edubray@braunintertec.com	Laboratory Results Reviewed by: Steve Tanquary Senior Technician Date of Issue: 1/19/2016
Date Sampled: 12/23/2015 D	Iternate Sample ID: 15-1369 ate Submitted: 12/23/2015 ampling Method: Grab
Dry Danaity Maisture Contant Deletionship	Teet Deculto
Dry Density - Moisture Content Relationship	Test Results
Dy Density (lbf/ft [*]) 105.0 104.0 103.0 103.0 100.0	ASTM D 698 - 07^Maximum Dry104.8Density (lbf/ft³):Corrected MaximumCorrected Maximum104.8Dry Density (lbf/ft³):Optimum Moisture20.1Content (%):Corrected Optimum20.1Moisture Content(%):Method:APreparation Method:MoistRetained Sieve No 40(4.75mm) (%):100Passing Sieve No 4100(4.75mm) (%):Lean Clay, dark gray brown
Ivbisture Content (%)	

Comments ^ Only ASTM and AASHTO equivalent test methods are covered by our current AAP accreditation. Atterberg Limits; ASTM D4318: LL=48, PL=19, PI=29



Direct Shear Test Report



Direct Shear Test Report



APPENDIX D

Rock Core Photographs



Run No.	Depth (ft)	Recovery (%)	RQD (%)
1	23.0 to 25.0	98	94
2	25.0 to 30.0	100	86
3	30.0 to 33.0	100	100





B-06		Kenneth R	oad Bridge		20152024
To	P RUN 5				
		END RUN 5	TOP RUN 6		END RUN 6
<u>Run No.</u> 5 6	<u>Depth (ft)</u> 35.5 to 40.5 40.5 to 45.5		<u>Recovery (%</u> 100 98	<u>))</u>	<u>RQD (%)</u> 85 92
B-07		Kenneth R	oad Bridge		20152024
	TOP RUN 1 TOP RUN 2			END	RUN 1
	ENI	RUN 2	FOP RUN 3	END	PRUN 3
<u>Run No.</u>	Depth (ft)		Recovery (%))	<u>RQD (%)</u>

<u>Run No.</u>	Depth (ft)	<u>Recovery (%)</u>	<u>RQD (%)</u>
1	18.5 to 20.5	96	96
2	20.5 to 25.5	98	98
3	25.5 to 28.5	100	100

APPENDIX E

Pavement Core Photographs



<u>Material</u>	Thickness (in)
Asphalt	9.5
Total	9.5

B-2	Kenneth Rd. Bridge	20152024
ASS.C.S.		
ALC: NO		
Martin C.		· ·
Shite !!		
. 12043		
the second second	- 12 MARCH	
L.a.		
		P

<u>Material</u>	<u>Thickness (in)</u>
Asphalt	8.0
Total	8.0

<u>Notes</u>

APPENDIX F

Global Stability Analysis Results

