STATE OF NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION MATERIALS DIVISION GEOTECHNICAL SECTION

GEOTECHNICAL REPORT US 95 AT DURANGO DRIVE INTERCHANGE LAS VEGAS JULY 2000

E.A. 72411 CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA

Prepared by: ______________________________

 Jeffrey A. Palmer, Ph.D. Staff II Associate Engineer

Reviewed by:_____________________________

 Parviz Noori, P.E. Assistant Chief Materials Engineer

Approved by:_____________________________

 Dean Weitzel, P.E. Chief Materials Engineer

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLES AND GRAPHS

APPENDICES

B. GEOLOGY AND SEISMICITY

C. SUBSURFACE INVESTIGATION BORING LOGS

D. LAB TEST RESULTS

INTRODUCTION

General

This report has been prepared to characterize the subsurface soil conditions of the site and to provide geotechnical design criteria for the proposed structure. The new interchange will be built to ease the flow of traffic to and from the new housing development near Durango Drive to Las Vegas. At present, there is a two-way stop sign with the majority of traffic making a left turn onto US 95 southbound. As the housing development increases in size, the traffic is expected to increase.

Purpose and Scope

The purpose of this report is to provide information regarding the subsurface soil conditions at the proposed project location. In addition, this report provides geotechnical design and construction recommendations including the construction of a new bridge structure and retaining walls. The scope of this report consists primarily of investigation and analysis. The investigation included recent subsurface explorations, soil sampling, and analysis of field and laboratory testing data. This report describes the subsurface soil conditions, provides recommendations regarding geotechnical properties of the soil strata, and includes boring logs and summaries of test results from the field investigation.

GEOLOGY AND SEISMICITY

Geology

The site is founded in alluvium $(Q_{oa})^1$ deposited on the Kyle Canyon alluvial fan originating from the Spring Mountains. The Spring Mountains are within the limestone and dolostone belt of southern and eastern Nevada as shown in Figure B1. The alluvial fan deposits are pink to brown sand, gravel, and cobble size material, and are unconsolidated to locally cemented due to petrocalcic carbonate deposits (caliche). Clasts are predominately limestone and dolostone with subordinate quartzite. Sand size sediment is mainly limestone and dolomite with subordinate quartz and feldspar. Detrital gypsum occurs locally, and is an important component in these deposits. There are also active wash alluvium deposits (typically veneers) throughout the area, which is subject to flooding.

Seismicity

The site is located approximately 25 kilometers east of the La Madre fault and 10 kilometers east of the Keystone Thrust³. These faults are no longer considered active. The Las Vegas Valley Shear Zone lies approximately 10 kilometers northeast of the site³ and is currently active. Other local active faults include the Frenchman Mountain Fault, the Whitney Mesa Fault, the Cashman Fault, the Valley View Fault, the Decatur Fault, the Eglington Fault, and the West Charleston Fault⁴, as shown in Figure B2 map of Las Vegas Valley quaternary faults. The most prominent fault in the Las Vegas Valley is the Frenchman Mountain Fault which is capable of producing a magnitude 7 earthquake every 10,000 to 50,000 years⁴. Other faults capable of causing earthquakes could occur outside the Las Vegas Valley with strong enough ground shaking to cause damage within the valley, such as the Furnace Creek Fault in Death Valley, some 145 kilometers northwest of Las Vegas.

The site area has subsided approximately 50 mm between 1963 and 1980, probably due to dewatering². See Figure B3 for a map of quaternary faults, subsidence contours, and mapped fissures related to subsidence.

The recommended effective peak acceleration coefficient is 0.15g based on a 10% probability of exceedance in 50 years (AASHTO). See Figure B4 for a map of peak acceleration contours for Nevada and California. The AASHTO ATC-6 response spectra with Type II soil is recommended. A graph with three Response Spectra curves are shown in Figure B5 including AASHTO using 0.15g Peak Ground Acceleration. The other two curves, for comparison only, are the UBC for Zone 2B and USGS using 0.1048g based on the USGS National Seismic Hazard Mapping Project.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Site Description

US 95 is a four lane freeway north of Las Vegas, and is oriented in a north-west to south-east direction. North Durango Drive is presently a two lane road with stop signs crossing US 95. A site map for the project is presented as Map A1 in Appendix A. A new housing development is being built to the east of the intersection resulting in a large expected increase in traffic through the intersection.

Project

The project consists of constructing an interchange to improve access to the southbound lanes of US 95 for traffic leaving the residential area located north east of the interchange. The westbound traffic on Durango Drive will be able to cross over the freeway and turn left onto the southbound on-ramp. In addition, the project includes the construction of water retention basins and improved drainage channels for control of surface water runoff.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Abutments and Piers

Based on our field investigation and laboratory testing, various foundation systems were evaluated to support the structures. The soil at the site consists of medium to very dense sandy gravel with lesser amounts of silt and clay. The site conditions indicate that the in situ soils are competent to support the proposed structures on either spread footings or drilled shafts. We recommend using spread footings for both abutments and piers. The recommended bearing capacity for the abutment footings is 192 kPa. Design soil parameters for the abutment walls are provided in Table 1. Allowable and ultimate bearing pressures as functions of footing width, settlement, and embedment length are provided in Graphs 1 through 4 for pier footings founded in native soils. Settlements are expected to occur immediately after loads are applied to the foundations. It is our recommendation that the foundation at each support be designed similar to each other, so as to minimize any differential settlement. Also, similar foundation systems will have similar responses in seismic events.

All excavations shall be performed in accordance with the NDOT "Standard Specifications for Road and Bridge Construction." All permanent slopes should be constructed to lie at a maximum of 2:1 (horizontal to vertical). It is the responsibility of the contractor to provide all necessary shorings. Caliche zones, cobbles, and/or boulders may be encountered during excavation. This may cause difficulties at any depth in the excavation of pier, retaining wall, and sound wall spread footings.

Retaining Walls

Allowable and ultimate bearing pressures are functions of footing width, settlement, and embedment length and is provided in Graph 5 for the strip footing. Estimates for construction excavation should be made on the basis of using temporary 1:1 (horizontal to vertical) slopes. Recommended design parameters for the retaining walls are presented in Table 1. The horizontal and vertical Acceleration Coefficients (Ah) and (Av), Importance Classification (IC), Seismic Performance Factor (SPC), Soil Profile Type, and Site Coefficient (S), were all obtained using AASHTO Standard Specifications for Highway Bridges, Division 1-A, Section 3. Earth pressure coefficients (K_a, K_p, K_{ae}) and K_{pe}) were calculated using various methods.

Shrinkage Factor

The excavated materials from the proposed detention basins are acceptable for use as embankment fills. This is based on the R-value test results, as shown on Page 50, from soils taken at the site. We recommend the use of a 10% shrinkage factor for the reduction in volume of soils due to transport and compaction.

Sound Wall

Given the loading conditions provided by NDOT Bridge Division (memo from Nat Mangoba, dated March 31, 2000), 1.83 meter square spread footings are recommended to support the wall pillisters. This is based on an analysis of bearing capacity, sliding, and overturning of an eccentrically loaded square footing. The loads used in the analysis were a vertical dead load of 196.26 kN and a wind load of 193.05 kN applied at the center of a wall pillister with a height of 4.27 meters.

FIELD INVESTIGATION

The Nevada Department of Transportation (NDOT) Geotechnical Section conducted a subsurface investigation at the proposed project site approximately one year ago. Subsurface soil conditions were explored by drilling four boreholes (DURLV1 through DURLV4) to a maximum depth of 21.2 meters. The approximate locations of the boreholes are shown on Map A2 in Appendix A. Surface elevations were obtained for the borehole locations by surveying from known elevations. Drilling was accomplished using a Mobile B-80 drill rig with bentonite drilling slurry for wet drilling. Disturbed soil samples were obtained with a California Modified Split Spoon Sampler (CMS). Modified standard penetration resistance values were obtained using the CMS Sampler, based on the Standard Penetration Test (SPT) procedure (ASTM T 206-87). Uncorrected (for overburden, hammer drop system, and sampler type) blowcounts are shown in the boring logs in Appendix C. All samples were transported to the NDOT materials laboratory for testing and/or storage. All soil samples were classified using the Unified Soil Classification System (USCS). More detailed information from the soil samples is included in the boring logs, and in the test result summary sheets. Copies of the boring logs and a boring log key are presented in Appendix C; summaries of test results are in Appendix D.

LABORATORY ANALYSIS

Laboratory tests were conducted on the samples collected from the 4 boreholes. The testing program consisted of sieve and hydrometer analysis, Atterberg limits, moisture contents, and chemical analysis. Plasticity Indices (PI) obtained from testing ranged from 3 to 22, and moisture contents varied from 3.9% to 13.0%. Percent fines (less than 75 μm sieve) ranged from 7.8 to 28.3. Unit weight, direct shear, and consolidation tests were not conducted due to the disturbance of the samples, and the inability of samples to retain their shape to be placed into the testing molds. Further information is presented in the summaries of test results in Appendix D.

DISCUSSION

Borings from the subsurface investigation identified the soils to be primarily silty gravel with sand and clayey gravel with sand. There were two major layers of subsurface stratification that was apparent from the set of four borings. The contact between the two layers was at different elevations in each borehole, indicating that the layers were inclined or that the contact was not planar. Conservative design parameters have been determined by using the weakest soil strengths in calculations. The soil is very dense and contains many cobbles, as was seen on the wall of a back hoe trench (Photos 1 and 2) located approximately 30 meters south east of the interchange. The presence of boulders and caliche may occur during excavation. The presence of cobbles and possibly boulders was determined by observing the many rock fragments obtained during drilling, and several zones where the auger had difficulty in drilling into the hard soil. The presence of caliche was determined from the nature of the depositional environment of the soil (alluvial fan originating from a large mountain range composed of limestone and dolostone) and from the difficult drilling zones. Very few samples were obtained due to the refusal of the sampler to penetrate the soil during many of the SPT tests conducted in hard soil.

REFERENCES

1. United States Geological Survey "NW Las Vegas", 7 Minute (1:24,000) Quadrangle Geologic Map (Map 3Dg, 1987), Nevada Bureau of Mines and Geology (Matti, Bachhuber, Morton, Bell).

2. "Subsidence in Las Vegas Valley: Nevada Bureau of Mines and Geology" Bulletin 95, Bell, J. W. (1981).

3. United States Geological Survey "Tectonic Map of Clark County, Nevada" Bulletin 62 Plate 5, Nevada Bureau of Mines and Geology.

4. Las Vegas Review Journal article, "Valley Faults Capable of Healthy Jolt," Keith Rogers interview with Craig dePolo, research geologist with the Nevada Bureau of Mines and Geology, and Geologist Burt Slemmons, a member of the Nevada Earthquake Safety Council and professor emeritus at the University of Nevada, Reno (April 11, 1999).

Photo 1. Open trench at the Durango Interchange site showing rock size and stratification.

Photo 2. Alternative view of the same trench.

Table 1. Recommended Design Soil Parameters for Retaining Walls.

RETAINING WALL INTEGRAL COEFFICIENTS (Not Supporting Any Structures) ABUTMENT (Not Supporting Any Structures) ABUTMENT (NALLS **0O BACKSLOPE 2H:1V BACKSLOPE WALLS** K_0 (At Rest Earth Pressure*) 0.47 0.47 0.47 0.47 0.47 K_a (Active Earth Pressure**) 0.30 0.30 0.56 0.30 K_p (Passive Earth Pressure**) 6.00 6.00 6.00 6.00 6.00 K_v (Design Vertical Acceleration) 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 K_h (Design Horizontal Acceleration) 0.15 0.15 0.15 0.15 K_{ae} (Dynamic Active Earth Pressure⁺) 0.38 0.95 1 K_{pe} (Dynamic Passive Earth Pressure⁺) 5.49 5.49 5.49 $\frac{1}{\sqrt{5}}$ Base Friction for Sliding 0.32 0.32 0.32 -

Friction Angle of Embankment Soil =

 32°

Friction Angle of Foundation Soil = 40°

* Coulomb

** Caquot and Kerisel (1948), NAVFAC (1982); use $K_{p(Design)} =$

 $K_p/1.5$

+ Mononobe Okabe

 K_p and $K_{pe} = 0$ for depths of less than

0.9 meters

 1 See the discussion on maximum pressure distribution and limiting effective stresses in soil behind the abutment wall

(Lam and Martin, 1986).

Table 1. Notes.

For the total earth pressure (active and passive) behind an integral abutment during earthquake loading, FHWA (Lam and Martin, 1986) recommends using the sum of the following three components:

- 1. The static pressure due to gravity loads, $F_0 = 1/2 K_0 \gamma_1 H^2$ Applied at 1/3 H from the wall bottom
- 2. The pressure induced due to displacement of the wall into the embankment backfill by bridge inertial loading,

 $F_1 = 0.425E_s\delta_1$ Applied at 0.37H from the wall bottom

3. Additional earthquake induced dynamic pressures arising from the earthquake response of the backfill itself and its interaction with the abutment wall,

$$
F_2 = 0.12 E_s \delta_2
$$
 Applied at 0.6H from the wall bottom

where K_o is the at-rest earth pressure coefficient, H is the abutment wall height, γ_1 (18.85 kN/m³) is the embankment unit weight, δ_1 is the lateral translational displacement of the abutment wall, δ_2 is the rotational displacement at the top of the abutment wall, and E_s is Young's modulus for the embankment backfill. A value of 69 MPa may be used for E_s .

Abutment forces are considered excessive if the effective stress in the embankment backfill behind the abutment exceeds 369 kPa during earthquake loading. When superstructure inertia forces are transmitted directly to the embankment backfill by the integral abutment wall, adequate passive resistance must be able to restrict the displacements to a maximum of 0.1 meter.

Graph 1. Settlement, S, for 1.22 meter Embedment, Square Footings

Graph 2. Settlement, S, for 1.52 meter Embedment, Square Footings

Graph 3. Settlement, S, for 1.83 meter Embedment, Square Footings

Graph 4. Settlement, S, for 1.22 meter Embedment, Strip Footings, L/W > 9

Footing Width (meters)

APPENDIX A

LOCATION MAPS

Map A1. Site location of the new Durango Interchange.

(1)

础

L.

L.

u

لتأبا

APPENDIX B

÷,

GEOLOGY AND SEISMICITY

Figure B1. Limestone belt through Nevada.

Figure B2. Significant local earthquake fault zones of Las Vegas Valley (printed in Las Vegas Review Journal, April 11, 1999).

Figure B3. Zones of subsidence relative to local earthquake faults (printed in Las Vegas Review Journal).

Peak Acceleration (%g) with 10% Probability of Exceedance in 50 Years site: NEHRP B-C boundary

For Nevada and surrounding states: USGS

Figure B4. Seismic acceleration coefficients for Nevada and California.

Figure B5. Response Spectra for the I15 at Durango Drive Interchange.

APPENDIX C

SUBSURFACE INVESTIGATION **BORING LOGS**

 25

NV_DOT_TEMPLTE1.GPJ_NV_DOT.GDT_5/1800

NV_DOT_TEMPLTE1.GPJ_NV_DOT.GDT_S/1800

NV_DOT_TEMPLTE1.GPJ_NV_DOT.GDT_S/18/00

 $\hat{\vec{E}}$

NV_DOT_TEMPLTE1.GPJ_NV_DOT.GDT_6/100

 31

ä,

NV DOT TEMPLIE1.GPJ NV DOT.GDT 61100

KEY TO BORING LOGS

MOISTURE CONDITION CRITERIA

 $\boxed{\nabla} \quad \blacksquare$

Groundwater Elevation Symbols

Blow counts on Calif. Modified Sampler $(\rm N_{\rm CMS})$ can be converted to N_{SPT} by:
 $(N_{\text{CMS}})(0.62) = N_{\text{SPT}}$

SAMPLER NOTATION

Blow counts from Automatic or Safety Hammer can be converted
to Standard SPT N_{60} by:
($N_{\text{AUTOMATIC}}$)(1.25) = N_{60}
(N_{SAFETY})(1.17) = N_{60}

TEST ABBREVIATIONS

APPENDIX D

TEST RESULTS

 ~ 100 m $^{-1}$

72411 E.A. No. DUR4

Boring No.

Job Description SR 95 @ Durango - Clark County Elevation (m)

N.D.O.T. GEOTECHNICAL SECTION

SUMMARY OF TEST RESULTS

Station 35+45.8 13.8m Rt.

CMS = California Modified Sampler 61mm ID $SPT = Standard Pereration 35mm 1D$ $CSS = Calif. Split. Spole 61.5mm 1D$ $CS =$ Continuous Sample 82mm ID $CPT = Cone$ Penetration Test P = Pushed, not driven $PB = Piccher Barrel$ $RC = Rock Core$ $TP = Test$ Pit $R =$ Refusal

 $UU = Uncosolidated Undrained$ $U =$ Unconfined Compressive $CU =$ Consolidated Undrained $CD =$ Consolidated Drained $DS = Direct Shear$ $C = Cohesion$ $\varphi =$ Friction

- $G =$ Specific Gravity $OC = Convolidation$ $PI =$ Plasticity Index $LL = LIquid Limit$ $NP = Non-Plastic$ $PL = Plastic Linit$ $Ch = Chemical$
 $RV = R \cdot Value$ $S = Sleve$
- $CM = Computation$

 $H = Hydrometer$

- $E =$ Swell/Pressure on Expansive Solls
	- $SL = Shrinkage Limit$
		-
- $UW =$ Unit Weight
	- $W =$ Moisture Content
- $K =$ Permeability
- $O =$ Organic Content
	- $D =$ Dispersive
- RQD = Rock Quality Designation

 $N = (N_{\rm css})(0.62)$

 $N =$ Field SPT

 $Sh = Shelby$ Tube 73 mm ID

 $N = No.$ of blows per 0.3m, sampler

driven under 64kg mass dropped 760mm.

N.D.O.T. GEOTECHNICAL SECTION SUMMARY OF TEST RESULTS

Job Description SR 95 @ Durango - Clark County

72411

E.A. No.

 $Sh = Shelby$ Tube 73 mm ID $R =$ Refusal

 $DS = Direct Shear$ φ = Friction
C = Cohesion

 $NP = Non-Plastic
OC = Convilation$ $LL =$ Liquid Limit $PL =$ Plastic Limit

 $W =$ Moisture Content

 $K =$ Permeability

 $O =$ Organic Content
 $D =$ Dispersive

 $RQD = Rock$ Quality Designation

 $Ch = Chemical$
 $RV = R \cdot Value$

 $N = (N_{\text{css}})(0.62)$

 $N =$ Field SPT

 $N = No.$ of blows per 0.3m, sampler driven under 64kg mass dropped 760mm.

 $CSS = Call$. Split Spoon 61.5mm ID $CPT = Cone$ Penetration Test

P = Pushed, not driven

 $TP = Test$ Pit

Plate 4

N.D.O.T. GEOTECHNICAL SECTION SUMMARY OF TEST RESULTS

> 72411 Ê E.A. No.

Job Description SR 95 @ Durango - Clark County Í

> CMS = California Modified Sampler 61mm ID $SPT =$ Standard Penetration 35mm ID $CSS = Calif. Split Spoon 61.5mm 1D$ $CS =$ Continuous Sample 82mm ID $PB = Picther Barrel$ $RC = Rock Core$

 $UU = Uncosolidated Undrained$ $CU =$ Consolidated Undrained $U =$ Unconfined Compressive $CD =$ Consolidated Drained $DS = Direct Shear$ $\varphi =$ Friction

 $G =$ Specific Gravity $PI =$ Plasticity Index $OC =$ Consolidation $LL = L$ iquid Limit $PL =$ Plastic Limit $NP = Non-Plastic$ $S = Sleve$

 $CN =$ Compaction

 $H = Hydrometer$

- $E = S$ well/Pressure on Expansive Soils
	- SL = Shrinkage Limit
	- - $UW =$ Unit Weight
			- $W =$ Moisture Content
				- $K =$ Permeability
					-
- $O =$ Organic Content
- $D =$ Dispersive
- RQD = Rock Quality Designation

 $RV = R - Value$ $Ch = Chemical$

 $N = (N_{\rm css})(0.62)$

 $N =$ Field SPT

 $Sh = Shelby$ Tube 73 mm ID

P = Pushed, not driven

 $R =$ Refusal

 $TP = Test$ Pit

 $N = No.$ of blows per 0.3m, sampler

 $C = Cohesion$

 $CPT = Cone$ Penetration Test

driven under 64kg mass dropped 760mm.

72411 DUR1 Boring No. E.A. No.

Job Description SR 95 @ Durango - Clark County Elevation (m)

13.8m Rt. Station 35+45.8

CMS = California Modified Sampler 61mm ID SPT = Standard Penetration 35mm ID $CS =$ Continuous Sample 82mm ID

 $CS =$ Calif. Split Spoon 61.5mm ID $PB = P$ Itcher Barrel $RC = Rock Core$

 $CPT = Cone$ Penetration Test

 $TP = Test$ Pit

P = Pushed, not driven $R =$ Refusal

 $Sh = Shelby$ Tube 73 mm ID

 $UU = Uncosolidated Undrained$ $U =$ Unconfined Compressive $CU =$ Consolidated Undrained $CD =$ Consolidated Drained $DS = Direct Shear$

 $PI =$ Plasticity Index $S = Sleve$

 $G =$ Specific Gravity

 $E =$ Swell/Pressure on Expansive Soils

 $CM =$ Compaction

 $H = Hydrometer$

SL = Shrinkage Limit

 $UW =$ Unit Weight

 $LL = L$ lquid Limit

 $PL =$ Plastic Limit $NP = Non-Plastic$

 $W =$ Moisture Content

 $K =$ Permeability

 $O =$ Organic Content

 $D =$ Dispersive

 $OC =$ Consolidation

 $N = No.$ of blows per $0.3m$, sampler

 $C =$ Cohesion φ = Friction

driven under 64kg mass dropped 760mm.

 $Ch = Chemical$
 $RV = R \cdot Value$

 $N = (N_{\rm css})(0.62)$

 $N =$ Field SPT

 $RQD = Rock$ Quality Designation

 $X = X-Ray$ Defraction

NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION **GEOTECHNICAL SECTION**

CHEMICAL ANALYSIS

 \sim

E.A. No. 72411

PROJECT US 95 @ Durango Interchange

BORING # DUR2

 $\hat{\mathbf{z}}$

R-Values at Durango Interchange.

