



**COLORADO**  
Department of Transportation

*CDOT Project NO. FBR R200-266*  
*CDOT Subaccount No. 23558*

## STRUCTURE ALTERNATIVES EVALUATION REPORT

Region 2 Bridge Bundle Design Build Grant Project  
Preliminary Design and Procurement Support Services

# Structure M-22-Y

(Region 2 – US 350 MP 57.474)



Prepared for: Colorado Department of Transportation Region 2  
5615 Wills Blvd.  
Pueblo, CO 81008

Prepared by: Inna E. Pushkarova, PE  
PushkarovaInna@StanleyGroup.com  
T: 720.460.4742



*Stanley Consultants Project No. 29715*  
*January 2021*

## Table of Contents

1.	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....	4
1.1.	PROJECT DESCRIPTION .....	4
1.2.	PURPOSE OF THE REPORT .....	4
1.3.	STRUCTURE SELECTION PROCESS.....	4
1.4.	STRUCTURE RECOMMENDATIONS.....	5
2.	SITE DESCRIPTION AND DESIGN FEATURES .....	5
2.1.	EXISTING STRUCTURE .....	5
2.2.	RIGHT OF WAY IMPACT .....	8
2.3.	TRAFFIC DETOUR OR SHOOFLY .....	8
2.4.	UTILITIES.....	9
2.5.	GEOTECHNICAL SUMMARY .....	9
2.6.	HYDRAULICS SUMMARY.....	10
2.7.	ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERNS .....	10
2.8.	ROADWAY FEATURES .....	10
3.	STRUCTURAL DESIGN CRITERIA .....	11
3.1.	DESIGN SPECIFICATIONS .....	11
3.2.	CONSTRUCTION SPECIFICATIONS.....	12
3.3.	LOADING.....	12
4.	STRUCTURE SELECTION .....	12
4.1.	SELECTION CRITERIA.....	12
4.2.	REHABILITATION ALTERNATIVES.....	12
4.3.	STRUCTURE LAYOUT ALTERNATIVES.....	13
4.4.	SUPERSTRUCTURE ALTERNATIVES .....	13
4.5.	SUBSTRUCTURE ALTERNATIVES .....	14
4.6.	ACCELERATED BRIDGE CONSTRUCTION (ABC).....	15
4.7.	CONSTRUCTION PHASING .....	15
4.8.	CONSTRUCTABILITY .....	15
4.9.	MAINTENANCE AND DURABILITY.....	15
4.10.	CORROSIVE RESISTANCE.....	15
4.11.	CONSTRUCTION COST .....	15

---

4.12. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS .....	16
APPENDIX A – General Layout and Typical Section .....	17
APPENDIX B – Structure Selection Report Checklist .....	18
APPENDIX C – Construction Cost Estimate .....	19
APPENDIX D – Geotechnical Report.....	20
Picture 1 - Bridge M-22-Y .....	6
Picture 2 - Repaired Girders.....	7
Picture 3 - Girders, Guardrail, Wingwall .....	8
Table 1 - Bridge M-22-Y Summary Information .....	6
Table 2 - Summary of Bedrock and Groundwater Conditions .....	9
Table 3 - Construction Cost Summary .....	16
Table 4 - Summary of Structure Alternatives Evaluation.....	16
Figure 1 - Existing Roadway Section .....	11
Figure 2 - Proposed Roadway Section .....	11

## 1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

### 1.1. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The CDOT Region 2 Bridge Bundle Design Build Project consists of the replacement of seventeen (17) rural bridges on essential highway corridors in southeastern and central Colorado. The key corridors (US 350, US 24, CO 239 and CO 9) provide rural mobility, intra- and interstate commerce, movement of agricultural products and supplies, and access to tourist destinations. The 2 other bridges are Additionally Requested Elements (AREs) in the design build project. There is a total of nineteen (19) structures bundled under this project.

This design build project is partially funded by the USDOT FHWA Competitive Highway Bridge Program grant and funds from the Colorado Bridge Enterprise (14 structures, project number 23558). The 5 additional structures are funded solely by Colorado Bridge Enterprise (project number 23559). These projects are combined to form one design-build project.

The nineteen bridges identified to be included in the ‘Region 2 Bridge Bundle’ were selected based on similarities in the bridge conditions, risk factors, site characteristics, and probable replacement type, with the goal of achieving economy of scale. Seventeen of the bridges being replaced are at least 80 years old. Five of the bridges are Load Restricted limiting trucking routes through major sections of the US 24 and US 350 corridors. The bundle is comprised of nine timber bridges, four concrete box culverts, one corrugated metal pipe (CMP), four concrete I-beam bridges, and one I-beam bridge with corrugated metal deck.

### 1.2. PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

This report presents the findings of the preliminary level multidisciplinary investigation of the existing conditions of the given structure. The objective of this report is not to select a new structure type but to develop guidelines that will be addressed in the Design-Build documents and make recommendations based on the available information. All the information obtained in the survey, geotechnical investigation, hydrology and hydraulics, existing utilities, and environmental investigation is discussed in this report. The study evaluates feasible structure alternatives for the site and identifies all known constraints.

### 1.3. STRUCTURE SELECTION PROCESS

The following criteria for comparing and evaluating the structural alternatives is discussed below and will need to be considered during design-build processes:

- Hydraulic Opening Requirements
- Roadway alignments
- ROW Impacts
- Constructability
- Construction costs
- Maintenance
- Durability
- Traffic Control

The recommendations of the report are based on the overall consideration of all these elements as appropriate to this site and bridge.



## 1.4. STRUCTURE RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the subsequent discussion, the recommended proposed overpass structure is a two-cell 6 ft x 4 ft concrete box culvert, similar to the CDOT M-601-2 standard, to provide the required hydraulic opening. The proposed length of the box will be 43 ft. This length of proposed box culvert construction must accommodate two 12 ft lanes of traffic with 6 ft shoulders, 2 ft of shy distance and the Colorado current standard Bridge Rail of each side.

The contractor may select a different structure type based on their investigation, meeting the criteria described in this report.

## 2. SITE DESCRIPTION AND DESIGN FEATURES

### 2.1. EXISTING STRUCTURE

The existing structure is a single span treated timber stringer bridge built in 1935 to span a seasonal wash. The bridge is tangent. The existing bridge was based on a CDOT Standard P-117-B-H 60. The existing bridge consist of one 23 ft span with a width of 25 ft curb to curb, 26 ft out to out of deck between rails. The existing vertical clearance is 3 ft. The existing bridge has 12 rows of stringers, 6 in x 20 in wood stringers, spaced at 2 ft 3-¼ in. The deck consists of wood planks, 3 in x 6 in.

The abutments consist of wood abutment caps, 12 in x 12 in, supported on (6) 12 in diameter piles. The pile spacing at the abutment is 5 ft - 6 in. There are 4 wood wingwalls at the existing bridge. The wingwalls are 10 ft long and vary in height. The wingwalls are supported by (3) 12 in diameter piles.

The existing bridge railing is attached to the outside edge of the deck and consists of a timber rail with 6 in x 8 in x 5 ft post and a single 3 in x 8 in rail.

It is located on US 350, southwest of La Junta, at milepost 57.474. Table 1 summarizes bridge information.

National Bridge Structure Number	M-22-Y
Year Built	1935
Construction Type	Treated timber stringer
Condition Rating	Poor
Load Restricted	Yes
Bridge Length	24.5 feet
Bridge Width	26 feet
Number of spans	1
Water Crossing	Seasonal wash
ADT (2018)	530
Percent Commercial Traffic	18%

**Table 1 - Bridge M-22-Y Summary Information**



**Picture 1 - Bridge M-22-Y**

The replacement of Bridge M-22-Y is warranted due to the age and deteriorating conditions.



Due to restricted clearance we were unable to perform a complete visual inspection on girders. Based on the inspection report, 33% of girders are split or repaired. Four girders have been repaired with lag bolts, so it is now considered a temporary structure. Other issues include:

- Exterior girders are weathered
- Ten piles have cracks penetrating 5-50 percent of pile thickness
- All wing walls are bowed and have been pushed outward. Timber piles are cracked and splintered at the top.
- Guard rails are weathered, splintered, not approved crash tested
- Rot, mold, water staining, and deterioration are present throughout numerous primary structural components

Because of the condition, M-22-Y is load restricted, which limits trucking routes through major sections of the US 350 corridor, which is a key corridor between La Junta and Trinidad and connects I-25 and US 50.



**Picture 2 - Repaired Girders**



**Picture 3 - Girders, Guardrail, Wingwall**

## 2.2. RIGHT OF WAY IMPACT

The existing right of way (ROW) is located approximately 50 ft on each side from the centerline of the existing road. Any alternative selected by a design-build team shall not make an impact on an existing right of way. No permanent ROW acquisitions are planned on either side of the US 350. Temporary construction easements may be required for detour or drainage erosion control.

## 2.3. TRAFFIC DETOUR OR SHOOFLY

As stated by the CDOT grant application, the roadway shall not be closed for construction. Two other alternatives were investigated:

1. Phasing the construction to keep one lane open. Due to the narrow existing roadway and existing wood railing keeping one lane of roadway, this alternative is not recommended.
2. Building a one-lane shoofly on west side of the existing bridge with a temporary pipe placed for drainage.

Constructing a temporary shoofly is the recommended alternative at this site.



## 2.4. UTILITIES

Stanley subcontracted with Lamb-Star Engineering to provide utility location services in the vicinity of the structure. Based on their investigation, the existing utilities in the vicinity of the structure consist of the following:

- Underground Century Link telephone line located approximately 63 ft east of the centerline of US 350. The line is outside of the existing ROW and runs parallel to it.
- Overhead electric line located 50 ft east of the centerline of US 350. The line runs along the existing ROW on the east side of the bridge.
- Overhead railroad communication line located approximately 77 ft west of the centerline of US 350. The line is outside of the existing ROW and runs parallel to it.

## 2.5. GEOTECHNICAL SUMMARY

Stanley subcontracted with Yeh and Associates, Inc. to perform the geotechnical investigation of all bridges in this project. Full Preliminary Geotechnical Study is provided in the Appendix D.

Two bridge borings, M-22-Y-B-1 and M-22-Y-B-2, were drilled by Yeh in the vicinity of the existing bridge, and two pavement borings, M-22-Y-P-1 and M-22-Y-P-2, were drilled along the existing pavement approximately 250 feet from the bridge.

The bridge borings encountered lean clay soils and decomposed shale over shale bedrock. Table 2 provides a summary of the bedrock and groundwater conditions for the bridge borings. The surface elevations, approximate bedrock depths/elevations, and approximate groundwater depths/elevations are presented to the nearest 0.5 feet. The groundwater depths and elevations are based on observations during drilling.

Boring ID	Ground Surface Elevation at Time of Drilling (feet)	Approx. Depth to Top of Competent Bedrock (feet)	Approx. Elevation to Top of Competent Bedrock (feet)	Approx. Groundwater Depth(feet)	Approx. Groundwater Elevation(feet)
M-22-Y-B-1	4410.0	35.0	4375.0	Not Encountered	Not Encountered
M-22-Y-B-2	4409.5	35.0	4374.5	Not Encountered	Not Encountered

**Table 2 - Summary of Bedrock and Groundwater Conditions**

If a bridge structure is selected, the recommended substructure foundation types for this site include drilled shafts and driven H-piles. If a CBC structure is selected shallow foundation are suitable to support the CBC and wingwalls.

## 2.6. HYDRAULICS SUMMARY

Bridge M-22-Y crosses a seasonal wash. There is a railroad bridge 152 feet west of the M-22-Y bridge.

The drainage is not in a mapped floodplain. The design storm event for this crossing is the 25-year storm which has a flow rate is 56 cfs. An SRH-2D model was developed at this location. However, the 100-year storm event can pass through the existing bridge without overtopping the road, therefore the 100-year storm event was used to ensure the water surface elevation during the 100-year storm didn't increase significantly. The 100-year flow rate used was 107 cfs. The proposed model indicates that a two-cell 6 ft x 4 ft culvert is required to carry the 100-year storm. The 28 ft span bridge alternative is also an acceptable option.

The channel was not identified as having a high potential for debris production. Therefore, if a bridge is selected for the proposed conveyance structure, 2 feet of freeboard would typically be required. Preliminary analysis shows that 100-year floodplain at M-22-Y will hit the proposed bridge, and due to funding and site constraints, it is not feasible to raise the bridge above the 100-year floodplain. A more detailed analysis in the final design will need to be completed to determine if this option meets freeboard requirements set forth in the CDOT Drainage Design Manual. There is no freeboard requirement for the proposed box culvert option, however the culvert must meet Headwater Depth to Structure Depth ratio (HW/D) of 1.5 max per the CDOT Drainage Design Manual. The HW/D for this culvert is 0.64.

A Preliminary Hydraulic Report has been completed and can provide more information about the existing and proposed hydraulics conditions.


## 2.7. ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERNS

Based on field investigation performed by Stanley Consultants Environmental team, the area in the vicinity of the existing bridge is adjacent to the USFS Comanche Grassland. Impacts outside of the existing CDOT ROW are not anticipated. No wetlands, sensitive species or other environmental issues of concern have been identified.

## 2.8. ROADWAY FEATURES


### 2.8.1. Cross Section

Existing US 350 is a 2-lane roadway with two-way traffic. Both lanes are 11 ft wide with approximately 1.5 ft shoulders. The design speed is 75 mph.



**Figure 1 - Existing Roadway Section**

The proposed roadway section width is based on the traffic volumes and the requirements of the current CDOT Roadway Design Guide. Lane width is expected to be 12.0 ft in each direction with 6.0 ft shoulders, and 2.0 ft curb offsets. The AADT for this section of road is 500 veh/day, the design speed is 75 mph. Total required roadway width over proposed structure is 40.0 ft.



**Figure 2 - Proposed Roadway Section**

### 2.8.2. Vertical Alignment

The proposed vertical profile of US 350 must be set as close to the existing as allowed by the results of the hydrology study to avoid any ROW acquisitions and to limit impacts to the existing roadway section beyond the length of the structure.

The proposed bridge profile is on a tangent with ahead station upgrade of 0.19%, practically mimicking the existing grade. The profile grade is less than 0.5% min recommended by FHWA for bridge decks. Refer to Section 4.3 for more information.

### 2.8.3. Horizontal Alignment

The horizontal alignment of the existing bridge has no skew. The bridge is on a continuous horizontal tangent. It is understood that the proposed structure will be constructed in the same location as the existing with no change to the horizontal alignment of the road and no skew.

## 3. STRUCTURAL DESIGN CRITERIA

### 3.1. DESIGN SPECIFICATIONS

- AASHTO LRFD Bridge Design Specifications, 9th Edition



- CDOT LRFD Bridge Design Manual
- CDOT Bridge Rating Manual
- CDOT Bridge Detail Manual

### 3.2. CONSTRUCTION SPECIFICATIONS

Colorado Department of Transportation Standard Specifications for Road and Bridge Construction, 2019.

### 3.3. LOADING

*Live Loads:* HL-93 Design Truck or Tandem, Design Lane Load, Colorado Permit Vehicle

*Bridge Barrier:* Bridge Rail Type 10MASH per the CDOT manual and CDOT standards. The Type 10MASH will be placed on the culvert headwall.

*Future Wearing Surface:* 36.67 lbs per square foot (3 in minimum)

*Utilities:* per plan details if required at final design

*Collision Load:* the substructure will not require collision loading design. In cases where Bridge Rail is attached to the structure, the effects of vehicular collision on the barrier must be considered in accordance with AASHTO.

*Earthquake Load:* The structure is located within Seismic Zone 1 and must meet the AASHTO connection and detailing requirements.

*Stream Forces and Scour Effects:* stream force effects must be evaluated during final design when applicable. Possible cases include stream forces on the substructure and superstructure in addition to buoyancy from overtopping. Evaluation from scour will be performed per the CDOT Bridge Design Manual and AASHTO.

## 4. STRUCTURE SELECTION

### 4.1. SELECTION CRITERIA

The goal of this report is to identify which structural alternatives best meet the project requirements. The following criteria were established as a basis for evaluating the suitability of each structure type: hydraulic opening, constructability, construction cost, maintenance & durability, ROW and roadway impacts. The discussion below expands on these factors as it pertains to each alternative. Summary of Structure Alternatives Evaluation Table can be found at the end of Section 4.

### 4.2. REHABILITATION ALTERNATIVES

Rehabilitation of M-22-Y will not be performed due to the age and type of the bridge. Constructed in 1935, this timber structure was in service for over 80 years and is showing signs of deterioration and aging that are inconsistent with practical and cost-effective rehabilitation.

### 4.3. STRUCTURE LAYOUT ALTERNATIVES

Layout of the proposed structure is controlled by the width of the proposed roadway section, stream geometry, hydraulic opening requirements and the position of the existing bridge substructure.

Using the proposed 4 ft high box culvert, an estimated 11 in top slab thicknesses, the fill height over the proposed CBC will vary from 3 in min to 1 ft – 2 in max. The box will have to be designed for direct traffic load per AASHTO.

Vertical clearance over waterway was established based on hydrology and hydraulics requirements.

The horizontal alignment of the proposed structure will not have skew. The FHWA Design of Bridge Deck Drainage, Hydraulic Engineering publications referred to by CDOT Bridge Design manual states that if the proposed vertical grade is less than 0.5%, the designer must specify a gutter grade that will run the water to the inlet boxed from high points between the boxes. As Stated in Section 2.8.2, proposed vertical roadway grade is approximately 0.19%, matching the existing roadway profile. If bridge structure is selected, design team will need to address drainage issues during final design.

If bridge structure is selected, it must satisfy the live load deflection requirement for the selected girder types specified in AASHTO LRFD Bridge Design Manual.

### 4.4. SUPERSTRUCTURE ALTERNATIVES

#### 4.4.1. Concrete Box Culvert Alternative

Concrete box culverts are a cost-effective solution in both short- and long-term due to ease of construction and maintenance. The benefit of this structure type is that the culverts can be cast - in-place (CIP) or precast off-site and transported to the site for placement to streamline the construction process. In addition, CBC size can be selected from CDOT M&S Standards that cover a wide array of single-cell and multi-cell culvert sizes.

For M-22-Y, a two-cell 6 ft x 4 ft box culvert is required. The box can be constructed as CIP or precast. The box is estimated to have a total height of 6'-10". CDOT does not have a standard for a 6 ft x 4 ft box culvert, therefore, the 6 ft x 6 ft CBC standard will be used to select the wall thicknesses. At the end of the box culvert there will be concrete headwalls and wingwalls. Wingwalls will be per CDOT M-601-20 standards.

#### 4.4.2. Concrete Girder Bridge Alternatives

For constructability the new abutments were placed behind the existing abutments. The proposed bridge will have a span of 28 ft. The selected materials and structure components must exhibit high durability and provide longevity of the bridge under Colorado's harsh weather conditions. For this project, a viable alternative to be considered is a precast prestressed concrete box girder bridge. The suggested girder size was selected using Table 5B-1 from the CDOT Bridge Manual. In order to minimize the superstructure depth to accommodate the hydraulic requirements, the proposed girders should be BX18x48 at 12 ft spacing. Using a 1" haunch, 8"

deck and 3" asphalt, so the overall depth is estimated at 30". This would provide a vertical clearance of approximately 3 ft.

The abutments would be CIP caps estimated at 2 ft – 6 in wide and 3 ft – 6 in deep. The abutments caps will be supported on steel HP 12x74 or drilled shafts. Concrete wingwalls would be used at each abutment. Bridge rails will be located on top of headwalls for this alternative.

#### 4.4.3. Steel Girder Bridge Alternatives

At this location a concrete box culvert and concrete girder bridge alternatives have been evaluated. Since steel girders are not usually cost effective for short spans, we have not evaluated a steel girder option at this location. Steel girders also require future maintenance and are not a preferred alternative.

#### 4.4.4. Span Configurations

Total length of the existing structure is 24.5 ft. It is assumed that if the bridge alternative is selected, the proposed substructure will be constructed behind the existing abutments. Based on this assumption, the proposed bridge length will be 28 ft. According to information provided in CDOT Bridge Design Manual, BT, CBT and BX girders can all be used in one span configuration at this approximate length. Due to vertical clearance reasons noted above only the BX girders were considered.

### 4.5. SUBSTRUCTURE ALTERNATIVES

The replacement structure will consist of either a new bridge structure or a concrete box culvert structure (CBC). If a bridge structure is selected, then the abutments will be supported on driven H-piles or drilled shafts. If CBC structure is selected, then the structure and wingwalls will be founded on shallow foundations.

Based on the subsurface conditions encountered during our preliminary study, engineering analysis, and experience with similar projects it is our opinion that driven H-pile and drilled shaft foundations are suitable for support of the bridge structure. Shallow foundations are suitable for support of the CBC and wing wall structures. Recommendations for the drilled shafts are presented in Section 3.1, driven H-pile recommendations are provided in Section 3.2, and CBC foundation recommendations are presented in Section 3.3.

The soil and bedrock properties were estimated from penetration resistance, material descriptions, and laboratory data. The design and construction of the foundation elements should comply with all applicable requirements and guidelines listed in AASHTO (2020) and the CDOT Standard Specifications (CDOT 2019).

An integral cast-in-place abutment supported by H-piles was selected as a proposed bridge substructure alternative for this evaluation. To meet grading requirements an abutment cap will be 3.5 ft deep and 2.5 ft wide. Based on the preliminary evaluation, the abutments caps will be supported on 4 steel HP 12 x 74. Concrete wingwalls would be used at each abutment.

#### 4.6. ACCELERATED BRIDGE CONSTRUCTION (ABC)

CDOT has developed an Accelerated Bridge Construction (ABC) decision making process. The intent of this process is to apply some form of ABC on most projects. Design-build team is encouraged to use these recourses to evaluate cost efficiency of implementing ABC design.

#### 4.7. CONSTRUCTION PHASING

The existing wood bridge structure does not provide adequate width to allow for a one lane phasing option. And, as stated by grant the application, the roadway should not be closed for construction.

The only option for phasing is the construction of a shoofly. Option for a one-lane and two-lane shoofly have been investigated. The preferred option is a two-lane shoofly, constructed west of the existing bridge. Refer to Section 2.3 for more information.

#### 4.8. CONSTRUCTABILITY

Both the box culvert and bridge alternatives will require a shoofly. Constructing a box culvert would require less construction time and using precast would further reduce construction time.

#### 4.9. MAINTENANCE AND DURABILITY

Typical CDOT specified materials and construction methods must be used for the construction of the proposed structure. Following accepted current practice in designing and constructing the structure will provide a durable bridge to meet the required 100-year service life with minimal required maintenance.

Based on discussions with CDOT maintenance, the minimum box culvert height was set at 4 feet. Maintenance has a remote-controlled skid equipment that can clean up a box culvert of this size.

Concrete structures have less maintenance than steel structures and are preferred.

#### 4.10. CORROSIVE RESISTANCE

Epoxy coated reinforcing must be used for all reinforced concrete elements. A waterproofing membrane and stone matrix asphalt will be used on top of the concrete deck or CBC to prevent water and salt intrusion.

#### 4.11. CONSTRUCTION COST

Construction costs are one of the most important factors in the structure type selections. Preliminary construction cost estimates are prepared for all selected structure alternatives to be compared as discussed above. High level construction cost for each structure type is summarized in the table below. Detailed calculations of the cost can be found in the Appendix C of this report. Individual items cost was obtained from recent CDOT Cost Data Books. A 30% contingency multiplier was used in cost calculations.

Alternative	Construction Cost	Area	Cost per sf	Cost Rating
CBC	\$ 294,000.00	624 sf	\$ 471.00	1.5
Concrete Girder Bridge	\$ 437,000.00	1204 sf	\$ 363.00	1.0

**Table 3 - Construction Cost Summary**

#### 4.12. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The table below provides a summary of feasible alternatives evaluation based on the established selection criteria.

Criteria	CBC	BX Girder Bridge
Hydraulic Opening	Satisfies the requirements	Satisfies the requirements
Constructability	No expected constructability issues. Can be precast to streamline construction.	No expected constructability issues.
Construction Cost Rating	1.5	1.0
Maintenance & Durability	Low maintenance. Can be cleaned with remote-controlled skid equipment	Low maintenance
ROW and Roadway Impacts	No ROW impacts	No ROW impacts

**Table 4 - Summary of Structure Alternatives Evaluation**

Based on the criteria discussed above, the CBC alternative is recommended to replace existing structure M-22-Y. The contractor may select a different structure type based on their investigations, meeting the criteria described in this report. See Appendix A for the selected General Layout and Typical Section.


# **APPENDIX A**

General Layout and Typical Section


9365 1:30:19 PM p:\1\SC1-PW\INTEG-2.stanleygroup.com\Datasource-1\Documents\Colorado\Department\_of\_Transportation\29715 - CDDT R2 Bridge Bundle\11-CADD\Worksets\29175\DCNs\Bridges\GeneralLayout M-22-Y\_SH350 MP 57.47.dgn



Know what's below.  
Call before you dig.




**PLAN**



**SECTION**

(Taken Normal to  $\text{CL}$  Box Culvert)



**PROFILE**

(Taken Along CL Box Culvert)

**Notes:**

- Dimensions are based on recent survey and existing as-built drawings.

Print Date: 2/2/2021 File Name:

23558STR\_GeneralLayout M-22-Y\_SH350 MP 57.47.dgn

Horiz. Scale: Vert. Scale: As Noted



**Sheet Revisions**

Date:	Comments	Init.

Colorado Department of Transportation



5615 Wills Blvd  
Pueblo, CO 81008  
Phone: 719-546-5753  
FAX: 719-546-5402

Region 2

JLS

As Constructed

No Revisions:

Revised:

Void:

REGION 2 BRIDGE BUNDLE  
US 350 OVER SEASONAL DRAW  
GENERAL LAYOUT AND TYP. SECTION

Designer: I. Pushkarova	Structure No. M-22-Y
Detailer: I. Pushkarova	M.P. US 350 57.474
Sheet Subset: STR	Subset Sheets: 1 of 1

Project No./Code

Sheet Number



# **APPENDIX B**

## Structure Selection Report Checklist

# Structure Selection Report QA Checklist

This checklist is to serve as a general guideline for structure selection process. It is to be filled out by the project Engineer of Record or designee to indicate all items that are to be discussed in the Structure Selection Report. This checklist is to be included as an appendix to the Structure Selection Report and must be signed by Staff Bridge Unit Leader or designee prior to submittal of FIR documents to the Region.

Project Name \_\_\_\_\_

Project Location \_\_\_\_\_

Project Number \_\_\_\_\_ Subaccount \_\_\_\_\_

Structure Number(s) \_\_\_\_\_

Engineer of Record \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

## Cover Sheet

- Name of the Project and Site Address
- Structure(s) Number
- Property Owner Name and Contact Information
- Report Preparer Name and Contact Information
- Seal and Signature of the Designer
- Submittal and Revision Dates as Applicable

## Executive Summary

- Project Description
- Purpose of the Report
- Structure Selection Process
- Structure Recommendations

## Site Description and Design Features

- Existing Structures
- ROW Impact
- Traffic Detour
- Utilities
- Geotechnical Summary
- Hydraulics Summary
- Environmental Concerns
- Roadway Design Features
  - Cross Section
  - Vertical Alignment
  - Horizontal Alignment

## Structural Design Criteria

- Design Specifications
- Construction Specifications
- Loading
  - Collision Load
  - Earthquake Load
- Software to be used by the Designer
- Software to be used by the Independent Design Checker

## Structure Selection

- Selection Criteria
- Rehabilitation Alternatives
- Structure Layout Alternatives:
  - Vertical Clearances
  - Horizontal Clearances
  - Deflection
  - Skew

- Superstructure Alternatives:
  - Concrete Girder Alternatives \* CBC Alternative
  - Steel Girder Alternatives \* RCP Alternative
  - Span Configurations
- Substructure Alternatives:
  - Abutment Alternatives (GRS, Integral, Semi-integral, etc.)
  - Pier Alternatives
- Wall Alternatives
- Construction Phasing
- Possible Future Widening
- Use of Existing Bridge in Phasing / Partial Configuration
- ABC Design
- Constructability
- Aesthetic Design
- Maintenance and Durability
- Corrosive Resistance
- Load Testing Requirements
- Use of Lightweight Concrete
- Construction Cost
- Life Cycle Cost Analysis

**Other**

---



---

**Figures and Appendices**

- Vicinity Map
- Alternative Typical Sections
- General Layout of the Selected Structure
- Summary of Structure Type Evaluation Table
- Summary of Quantities and Cost Estimate Tables
- Inspection Report
- Hydraulics Investigation Results
- Geotechnical Investigation Results

**Recommendations**

---



---



---



---

*If you need more space, use an additional sheet(s) of paper.*

**List of Variances**

---



---



---



---

*If you need more space, use an additional sheet(s) of paper.*

**CDOT Staff Bridge Quality Assurance Sign-off**

By signing this checklist Staff Bridge Unit Leader or designee acknowledges approval of the Structure Selection Report findings, recommendations, and all design deviations from the CDOT Structural Standards and design criteria.

---



---



---

Print Name

Signature

Date

# **APPENDIX C**

## Construction Cost Estimate





# **APPENDIX D**

Geotechnical Report





February 3, 2021

Project No. 220-063

Mr. Ron Gibson, P.E.  
Stanley Consultants  
8000 South Chester Street, Suite 500  
Centennial, Colorado 80112

**Subject: Preliminary Geotechnical Study  
Structure M-22-Y  
23558/23559 Region 2 Bridge Bundle  
CDOT Region 2, Colorado**

Dear Mr. Gibson:

This memorandum presents the results of Yeh and Associates, Inc.'s (Yeh) preliminary geotechnical engineering study for the proposed replacement of Structure M-22-Y as part of the CDOT Region 2 Bridge Bundle Design-Build Project.

The CDOT Region 2 Bridge Bundle Design-Build Project consists of the replacement of a total of 19 structures bundled together as a single project. These structures are rural bridges on essential highway corridors (US 350, US 24, CO 239, and CO 9) in southeastern and central Colorado. These key corridors provide rural mobility, intra- and interstate commerce, movement of agricultural products and supplies, and access to tourist destinations. The design-build project consists of 17 bridges and two Additionally Requested Elements (ARE) structures.

This design-build project is jointly funded by the USDOT FHWA Competitive Highway Bridge Program grant (14 structures, Project No. 23558) and the Colorado Bridge Enterprise (five structures, Project No. 23559). These projects are combined to form one design-build project. The two ARE structures are part of the five bridges funded by the Colorado Bridge Enterprise.

The 19 bridges identified to be included in the Region 2 Bridge Bundle were selected based on similarities in the bridge conditions, risk factors, site characteristics, and probable replacement type, with the goal of achieving economy of scale. Seventeen of the bridges being replaced are at least 80 years old. Five of the bridges are load-restricted, limiting trucking routes through major sections of the US 24 and US 350 corridors. The bundle includes nine timber bridges, four concrete box culverts, one corrugated metal pipe (CMP), four concrete I-beam bridges, and one I-beam bridge with corrugated metal deck.

## **1 PROJECT UNDERSTANDING**

Bridge M-22-Y is part of the Region 2 Bridge Bundle project that will be delivered as a design-build project. Our preliminary geotechnical study was completed to support the 30% design level that will be included in the design build bid package. We understand the existing structure will be replaced with either a concrete box culvert (CBC) or a bridge structure. The new structure will be constructed along the current roadway alignment and

existing roadway grade will be maintained. No significant cut or fills are required for construction of the proposed replacement structure.

## 2 SUBSURFACE CONDITIONS

Two bridge borings, M-22-Y-B-1 and M-22-Y-B-2, were drilled by Yeh in the vicinity of the existing bridges, and two pavement borings, M-22-Y-P-1 and M-22-Y-P-2, were drilled along the existing pavement approximately 250 feet from the bridge. The approximate boring locations are shown on the engineering geology sheet in Appendix A. The legend and boring logs are included in Appendix B. Laboratory test results are provided in Appendix C and are shown on the boring logs.

The bridge borings encountered lean clay soils and decomposed shale over shale bedrock. Table 1 provides a summary of the bedrock and groundwater conditions for the bridge borings. The surface elevations, approximate bedrock depths/elevations, and approximate groundwater depths/elevations are presented to the nearest 0.5 feet. The groundwater depths and elevations are based on observations during drilling.

**Table 1. Summary of Bedrock and Groundwater Conditions**

Boring ID	Location <sup>1</sup> (Northing, Easting)	Ground Surface Elevation at Time of Drilling <sup>1</sup> (feet)	Approx. Depth to Top of Competent Bedrock <sup>1</sup> (feet)	Approx. Elevation to Top of Competent Bedrock <sup>1</sup> (feet)	Approx. Groundwater Depth <sup>1, 2</sup> (feet)	Approx. Groundwater Elevation <sup>1, 2</sup> (feet)
M-22-Y-B-1	429757.712, 504512.846	4410.0	35.0	4375.0	Not Encountered	Not Encountered
M-22-Y-B-2	429724.335, 504495.889	4409.5	35.0	4374.5	Not Encountered	Not Encountered

Notes:

(1) Surface elevations, approximate bedrock depths/elevations, and approximate groundwater depths/elevations are presented to the nearest 0.5 feet. Location and elevation are provided by project surveyor.

(2) Groundwater depths and elevations are based on observations during drilling.

## 3 BRIDGE FOUNDATION RECOMMENDATIONS

We understand that the replacement structure will consist of either a new bridge structure or a concrete box culvert structure (CBC). If a bridge structure is selected, then the abutments and piers will be supported on driven H-piles or drilled shafts. If a CBC structure is selected, then the structure will be founded on a shallow mat foundation. Wing walls for the bridge and CBC structures will be founded on shallow strip foundations.

Based on the subsurface conditions encountered during our preliminary study, our engineering analysis, and our experience with similar projects, it is our opinion that driven H-pile and drilled shaft foundations are suitable for support of the bridge structure. Shallow foundations are suitable for support of the CBC and wing wall structures. Recommendations for the drilled shafts are presented in Section 3.2, driven H-pile recommendations are provided in Section 3.3, and CBC foundation recommendations are presented in Section 3.4.

The soil and bedrock properties were estimated from penetration resistance, material descriptions, and laboratory data. The design and construction of the foundation elements should comply with all applicable requirements and guidelines listed in AASHTO (2020) and the CDOT Standard Specifications (CDOT 2019).



### 3.1 Shallow Foundation Recommendations

Based on the depth to competent bedrock and the anticipated loading requirements, it is our opinion that shallow foundations are not suitable to support the bridge abutments. Bedrock is anticipated about 15 to 25 feet below the existing channel bottom and the relatively soft clays observed above the bedrock are not suitable for support of shallow foundations.

### 3.2 Drilled Shaft Recommendations

#### 3.2.1 Drilled Shaft Nominal Axial Resistance

The estimated bearing resistance should be developed from the side and tip resistance in the underlying very hard bedrock. The resistance from the overburden soil should be neglected. The design approach in Abu-Hejleh et al. (2003) provides recommendations for the use of an updated Colorado SPT-based (UCSB) design method. In this design method, the nominal side and tip resistance of a drilled shaft in the sedimentary bedrock is proportional to the driven sampler penetration resistance. This approach was generally used to estimate the axial resistance in the bedrock. Based on local practice, the modified California penetration resistance is considered to be equivalent to a standard penetration test (SPT) penetration resistance, i.e. N value, in bedrock.

Table 2 contains the recommended values for the nominal side and tip resistance for drilled shafts founded in the underlying very hard bedrock. The upper three feet of competent bedrock penetration shall not be used for drilled shaft resistance due to the likelihood of construction disturbance and possible additional weathering. To account for axial group effects, the minimum spacing requirements between drilled shafts should be three diameters from center-to-center.

**Table 2. Recommended Drilled Shaft Axial Resistance**

Reference Boring	Approximate Top of Competent Bedrock Elevation (feet)	Tip Resistance (ksf)		Side Resistance, (ksf)	
		Nominal	Factored ( $\Phi=0.50$ )	Nominal	Factored ( $\Phi=0.45$ )
M-22-Y-B-1	4375.0	95	47.5	11	5.0
M-22-Y-B-2	4374.5	95	47.5	11	5.0

#### 3.2.2 Drilled Shaft Lateral Resistance

The input parameters provided in Table 3 are recommended for use with the computer program LPILE to develop the soil models used to evaluate the drilled shaft response to lateral loading. Table 3 provides the estimated values associated with the soil types encountered in the borings. They can also be used for driven H-piles, which will be described in Section 3.3. The nature and type of loading should be considered carefully. Individual soil layers and their extent can be averaged or distinguished by referring to the boring logs at the locations of the proposed bridge. The soils and/or bedrock materials prone to future disturbance, such as from utility excavations or frost heave, should be neglected in the lateral load analyses to the depth of disturbance, which may require more than but should not be less than three feet.

Recommendations for p-y multiplier values ( $P_m$  values) to account for the reduction in lateral capacity due to group effects are provided in Section 10.7.3.12 of AASHTO (2020). The  $P_m$  value will depend on the direction of the applied load, center-to-center spacing, and location of the foundation element within the group.



**Table 3. LPILE Parameters**

Soil Type	LPILE Soil Criteria	Effective Unit Weight (pcf)		Friction Angle, (deg.)	Undrained Cohesion, (psf)	Strain Factor, ε50	p-y modulus kstatic (pci)	
		AGT <sup>1</sup>	BGT <sup>2</sup>				AGT <sup>1</sup>	BGT <sup>2</sup>
Class 1 Structure Backfill	Sand (Reese)	130	67.5	34	-	-	90	60
Clay	Stiff Clay w/o Free Water (Reese)	120	62.5	-	600	0.01	-	-
Shale Bedrock	Stiff Clay w/o Free Water (Reese)	135	135	-	8,000	0.004	-	-

Note: <sup>1</sup>Above Groundwater Table

<sup>2</sup>Below Groundwater Table

### 3.2.3 General Drilled Shaft Recommendations

The following recommendations can be used in the design and construction of the drilled shafts.

- Groundwater and potentially caving soils may be encountered during drilling depending on the time of year and location. The Contractor shall construct the drilled shafts using means and methods that maintain a stable hole.
- Bedrock may be very hard at various elevations. The contractor should mobilize equipment of sufficient size and operating condition to achieve the required design bedrock penetration.
- Drilled shaft construction shall not disturb previously installed drilled shafts. The drilled shaft concrete should have sufficient time to cure before construction on a drilled shaft within three shaft diameters (center to center spacing) begins to prevent interaction between shafts during excavation and concrete placement.
- Based on the results of the field investigation and experience with similar properly constructed drilled shaft foundations, it is estimated that foundation settlement will be less than approximately ½ inch when designed according to the criteria presented in this report.
- A representative of the Contractor’s engineer should observe drilled shaft installation operations on a full-time basis.

### 3.3 Driven H-Pile Recommendations

#### 3.3.1 Driven H-Pile Axial Resistance

Steel H-piles driven into bedrock may be designed for a nominal axial resistance equal to 32 kips per square inch (ksi) multiplied by the cross-sectional area of the pile for piles composed of Grade 50 ksi steel for use with LRFD Strength Limit State design. Piles should be driven to refusal into the underlying bedrock as defined in Section 502.05 of CDOT (2019). A wave equation analysis using the Contractor’s pile driving equipment is necessary to estimate pile drivability.

#### 3.3.2 Driven H-Pile Axial Resistance Factors

Assuming a pile driving analyzer (PDA) is used to monitor pile driving per Section 502 of CDOT (2019), a resistance factor of 0.65 may be used per AASHTO (2020) Table 10.5.5.2.3-1. Section 502.05 of CDOT (2019) stipulates that if PDA is used, a minimum of one PDA per bridge bent be performed to determine the condition of the pile, efficiency of the hammer, static bearing resistance of the pile, and to establish pile driving criteria. Per AASHTO



(2020) recommendations, a resistance factor of 0.5 can be used for wave equation analysis only without pile dynamic measurements such as PDA monitoring. Per AASHTO (2020) recommendations, a resistance factor of 0.75 may be used if a successful static load test is conducted per site condition.

### 3.3.3 Driven H-Pile Lateral Resistance

The information provided previously in Section 3.2.2 may be used to evaluate H-pile lateral resistance.

### 3.3.4 General Driven H-Pile Recommendations

The following recommendations are for the design and construction of driven H-piles.

1. Based on the results of the field investigation and experience with similar properly constructed driven pile foundations, it is estimated that settlement will be less than approximately ½ inch when designed according to the criteria presented in this report.
2. A minimum spacing requirement for the piles should be three diameters (equivalent) center to center.
3. Driven piles should be driven with protective cast steel pile points or equivalent to provide better pile tip seating and to prevent potential damage from coarse soil particles, which may be present at the site.
4. A qualified representative of the Contractor's engineer should observe pile-driving activities on a full-time basis. Piles should be observed and checked for crimping, buckling, and alignment. A record should be kept of embedment depths and penetration resistances for each pile.
5. It is estimated that the piles will penetrate approximately 3 to 5 feet into competent bedrock (see Table 1 for the estimated elevation for the top of competent bedrock). The final tip elevations will depend on bedrock conditions encountered during driving.
6. If the pile penetration extends below the estimated pile penetration into bedrock by 10 feet or more, the pile driving operations should be temporarily suspended for dynamic monitoring with PDA. We recommend that the subject pile be allowed to rest overnight or longer before restriking and monitoring the beginning-of-restrike with a PDA. The data collected with the PDA shall then be reduced using the software CAPWAP to determine the final nominal pile resistance. The pile driving criteria may be modified by CDOT's or the Contractor's engineer based on the PDA/CAPWAP results.

## 3.4 CBC Foundation Recommendations

To assure adequate foundation support and to minimize the potential for differential settlement, we recommend that the exposed subgrade soils should be scarified a minimum of 6 inches, moisture conditioned, and re-compacted in accordance with Section 203.07 of the CDOT Standard Specifications (2019) before the placement of structural elements or structural backfill. If unsuitable or soft materials are encountered after the excavation, the materials may be removed and replaced with CDOT Class 1 Structure Backfill in accordance with Section 203.07 of the CDOT Standard Specifications (2019). Visual inspection of the foundation excavations should be performed by a qualified representative of the Geotechnical Engineer of record to identify the quality of the foundation materials prior to placement of backfill and the CBC. Groundwater may be encountered during excavation for the subgrade preparation. Groundwater control systems may be required to prevent seepage migrating into the construction zone by creating groundwater cut-off and/or dewatering systems.

The recommended nominal bearing resistance using Strength Limit State for the CBC and associated wing walls for both moist and saturated conditions are provided in Table 4. We assume the materials in contact with the bottom of the proposed CBC and wing walls will consist of native clay soils or CDOT Class 1 Structure Backfill placed in accordance with Section 203.07 of the CDOT Standard Specifications (2019). The reduced footing width due to eccentricity can be calculated based on the recommendations in Sections 11.6.3.2 and 11.10.5.4 of



AASHTO (2020). A bearing resistance factor of 0.45 may be used for shallow foundations based on the recommendations in Table 10.5.5.2.2-1 of AASHTO (2020).

**Table 4. Bearing Resistance for CBC and Wing Walls on Shallow Foundation**

Soil Conditions	Nominal Bearing Resistance (ksf) <sup>1,2</sup>
Moist	$2.0 + 1.0 * B'$
Saturated	$1.1 + 0.5 * B'$
<sup>1</sup> B' is the footing width in feet reduced for eccentricity (e). $B' = B - 2e$ , where B is the nominal foundation width. <sup>2</sup> The calculated nominal bearing resistance is based on a minimum 12 inches of embedment and shall be limited to 10 ksf.	

The proposed CBC will be at the location of the existing CBC, and as needed, a portion of the CBC will be in a cut area, therefore it is estimated that the total settlement of the structure will be minimal and will occur during construction. The structure settlement is partially controlled by the weight of the adjacent embankment fill. Thus, it is recommended that the embankment fill on both sides of the CBC be placed at a relatively uniform elevation.

Resistance to sliding at the bottom of foundations can be calculated based on a coefficient of friction at the interface between the pre-cast concrete and the existing native soils or compacted CDOT Class 1 Structure Backfill. The recommended nominal coefficients of friction and the corresponding resistance factors for Class 1 Structure Backfill and native soils are provided in Table 5.

**Table 5. Coefficients of Friction for CBC and Wing Walls on Shallow Foundation**

Foundation Soil Type	Coefficient of Friction	Resistance Factor
Class 1 Structure Backfill	0.53	0.9
Native Clay	0.30	0.8

Backfill adjacent to the CBC should be Class 1 Structure Backfill, compacted with moisture density control. Backfill materials shall have a Class 0 for severity of sulfate exposure. Fill should be tested for severity of sulfate exposure prior to acceptance.

The passive pressure against the sides of the foundation is typically ignored; however, passive resistance can be used if long-term protection from disturbance, such as frost heave, future excavations, etc., is assured. Table 6 presents recommendations for the passive soil resistances for the encountered soil conditions. The passive resistance estimates are calculated from Figure 3.11.5.4-1 in AASHTO (2020) where a portion of the slip surface is modeled as a logarithmic spiral, the backslope is horizontal and the passive soil/concrete interface friction angle is equal to 60 percent of the soil's friction angle.

The recommended passive earth pressure resistances are presented in terms of an equivalent fluid unit weight for moist and saturated conditions. The recommended passive earth pressure values assume mobilization of the nominal soil/concrete foundation interface shear strength. A suitable resistance factor should be included in the design to limit the strain, which will occur at the nominal shear strength, particularly in the case of passive



resistance. The resultant passive earth force, calculated from the equivalent fluid unit weight, should be applied at a point located 1/3 of the height of the soil (in contact with the foundation) above the base of the foundation, directed upward at an angle of 20 degrees from the horizontal.

**Table 6. Passive Soil Resistance for CBC**

	Soil Type	Nominal Resistance	Resistance Factor
Passive Soil Resistance	Moist	332 psf/ft	0.50
	Saturated	159 psf/ft	0.50

### 3.5 Lateral Earth Pressures

External loads used in the analyses of the bridge abutments and CBC wing walls should include earth pressure loads, traffic loads, and any other potential surcharge loads. Typical drainage details consisting of inlets near the abutments, geocomposite strip drains, and perforated pipes shall be included in the design to properly contain and transfer surface and subsurface water without saturating the soil around the abutments.

All abutment and CBC wing wall backfill materials should meet the requirements for CDOT Structure Backfill Class 1 in accordance with CDOT (2019). All backfill adjacent to the abutments and walls shall be placed and compacted in accordance with CDOT (2019). It is recommended that compaction of backfill materials be observed and evaluated by an experienced Contractor’s engineer or Contractor’s engineer’s representative.

A lateral wall movement or rotation of approximately 0.1 to 0.2 percent of the wall height may be required to mobilize active earth pressure for the recommended backfill materials. If the estimated wall movement is less than this amount, an at-rest soil pressure should be used in design. In order to mobilize passive earth pressure, lateral wall movement or rotation of approximately 1.0 to 2.0 percent of the wall height may be required for the recommended backfill materials. It should be carefully considered if this amount of movement can be accepted before passive earth pressure is used in the design.

Earth pressure loading within and along the back of the bridge abutments and CBC wing walls shall be controlled by the structural backfill. We recommend that active, at-rest, and passive lateral earth pressures used for the design of the structures be based on an effective angle of internal friction of 34 degrees, and a unit weight of 135 pounds per cubic foot (pcf) for CDOT Structure Backfill Class 1. The following can be used for design assuming a horizontal backslope:

- Active earth pressure coefficient ( $k_a$ ) of 0.28
- Passive earth pressure coefficient ( $k_p$ ) of 3.53
- At-rest earth pressure coefficient ( $k_0$ ) of 0.44

Lateral earth pressures for a non-horizontal backslope can be estimated using section 3.11 in AASHTO (2020).





### 3.6 Bridge Scour Parameters

A bulk sample of the creek bed soils/rock below the existing bridge was collected for gradation analysis. The results of the grain size analysis are presented in Appendix C.

## 4 BRIDGE APPROACH PAVEMENT

Pavement borings were located approximately 250 feet beyond the existing bridge abutments on each side. Prior to drilling, the existing pavement was cored with a 4-inch nominal diameter core barrel. Photos of the pavement core, logs of the subsurface soils/rock, and results of geotechnical and analytical laboratory testing are presented in the appendices. Bulk soil samples were collected from the pavement borings and combined for classification, strength (R-value), and analytical testing. Preliminary pavement thickness design will be completed by CDOT Staff materials. The asphalt pavement thicknesses, aggregate base thicknesses (if present), subgrade soil classifications, and subgrade R-values are presented in Table 7.

**Table 7. Existing Pavement Section and Subgrade Properties**

Boring ID	Existing Asphalt Concrete Thickness (in)	Aggregate Base Thickness (in)	Subgrade Soil Classification (AASHTO) <sup>1</sup>	R-Value <sup>1</sup>
M-22-Y-P-1	4.5	12.0	A-6 (7)	13
M-22-Y-P-2	7.0	8.0		

1. Subgrade Classification and R-value test results based on combined bulk sample from each pavement boring.

## 5 ANALYTICAL TEST RESULTS

Analytical testing was completed on representative samples of soils encountered in the borings. The test results can be found in Appendix C and are summarized in Table 8. The Analytical results should be used to select the proper concrete type for the project in accordance with CDOT Standard Specifications (2019). A qualified corrosion engineer should review the laboratory data and boring logs to determine the appropriate level of corrosion protection for materials in contact with these soils.

**Table 8. Analytical Test Results**

Sample Boring ID	Material	Water Soluble Sulfates, %	Water Soluble Chlorides, %	pH	Resistivity, ohm-cm
M-22-Y-P-1/P-2	Lean Clay (Fill)	0.041	0.0018	-	-
M-22-Y-B-1	Lean Clay	0.013	0.0033	7.9	1464
M-22-Y-B-2	Shale	0.593	0.0010	7.8	803

## 6 SEISMIC CONSIDERATIONS

No active faults are known to exist in the immediate vicinity of the proposed bridge locations. Based on the site class definitions provided in Table 3.10.3.1-1 of AASHTO LRFD (2020), the site can be categorized as Site Class D. Also based on the recommendations in Table 3.10.6-1 of AASHTO LRFD (2020), the bridge site can be classified as Seismic Zone 1.



The peak ground acceleration (PGA) and the short- and long- period spectral acceleration coefficients ( $S_s$  and  $S_1$ , respectively) for Site Class B (reference site class) were determined using the seismic design maps from the USGS website. The seismic design parameters for Site Class D are shown in Table 9.

**Table 9. Seismic Design Parameters**

PGA (0.0 sec)	$S_s$ (0.2 sec)	$S_1$ (1.0 sec)
0.044	0.097	0.031
$A_s$ (0.0 sec)	$S_{D5}$ (0.2 sec)	$S_{D1}$ (1.0 sec)
0.07	0.155	0.074

## 7 LIMITATIONS

Our scope of services was performed, and this report was prepared in accordance with generally accepted principles and practices in this area at the time this report was prepared. We make no other warranty, either express or implied.

The classifications, conclusions, and recommendations submitted in this report are based on the data obtained from published and unpublished maps, reports, and geotechnical analyses. Our conclusions and recommendations are based on our understanding of the project as described in this report and the site conditions as interpreted from the explorations. This data may not necessarily reflect variations in the subsurface conditions and water levels occurring at other locations.

The nature and extent of subsurface variations may not become evident until excavation is performed. Variations in the data may also occur with the passage of time. If during construction, fill, soil, rock, or groundwater conditions appear to be different from those described in this report, this office should be advised immediately so we could review these conditions and reconsider our recommendations. If there is a substantial lapse of time between the submission of this report and the start of work at the site, or if conditions have changed because of natural forces or construction operations at or adjacent to the site, we recommend that this report be reviewed to determine the applicability of the conclusions and recommendations concerning the changed conditions or time lapse. We recommend on-site observation of foundation excavations and foundation subgrade conditions by an experienced geotechnical engineer or engineer's representative.

The scope of services of this study did not include hazardous materials sampling or environmental sampling, investigation, or analyses. In addition, we did not evaluate the site for potential impacts to natural resources, including wetlands, endangered species, or environmentally critical areas.

## 8 REFERENCES

AASHTO LRFD, 9<sup>th</sup> Edition. AASHTO Load Resistance Factor Design (LRFD) Bridge Design Specifications, Eight Edition. Washington, DC: American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials. 2020.

Abu-Hejleh, N., O'Neill, M.W., Hanneman, Dennis, Atwooll, W.J., 2003. Improvement of the Geotechnical Axial Design Methodology for Colorado's Drilled Shafts Socketed in Weak Rocks, Final Report: Colorado Department of Transportation Research Branch, July 2003, Report No. CDOT-DTD-R-2003-6.

Colorado Department of Transportation, 2019. CDOT Standard Specifications for Road and Bridge Construction. 2019 Edition.



Respectfully Submitted,  
**YEH AND ASSOCIATES, INC.**

Prepared by:



Cory S. Wallace, EIT, GIT  
Staff Engineer

Reviewed by:



JG T. McCall, PE  
Senior Project Engineer

Independent Technical Review by:



Hsing-Cheng Liu, PE, PhD  
Senior Project Manager

Attachments:

- Appendix A
- Appendix B
- Appendix C

## **APPENDIX A**

---

## **ENGINEERING GEOLOGY SHEET**



## **APPENDIX B**

---

### **KEY TO BORING LOGS BORING LOGS PAVEMENT CORE PHOTOS**



## Legend for Symbols Used on Borehole Logs

### Sample Types



Bulk Sample of auger/odex cuttings



Rock core



Modified California Sampler (2.5 inch OD, 2.0 inch ID)



Standard Penetration Test (ASTM D1586)

### Drilling Methods



CORING



HOLLOW-STEM AUGER



CORING

### Lithology Symbols (see Boring Logs for complete descriptions)



Asphalt



Cobbles and gravel



USCS Fat/High Plasticity Clay



USCS Lean/Low Plasticity Clay



Fill



Fill with Clay as major soil



Fill with Gravel as major soil



USCS Clayey Gravel



USCS Silty, Clayey Gravel



USCS Poorly-graded Gravel



USCS Poorly-graded Gravel with Clay



High Plasticity Sandy Clay



Poorly-graded Sandy Gravel



Low Plasticity Sandy Clay



USCS Clayey Sand



USCS Silty Sand



USCS Poorly-graded Sand



USCS Poorly-graded Sand with Clay



Shale



Weathered Bedrock



Granite



Limestone

### Lab Test Standards

Moisture Content	ASTM D2216
Dry Density	ASTM D7263
Sand/Fines Content	ASTM D421, ASTM C136, ASTM D1140
Atterberg Limits	ASTM D4318
AASHTO Class.	AASHTO M145, ASTM D3282
USCS Class.	ASTM D2487
(Fines = % Passing #200 Sieve)	
Sand = % Passing #4 Sieve, but not passing #200 Sieve)	

### Other Lab Test Abbreviations

pH	Soil pH (AASHTO T289-91)
S	Water-Soluble Sulfate Content (AASHTO T290-91, ASTM D4327)
Chl	Water-Soluble Chloride Content (AASHTO T291-91, ASTM D4327)
S/C	Swell/Collapse (ASTM D4546)
UCCS	Unconfined Compressive Strength (Soil - ASTM D2166, Rock - ASTM D7012)
R-Value	Resistance R-Value (ASTM D2844)
DS (C)	Direct Shear cohesion (ASTM D3080)
DS (phi)	Direct Shear friction angle (ASTM D3080)
Re	Electrical Resistivity (AASHTO T288-91)
PtL	Point Load Strength Index (ASTM D5731)

### Notes

1. Visual classifications are in general accordance with ASTM D2488, "Standard Practice for Description and Identification of Soils (Visual-Manual Procedures)".
2. "Penetration Resistance" on the Boring Logs refers to the uncorrected N value for SPT samples only, as per ASTM D1586. For samples obtained with a Modified California (MC) sampler, drive depth is 12 inches, and "Penetration Resistance" refers to the sum of all blows. Where blow counts were > 50 for the 3rd increment (SPT) or 2nd increment (MC), "Penetration Resistance" combines the last and 2nd-to-last blows and lengths; for other increments with > 50 blows, the blows for the last increment are reported.
3. The Modified California sampler used to obtain samples is a 2.5-inch OD, 2.0-inch ID (1.95-inch ID with liners), split-barrel sampler with internal liners, as per ASTM D3550. Sampler is driven with a 140-pound hammer, dropped 30 inches per blow.
4. "ER" for the hammer is the Reported Calibrated Energy Transfer Ratio for that specific hammer, as provided by the drilling company.









**Boring Began: 8/25/2020**  
**Boring Completed: 8/25/2020**  
Drilling Method(s): Hollow-Stem Auger  
Driller: Vine Laboratories  
Drill Rig: CME 55 Truck  
Hammer: Automatic (hydraulic), ER: 80%

**Total Depth: 35.3 ft**  
Ground Elevation: 4409.79  
Coordinates: N: 429757.7 E: 504512.8  
Location: US 350, southbound outside lane  
Logged By: C. Wallace  
Final By: J. McCall

Weather Notes: Clear, 80s  
Inclination from Horiz.: Vertical  
Night Work:

Groundwater Levels: Not Observed			
Symbol	-	-	-
Depth	-	-	-
Date	-	-	-

Elevation (feet)	Depth (feet)	Sample Type/Depth	Drilling Method	Soil Samples		Lithology	Material Description	Moisture Content (%)	Dry Density (pcf)	Gravel Content (%)	Sand Content (%)	Fines Content (%)	Atterberg Limits		AASHTO & USCS Classifications	Field Notes and Other Lab Tests	
				Blows per 6 in	Penetration Resistance								Liquid Limit	Plasticity Index			
							0.0 - 0.7 ft. ASPHALT (8 inches).										
							0.7 - 10.0 ft. Lean CLAY (CL) (Fill), light brown, moist, medium stiff to stiff.										
4405	5			4-5	9												
								18.6		0.0	7.6	92.4	29	14	A-6 (11) CL		
4400	10			2-4	6		10.0 - 21.0 ft. Lean CLAY (CL), light brown, moist, medium stiff.										
4395	15			2-2	4			20.3		0.0	5.0	95.0	38	24	A-6 (23) CL	pH=7.9 S=0.013% ChI=0.0033% Re=1464ohm·cm	
4390	20			15-29	44		21.0 - 35.0 ft. DECOMPOSED SHALE, light brown to gray, predominantly decomposed, hard to very hard, fissile, abundant calcite crystals.										
4385																	

BORING LOG 2019 - SPT CDOT STYLE 220-063 R2 BRIDGE BUNDLE.GPJ 2019 YEH COLORADO TEMPLATE.GDT 2019 YEH COLORADO LIBRARY.GLB 11/6/20



Elevation (feet)	Depth (feet)	Sample Type/Depth	Drilling Method	Soil Samples		Lithology	Material Description	Moisture Content (%)	Dry Density (pcf)	Gravel Content (%)	Sand Content (%)	Fines Content (%)	Atterberg Limits		AASHTO & USCS Classifications	Field Notes and Other Lab Tests
				Blows per 6 in	Penetration Resistance								Liquid Limit	Plasticity Index		
				39-50:5"	89:11"			11.9		0.5	6.5	93.0	47	28	A-7-6 (28) CL	UCCS=72.4 psi
4380	30			34-31-50:5"	81:11"											
4375	35			50:3"	50:3"		35.0 - 35.3 ft. SHALE, light brown to gray, moderately weathered, very hard, fissile, abundant calcite crystals. Bottom of Hole at 35.3 ft.									
4370																
4365																
4360																
4355																

BORING LOG 2019 - SPT CDOT STYLE 220-063 R2 BRIDGE BUNDLE.GPJ 2019 YEH COLORADO TEMPLATE.GDT 2019 YEH COLORADO LIBRARY.GLB 11/6/20





Elevation (feet)	Depth (feet)	Sample Type/Depth	Drilling Method	Soil Samples		Lithology	Material Description	Moisture Content (%)	Dry Density (pcf)	Gravel Content (%)	Sand Content (%)	Fines Content (%)	Atterberg Limits		AASHTO & USCS Classifications	Field Notes and Other Lab Tests
				Blows per 6 in	Penetration Resistance								Liquid Limit	Plasticity Index		
				2-3	5		25.0 - 35.0 ft. Lean CLAY (CL), light brown/gray mottled with white and red, moist, medium stiff.	24.6		0.0	4.2	95.8	36	20	A-6 (19) CL	
4380	30			5-8	13											
4375	35			50:5"	50:5"		35.0 - 42.0 ft. SHALE, light brown/gray with red, moderately weathered, very hard.	9.4		0.0	9.5	90.5	47	28	A-7-6 (26) CL	pH=7.8 S=0.593% ChI=0.0010% Re=803ohm-cm
4370	40			50:2"	50:2"		42.0 - 43.5 ft. LIMESTONE, gray, slightly weathered, very hard, slightly clayey.									
4365				50:2"	50:2"		Bottom of Hole at 43.5 ft.									
4360																
4355																

BORING LOG 2019 - SPT CDOT STYLE 220-063 R2 BRIDGE BUNDLE.GPJ 2019 YEH COLORADO TEMPLATE.GDT 2019 YEH COLORADO LIBRARY.GLB 11/6/20



Boring:	<b>P-1</b>	AC:	<b>4.5"</b>
Roadway:	<b>US 350</b>	PCC:	<b>-</b>
Direction:	<b>Southbound</b>	Base:	<b>12"</b>
Lane:	<b>Outside</b>	Notes:	<b>-</b>



Boring:	<b>P-2</b>	AC:	<b>7"</b>
Roadway:	<b>US 350</b>	PCC:	<b>-</b>
Direction:	<b>Northbound</b>	Base:	<b>8"</b>
Lane:	<b>Outside</b>	Notes:	<b>-</b>



**Yeh and Associates, Inc.**  
Geotechnical • Geological • Construction Services

**Pavement Core Photographs**

FIGURE

PROJECT NO. 220-063 DATE: 11/2/2020  
 FIGURE BY: BHL YEH OFFICE: Colorado Springs  
 CHECKED BY: JTM

CDOT Region 2 Bridge Bundle  
Structure M-22-Y

**B-1**

## APPENDIX C

---

### SUMMARY OF LABORATORY TEST RESULTS






## Summary of Laboratory Test Results


Project No: 220-063      Project Name: CDOT Region 2 Bridge Bundle      Date: 11-06-2020

Sample Location			Natural Moisture Content (%)	Natural Dry Density (pcf)	Gradation			Atterberg			pH	Water Soluble Sulfate (%)	Water Soluble Chloride (%)	Resistivity (ohm-cm)	Swell (+) / Collapse (-) (% at Load in psf)	Unconf. Comp. Strength (psi)	R-Value	Classification	
Boring No.	Depth (ft)	Sample Type			Gravel > #4 (%)	Sand (%)	Fines < #200 (%)	LL	PL	PI								AASHTO	USCS
M-22-Y Scour	0	BULK	11.9		1.0	11.9	87.1												
M-22-Y-B-1	5.0	MC	18.6	105.0	0.0	7.6	92.4	29	15	14								A-6 (11)	CL
M-22-Y-B-1	15.0	MC	20.3	102.7	0.0	5.0	95.0	38	14	24	7.9	0.013	0.0033	1464				A-6 (23)	CL
M-22-Y-B-1	25.0	MC	11.9	119.3	0.5	6.5	93.0	47	19	28					72.4			A-7-6 (28)	CL
M-22-Y-B-2	10.0	MC	17.9	106.4	0.0	2.6	97.4	35	15	20					0.1 @ 1000			A-6 (19)	CL
M-22-Y-B-2	25.0	MC	24.6	98.0	0.0	4.2	95.8	36	16	20								A-6 (19)	CL
M-22-Y-B-2	35.0	MC	9.4	117.3	0.0	9.5	90.5	47	19	28	7.8	0.593	0.0010	803				A-7-6 (26)	CL
M-22-Y-P-1	1.0	MC	16.5	110.2	0.0	19.1	80.9	39	17	22					0.8 @ 200			A-6 (17)	CL
M-22-Y-P-1/P-2	2.5	BULK	10.9		16.0	24.4	59.6	31	14	17		0.041	0.0018				13	A-6 (7)	CL
M-22-Y-P-2	4.0	MC	18.6	108.2	0.0	1.9	98.1	41	17	24					1.9 @ 200			A-7-6 (25)	CL







BOREHOLE	DEPTH (ft)	AASHTO Classification	USCS Classification	LL	PL	PI	%Gravel	%Sand	%Fines	
									%Silt	%Clay
● M-22-Y-B-1	5.0	A-6 (11)	CL	29	15	14	0.0	7.6	92.4	
⊠ M-22-Y-B-1	15.0	A-6 (23)	CL	38	14	24	0.0	5.0	95.0	
▲ M-22-Y-B-1	25.0	A-7-6 (28)	CL	47	19	28	0.5	6.5	93.0	
★ M-22-Y-B-2	10.0	A-6 (19)	CL	35	15	20	0.0	2.6	97.4	
◎ M-22-Y-B-2	25.0	A-6 (19)	CL	36	16	20	0.0	4.2	95.8	

 <b>Yeh and Associates, Inc.</b> Geotechnical • Geological • Construction Services	<h2>SIEVE ANALYSIS</h2>	<h2>FIGURE</h2>


03 GRAIN SIZE YEH 220-063 R2 BRIDGE BUNDLE GP.J 2019 YEH COLORADO TEMPLATE.GDT 2019 YEH COLORADO LIBRARY.GLB 11/6/20




BOREHOLE	DEPTH (ft)	AASHTO Classification	USCS Classification	LL	PL	PI	%Gravel	%Sand	%Fines	
									%Silt	%Clay
● M-22-Y-B-2	35.0	A-7-6 (26)	CL	47	19	28	0.0	9.5	90.5	
⊠ M-22-Y-P-1	1.0	A-6 (17)	CL	39	17	22	0.0	19.1	80.9	
▲ M-22-Y-P-1/P-2	2.5	A-6 (7)	CL	31	14	17	16.0	24.4	59.6	
★ M-22-Y-P-2	4.0	A-7-6 (25)	CL	41	17	24	0.0	1.9	98.1	

 <b>Yeh and Associates, Inc.</b> Geotechnical • Geological • Construction Services	<h2>SIEVE ANALYSIS</h2>	<h2>FIGURE</h2>
Project No. 220-063      Date: 11-06-2020 Report By: D. Gruenwald      Yeh Lab: Colorado Springs Checked By: J. McCall	CDOT Region 2 Bridge Bundle Structure M-22-Y	

03 GRAIN SIZE YEH 220-063 R2 BRIDGE BUNDLE.GPJ 2019 YEH COLORADO TEMPLATE.GDT 2019 YEH COLORADO LIBRARY.GLB 11/6/20




BOREHOLE	DEPTH (ft)	AASHTO Classification	USCS Classification	LL	PL	PI	%Gravel	%Sand	%Fines	
									%Silt	%Clay
● M-22-Y Scour	0.0						1.0	11.9	87.1	

 <b>Yeh and Associates, Inc.</b> Geotechnical • Geological • Construction Services	<h2>SIEVE ANALYSIS</h2>	<h2>FIGURE</h2>
Project No. 220-063      Date: 11-06-2020 Report By: D. Gruenwald      Yeh Lab: Colorado Springs Checked By: J. McCall	CDOT Region 2 Bridge Bundle Structure M-22-Y	




**SWELL/CONSOLIDATION TEST - ASTM D 4546**




<b>Boring ID</b>	P-1
<b>Sample Depth (ft)</b>	1.0
<b>Date Sampled</b>	8/25/2020

<b>Swell/ Consolidation (%)</b>	0.8
<b>Natural Moisture Content (%)</b>	16.5
<b>Saturated Moisture Content (%)</b>	17.2
<b>Dry Density (pcf)</b>	110.2


 <b>Yeh and Associates, Inc.</b> Geotechnical • Geological • Construction Services	<b>SWELL/ CONSOLIDATION TEST RESULTS</b>	<b>FIGURE</b>
	CDOT Region 2 Bridge Bundle Structure M-22-Y	<b>C-5</b>
Project No. 220-063      Date: 11/6/2020 Report By: D. Greunwald      Yeh Lab: Colorado Springs Checked By: J. McCall		

**SWELL/CONSOLIDATION TEST - ASTM D 4546**




<b>Boring ID</b>	P-2
<b>Sample Depth (ft)</b>	4.0
<b>Date Sampled</b>	8/25/2020

<b>Swell/ Consolidation (%)</b>	1.9
<b>Natural Moisture Content (%)</b>	18.6
<b>Saturated Moisture Content (%)</b>	21.1
<b>Dry Density (pcf)</b>	108.2


 <b>Yeh and Associates, Inc.</b> Geotechnical • Geological • Construction Services	<b>SWELL/ CONSOLIDATION TEST RESULTS</b>	<b>FIGURE</b>
	CDOT Region 2 Bridge Bundle Structure M-22-Y	<b>C-6</b>
Project No. 220-063      Date: 11/6/2020 Report By: D. Greunwald      Yeh Lab: Colorado Springs Checked By: J. McCall		

**SWELL/CONSOLIDATION TEST - ASTM D 4546**



<b>Boring ID</b>	B-2
<b>Sample Depth (ft)</b>	10.0
<b>Date Sampled</b>	8/25/2020

<b>Swell/ Consolidation (%)</b>	0.1
<b>Natural Moisture Content (%)</b>	17.9
<b>Saturated Moisture Content (%)</b>	19.7
<b>Dry Density (pcf)</b>	106.4

 <b>Yeh and Associates, Inc.</b> Geotechnical • Geological • Construction Services	<b>SWELL/ CONSOLIDATION TEST RESULTS</b>	<b>FIGURE</b>
	CDOT Region 2 Bridge Bundle Structure M-22-Y	<b>C-7</b>
Project No. 220-063      Date: 11/6/2020 Report By: D. Greunwald      Yeh Lab: Colorado Springs Checked By: J. McCall		







# YEH AND ASSOCIATES, INC

## R-Value Test Report

Project Number: 220-063

Project Name: CDOT Region 2 Bridge Bundle

Sample Id: P-1 / P-2

Depth (ft): 2.5

Location: M-22-Y


Station: 0

Date Sampled: 9/23/2020

Date Tested: 10/13/2020

R-Value at 300 psi exudation pressure =

**13**



Test No.	Compact. Press. (psi)	Density (pcf)	Moist. (%)	Horizont. Pressure (psi)'@ 160 psi	Sample Height (in).	Exud. Pressure (psi)	R Value	R Value Correct.
1	350	120.1	13.0	131	2.49	354	16	16
2	350	119.2	15.0	135	2.45	261	13	12
3	350	118.3	17.0	143	2.46	173	9	9

Sampled by: CW

Tested by: Kyle Lyons

Checked by: M.A