



US Army Corps  
of Engineers

TECHNICAL REPORT ITL-91-4

# STRUCTURAL EVALUATION OF EISENHOWER AND SNELL LOCKS, SAINT LAWRENCE SEAWAY, MASSENA, NEW YORK

by

Reed L. Mosher

Information Technology Laboratory

and

Tommy L. Bevins, Billy D. Nealey


Structures Laboratory

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

Waterways Experiment Station, Corps of Engineers


3909 Halls Ferry Road, Vicksburg, Mississippi 39180-6199

AD-A242 726



2

DTIC



November 1991


Final Report

Approved For Public Release; Distribution is Unlimited



Prepared for DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY  
US Army Corps of Engineers  
Washington, DC - 20314-1000

# DISCLAIMER NOTICE



THIS DOCUMENT IS BEST QUALITY AVAILABLE. THE COPY FURNISHED TO DTIC CONTAINED A SIGNIFICANT NUMBER OF PAGES WHICH DO NOT REPRODUCE LEGIBLY.

Destroy this report when no longer needed. Do not return it  
to the originator.

The findings in this report are not to be construed as an  
official Department of the Army position unless so  
designated by other authorized documents.

The contents of this report are not to be used for  
advertising, publication, or promotional purposes.  
Citation of trade names does not constitute an  
official endorsement or approval of the use  
of such commercial products.

91 1119 021

**91-15895**  


# REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

Form Approved  
OMB No. 0704-0188

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302, and to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0704-0188), Washington, DC 20503

<b>1. AGENCY USE ONLY (Leave blank)</b>	<b>2. REPORT DATE</b> November 1991	<b>3. REPORT TYPE AND DATES COVERED</b> Final report	
<b>4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE</b> Structural Evaluation of Eisenhower and Snell Locks, Saint Lawrence Seaway, Massena, New York		<b>5. FUNDING NUMBERS</b>	
<b>6. AUTHOR(S)</b> Reed L. Mosher, Tommy L. Bevins, Billy D. Neeley		<b>8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER</b> Technical Report ITL-91-4	
<b>7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)</b> USAE Waterways Experiment Station, Information Technology and Structures Laboratories 3909 Halls Ferry Road, Vicksburg, MS 39180-6199		<b>10. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY REPORT NUMBER</b>	
<b>9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)</b> DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY US Army Corps of Engineers Washington, DC 20314-1000		<b>11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES</b> Available from National Technical Information Service, 5285 Port Royal Road, Springfield, VA 22161	
<b>12a. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT</b>  Approved for public release; distribution unlimited		<b>12b. DISTRIBUTION CODE</b>	
<b>13. ABSTRACT (Maximum 200 words)</b> The Eisenhower and Snell Locks were constructed between 1955 and 1958 as part of an international cooperative effort to build the Saint Lawrence Seaway. The US portion of the project was authorized by the Wiley-Dondero Act of 13 May 1954. This act also created the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation (SLSDC) to construct, operate, and maintain the locks. SLSDC contracted with the Corps of Engineers (CE) to design and construct these locks. The CE has had a long history of providing engineering and review assistance to the SLSDC for the two locks. The SLSDC requested the CE through an Intergovernmental Agency Agreement to preform a structural evaluation study of the two locks to determine the adequacy of the existing locks considering present conditions and future needs, and to determine the advisability of their rehabilitation. The study focuses on the internal structural integrity of the chamber wall monoliths at each lock. <p style="text-align: right;">(Continued)</p>			
<b>14. SUBJECT TERMS</b>  See reverse.		<b>15. NUMBER OF PAGES</b> 306	
		<b>16. PRICE CODE</b>	
<b>17. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF REPORT</b> UNCLASSIFIED	<b>18. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE</b> UNCLASSIFIED	<b>19. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF ABSTRACT</b> UNCLASSIFIED	<b>20. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT</b>

13. (Concluded).

After an initial visual inspection of the locks, approximately 750 lin ft of 6-in.-diam cores were taken by the Mobile District for the laboratory testing program to support the static and seismic analyses. Portions of the cores were subjected to physical testing to develop parameters for the static and seismic analyses. The physical testing for the concrete consisted of tests to find unconfined compressive strength, Poisson's ratio, elastic modulus, splitting tensile strength, specific gravity, absorption, voids, and ultrasonic pulse velocity. Petrographic examinations of three specimens were conducted on the in-place concrete from Eisenhower and Snell Locks.

Three typical concrete chamber wall monoliths were analyzed: a north and a south wall at Eisenhower and a north wall at Snell. Each monolith was analyzed for three loading conditions: normal operation with upper pool in the chamber, normal operation with lower pool in the chamber, and the maintenance condition with the chamber fully dewatered.

For static loading and with the current condition as analyzed, the chamber wall monoliths at Eisenhower and Snell Locks show no evidence of being overstressed. The results of the static analyses show that the chamber wall monoliths have tensile stresses below 200 psi and compressive stresses less than 1,000 psi. These stress levels are below any of the strengths determined from the laboratory testing program (390 psi for tensile splitting tests and 3,660 psi for compression tests).

A response spectra seismic analysis was performed for a north chamber wall monolith at Eisenhower. The response spectra (Operating Basis Earthquake (OBE)) and Maximum Credible Earthquake (MCE)) developed from the geological-seismological investigation were used to perform the linear dynamic stress analysis. For both the OBE and MCE conditions, catastrophic failure of the lock wall is unlikely to occur. No damage should occur during the OBE event with a maximum principal stress of 300 psi. There is a possibility of damage to the structure during the MCE event near the top of the structure where the sloping face transitions into a vertical face. If damage does occur during the MCE event, no more than about 5 to 10 percent of the section would be damaged.

14. (Concluded).

Concrete testing	Snell Lock
Eisenhower Lock	Soil-structure interaction
Finite element analysis	Static-stress analysis
Seismic-stress analysis	Structural evaluation

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Eisenhower and Snell Locks were constructed between 1955 and 1958 as part of an international cooperative effort to build the Saint Lawrence Seaway. In February 1990, the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation (SLSDC) requested the Corps of Engineers (CE), through an Intergovernmental Agency Agreement, to perform a structural evaluation study of these two locks to determine the adequacy of the existing locks considering present conditions and future needs, and to determine the advisability of their rehabilitation. The study focuses on the internal structural integrity of the chamber wall monoliths at each lock.

The study consisted of three phases:

- a. Phase I - Field Investigation and Laboratory Testing Program: This phase of the study explored the current state of the in situ concrete in the chamber wall monoliths and determined the concrete properties needed for the stress analyses in the subsequent phases of the study.
- b. Phase II - Static Stress Analysis: In this phase of the study, the state of stress within the chamber wall monoliths is examined by performing nonlinear, two-dimensional, soil-structure interaction finite element analyses of two monoliths at Eisenhower Lock and one monolith at Snell Lock.
- c. Phase II - Seismic Stress Analysis: Dynamic finite element analyses of two monoliths are performed to assess their structural integrity during an earthquake. To support the dynamic analysis, a geological-seismological investigation was conducted to provide the ground motions, time histories, and corresponding response spectra that could be expected during a seismic event in the region.

After an initial visual inspection of the locks, approximately 750 lin ft of 6-in.-diam cores were taken for the laboratory testing program to support the static and seismic analyses. Portions of the cores were subjected to physical testing to develop parameters for the static and seismic analyses. The physical testing for the concrete consisted of unconfined compressive strength, Poisson's ratio, elastic modulus, splitting tensile strength, specific gravity, absorption, voids, and ultrasonic pulse velocity. Petrographic examinations of three specimens were conducted on the in-place concrete from Eisenhower and Snell Locks.

Three typical concrete chamber wall monoliths were analyzed: a north and a south wall at Eisenhower and a north wall at Snell. Each monolith was analyzed for

three loading conditions: normal operation with upper pool in the chamber, normal operation with lower pool in the chamber, and the maintenance condition with the chamber fully dewatered. For static loading and with the current condition as analyzed, the chamber wall monoliths at Eisenhower and Snell Locks show no evidence of being overstressed. The results of the static analyses show that the chamber wall monoliths have tensile stresses below 200 psi and compressive stresses less than 1,000 psi. These stress levels are below any of the strengths determined from the laboratory testing program (390 psi for tensile splitting tests and 3,660 psi for compression tests). The highest stresses under static loading are in areas of low strength as determined in the testing program. If for some reason the cross sectional area is significantly reduced, such as concrete deterioration as found in the history of Eisenhower Lock, the structural integrity would be in question. It is important for the SLSDC to maintain an aggressive maintenance program of replacing deteriorated concrete. In the near future, attention should be given to the repair of deteriorated concrete near the bottom of the lock walls at Eisenhower Lock.

For the seismic analysis, a geological-seismological investigation was conducted to find the strongest motions that the locks could expect to experience. There were no active faults either at the Eisenhower or Snell Lock sites or in the general area. The locks were determined to be in a high seismic area termed the Massena zone. The zone was given a floating earthquake of Modified Mercalli (MM) intensity of VIII which is the threshold of damage to properly built structures. Parameters for a Maximum Credible Earthquake (MCE) were assigned as horizontal peak motions of 0.83 g for acceleration, 35 cm/sec for velocity, and 12.4 sec for duration. The Operating Basis Earthquake (OBE) was assigned 0.46 g, 24 cm/sec, and 8.8 sec, respectively. A set of six accelerograms with response spectra was selected for use in the seismic analyses.

A response spectra seismic analysis was performed for a north chamber wall monolith at Eisenhower. For both the OBE and MCE conditions, catastrophic failure of the lock wall is unlikely to occur. No damage should occur during the OBE event with a maximum principal stress of 300 psi. There is a possibility of damage to the structure during the MCE event near the top of the structure where the sloping face

transitions into a vertical face. If damage does occur during the MCE event, no more than about 5 to 10 percent of the section would be damaged. Since, the MCE event has a low likelihood of occurrence and the damage level is low, it would be prudent to wait and make repairs to the chamber walls if such an earthquake event.

Accession For	
NTSB GRAFI	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
BTIC TAB	<input type="checkbox"/>
Unannounced	<input type="checkbox"/>
Justification	
By	
Distribution/	
Availability Codes	
Dist	Avail and/or Special
A-1	



## PREFACE

The Waterways Experiment Station (WES), US of Army Corps of Engineers, was authorized to conduct this study by the US Army Engineer District, Buffalo on 12 February 1990 by DA Form 2544, Number NCB-DA-90-16EJ.

Mr. Reed L. Mosher, Computer-Aided Engineering Division (CAED), Information Technology Laboratory (ITL), WES, was the Project Manager for the study. He was also the Principal Investigator for the static stress analysis and the primary author for this report. Messrs. Michael Pace and Kevin Abraham, both of CAED, helped in performing the static stress analysis. Mr. Tommy L. Bevins, Structural Analysis Group (SAG), Structural Mechanics Division (SMD), Structures Laboratory (SL) performed the seismic stress analysis under the direction of Dr. Robert L. Hall, Chief, SAG, SMD, SL. Mr. Bevins authored the section of this report describing the seismic analysis. Mr. Billy D. Neeley, Application Group (AG), Engineering Mechanics Branch, (EMB), and Dr. Robert H. Denson, formerly of Engineering Sciences Branch (ESB), Concrete Technology Division, SL, supervised the laboratory testing program. They were assisted by Messrs. Percy Collins, AG, Michael Lloyd, AG, Roy C. Gill, Cement and Pozzolan Group, ES, Sam Wong, Engineering Material Group (EMG), Ms. Judy Tom, EMG, and Ms. Linda Mayfield, Applied Mechanics Group, EM. Mr. Neeley authored the section of this report describing laboratory test results. Ms. Eileen M. Glynn, Rock Mechanics Branch (RMB), Soil and Rock Mechanics Division (SRMD), Geotechnical Laboratory (GL), logged the core and supervised drilling operation at Eisenhower and Snell Locks. Dr. E. L. Krinitzsky, Earthquake Engineering and Geosciences Division (EEGD), GL, conducted a geological-seismological investigation to find the strongest motions for the seismic analysis.

COL Larry B. Fulton, EN, was Commander and Director of WES during the preparation of this report. Dr. Robert W. Whalin was Technical Director.

## CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....	i
PREFACE .....	1
CONVERSION FACTOR, NON-SI TO SI (METRIC) UNITS OF MEASUREMENT .....	4
PART I: INTRODUCTION .....	5
Purpose and Scope .....	5
Detail Scope of Work .....	6
Organization of the Report .....	9
PART II: BACKGROUND .....	10
Introduction .....	10
Historical Problems and Repairs .....	11
PART III: FIELD INVESTIGATION AND LABORATORY TESTING PROGRAM .....	17
Site Visit .....	17
Drilling Operation .....	17
Test Specimens and Laboratory Testing .....	18
General Comments for Concrete .....	19
Petrographic Examination .....	22
Summary .....	23
PART IV: STATIC STRESS ANALYSIS .....	24
Introduction .....	24
Problem Description .....	24
Finite Element Model .....	26
Simulation of the Construction and Loading Conditions .....	28
Soil and Concrete Parameters for Finite Element Analyses .....	30
Analysis Results .....	33
Summary and Conclusions .....	37
PART V: SEISMIC ANALYSIS OF THE NORTH WALL OF THE EISENHOWER LOCK INCLUDING FLUID-SOIL-STRUCTURE INTERACTION .....	39
Introduction and Objectives .....	39
General Overview of Analysis .....	39
Analysis .....	42
Results .....	43
Conclusions .....	43
PART VI: CONCLUSIONS .....	45
REFERENCES .....	46

	<u>Page</u>
TABLES 1-8	
FIGURES 1-63	
APPENDIX A: INTERGOVERNMENTAL AGENCY AGREEMENT .....	A1
APPENDIX B: FIELD BORING LOGS .....	B1
APPENDIX C: DESCRIPTIONS OF <i>SOILSTRUCT</i> .....	C1
APPENDIX D: REANALYSIS OF TRIAXIAL TESTS .....	D1
APPENDIX E: RESULTS FOR SOUTH CHAMBER WALL AT EISENHOWER LOCK .....	E1
APPENDIX F: RESULTS FOR NORTH CHAMBER WALL AT SNELL LOCK .	F1
APPENDIX G: PETROGRAPHIC EXAMINATION RESULTS .....	G1

**CONVERSION FACTORS, NON-SI TO SI (METRIC)  
UNITS OF MEASUREMENT**

Non-SI units of measurement used in this report can be converted to SI (metric) units as follows:

<u>Multiply</u>	<u>By</u>	<u>To Obtain</u>
degrees (angle)	0.01745329	radians
Fahrenheit degrees	5/9	Celsius degrees or Kelvins*
feet	0.3048	metres
inches	2.54	centimetres
kip (force)	4.448222	kilonewtons
miles (US statute)	1.609347	kilometres
pounds (force) per square foot	47.88026	pascals
pounds (force) per square inch	6.894757	kilopascals
pounds (mass) per cubic foot	16.01846	kilograms per cubic metre

---

\* To obtain Celsius (C) temperature readings from Fahrenheit (F) readings, use the following formula:  $C = (5/9) (F-32)$ . To obtain Kelvin (K) readings, use;  $K = (5/9) (F-32) + 273.15$ .

# **STRUCTURAL EVALUATION OF EISENHOWER AND SNELL LOCKS, SAINT LAWRENCE SEAWAY, MASSENA, NEW YORK**

## **PART I: INTRODUCTION**

1. The Eisenhower and Snell Locks were constructed between 1955 and 1958 as part of an international cooperative effort to build the Saint Lawrence Seaway. The US portion of the project was authorized by the Wiley-Dondero Act of 13 May 1954. This act also created the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation (SLSDC) to construct, operate, and maintain the locks. SLSDC contracted with the Corps of Engineers (CE) to design and construct these locks. The CE has had a long history of providing engineering and review assistance to the SLSDC for the two locks. The SLSDC requested the CE through an Intergovernmental Agency Agreement (Appendix A.) to perform a structural evaluation study of the two locks and prepare a report detailing the findings of the study. The US Army Engineer Buffalo District (NCB) has overall responsibility for the study's coordination and project managing.

### **Purpose and Scope**

2. The purpose of the structural evaluation of Eisenhower and Snell Locks is to determine the adequacy of the existing locks considering present condition and future needs, and to determine the advisability of their rehabilitation. The scope of this study focuses on the internal structural integrity of the chamber wall monoliths at each lock. The study reviewed the history of the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation's (SLSDC) structural repairs to these monoliths and evaluated the monoliths' current internal condition based on field investigations and detailed finite element analyses for both static and seismic conditions. Previous reports, including the Gannett Fleming reports, were reviewed to identify pertinent information and acceptable existing data for use in the current evaluation.

3. The study is divided into three phases:

- a. Phase I - Field Investigation and Laboratory Testing Program: This phase of the study explored the current state of the in-situ concrete in the chamber wall monoliths and determined the concrete properties needed for the stress analyses in the subsequent phases of the study.
- b. Phase II - Static Stress Analysis: In this phase of the study, the state of stress within the chamber wall monoliths is examined by performing nonlinear two-dimensional soil-structure interaction finite element analyses of two monoliths at Eisenhower Lock and one monolith at Snell Lock.
- c. Phase II - Seismic Stress Analysis: Dynamic finite element analyses of two monoliths are performed to assess their structural integrity during an earthquake. To support the dynamic analysis, a geological-seismological investigation was conducted to provide the ground motions, time histories, and corresponding response spectra that could be expected during a seismic event in the region.

#### **Detail Scope of Work**

4. In this section, the general scope of work presented in the Intergovernmental Agency Agreement is expanded.

#### **Phase I - Field investigation and laboratory testing program**

5. The field investigation and laboratory testing program were conducted to provide the necessary parametric data to support the static and seismic analyses. The Mobile District conducted the drilling operation. Continuous six inch diameter cores were obtained from vertical core borings made at six representative locations. Four core borings were made at Eisenhower Lock (in monoliths - N53, N57, S19, and S17) and two at Snell Lock (in monoliths - N56 and S15). Each boring, except N56 at Snell, was approximately 125 ft deep and penetrated 10 to 15 ft into the bedrock beneath the locks to check for any unknown rock cavities. Boring N56 extended only 74 ft from the top of the wall. A total of approximately 750 lin ft of 6-in. diam core were obtained. Core drilling was performed from the top of the lock walls. For monoliths N53 and N57 at Eisenhower Lock and N56 at Snell Lock, the borings were located approximately 4 ft from the face of the lock wall to avoid the cable gallery. All borings were located to ensure no interference with the main culvert or any ports for

filling and emptying. All coring was accomplished with a single drill rig and with only one mobilization. Mobile District provided a borehole camera that was used to visually inspect the existing conditions of the concrete and rock core holes. WES had a field representative on site to log and inspect the cores. All cores were wrapped with material to resist drying. The cores were stored on site in space provide by SLSDC.

6. Two additional core borings were made at Eisenhower Lock in monoliths S19 and S17. These borings were located as close as possible to the back of the walls and were extended to a depth of approximately 20 ft. These borings were used to investigate the possibility of the existence of a crack near the top of the wall where the back of the walls change slope.

7. Once the coring was complete, samples were selected and shipped to WES for laboratory testing. The laboratory testing program consisted of tests to find unconfined compressive strength, Poisson's ratio, elastic modulus, splitting tensile strength, specific gravity, absorption, voids, and ultrasonic pulse velocity along with direct shear tests and petrographical examination for the concrete. For rock the testing program consisted of tests to find unconfined compressive strength, Poisson's ratio, elastic modulus, and ultrasonic pulse velocity along with several direct shear tests at the interface between the concrete and rock.

#### **Phase II - Static stress analysis**

8. The static stress analysis phase focused on the evaluation of internal structural integrity of the chamber wall monoliths at Eisenhower and Snell Locks. Of primary concern is the state of stress of the concrete in the chamber walls. The stress conditions in the chamber walls result from gravitational forces on the walls and from external forces applied by the backfill and water. The stress analyses were performed by using the finite element method. Three typical concrete chamber wall monoliths were analyzed, a north and a south wall at Eisenhower and a north wall at Snell. Each monolith was analyzed for three loading conditions: normal operation with upper pool in the chamber; normal operation with lower pool in the chamber; and the maintenance condition with the chamber fully dewatered.

9. The analyses were performed using the computer program *SOILSTRUCT* written by Dr. G. Wayne Clough and co-workers at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and

State University. *SOILSTRUCT* was specifically developed to model complex soil-structure interaction problems by the finite element method. The finite element computer program has been used to analyze a wide variety of problems, such as navigation locks, retaining walls, supported excavations, dams, tunnels, foundations, and cofferdams. The analyses were incremental soil-structure interaction analyses where the placement of the concrete and the backfill is simulated so as to obtain the induced stresses in the system. The incremental analysis applies the loads to the model in small increments to allow the nonlinear constitutive model for the soil and interface to adjust during the loading increment.

10. The study commenced by reviewing construction records and previous studies of the locks. From this information, the characterization of the backfill and foundation and a preliminary characterization of the concrete was made. The chamber wall monoliths were reviewed for selection of the monoliths for analysis. After selection of the monoliths, a finite element mesh was developed for the north wall at Eisenhower Lock. Once the mesh and modeling techniques had been proven to be sufficiently accurate, meshes for the other selected monoliths were generated. After the field investigation and laboratory testing had been completed, the final material characterizations were made for the analyses and each was reanalyzed for the three loading conditions. The results from the three analyses were processed and evaluated considering future rehabilitation of the walls and results are presented later in this section of the report.

### **Phase III - Seismic stress analysis**

11. A response spectra seismic analysis was planned for either Eisenhower or Snell lock depending upon which structure was subjected to the highest seismic accelerations. If the earthquake ground accelerations were approximately the same, the seismic analysis would be conducted on Eisenhower Lock, since it has the poorest concrete conditions. To determine the strongest ground motions, a geological-seismological investigation was conducted to provide the peak values of acceleration, velocity, and duration for comparison of earthquake ground shaking between both sites. Time histories (accelerograms) and corresponding response spectra were

provided to represent site-specific cyclic shaking as it would be felt at the structure experiencing the strongest disturbance.

12. Once the most critical structure was determined, it was analyzed considering three loading conditions together with an operating basis earthquake (OBE). The three load cases are: normal operation with upper pool in the chamber; normal operation with lower pool in the chamber; and the maintenance condition with the chamber fully dewatered. Two different typical lock-wall monoliths were analyzed using two-dimensional (2-D) finite element procedures with a response spectra from the OBE. These analyses considered the 2-D dynamic behavior of the structure, hydrodynamic loading from the water in the lock, and the dynamic lateral earth pressures. The active dynamic soil pressures were computed using the Mononobe-Oakbe equation, and the passive pressures were computed from either a Coulomb or log spiral analysis. The foundation of the lock is considered rigid. Static stresses from Phase II were used with the dynamic stresses in order to determine the total state of stress within the structures.

13. These analyses provided a preliminary structural evaluation of this structure for a seismic event at the site. If the total state of stress is within the allowable limits of the material, no further seismic stress analyses will be necessary. However, if these analyses indicate that cracking is likely, a seismic analysis using a time-history acceleration record and a nonlinear concrete model should be considered. Such an analysis is beyond the scope of work for this study and would require additional funds.

### **Organization of the Report**

14. In Part II, the background and historical information on Eisenhower and Snell Locks is presented. Part III summarizes the results of the Field Investigation and Laboratory Testing Program phase of the work. Part IV describes the procedures for the the static stress analyses and presents the results of these analyses. Part V describes the procedures for the dynamic stress analyses and reports the findings. Part VI summarizes the findings and presents the conclusions drawn from the study along with recommendations on need for future rehabilitation of the locks.

## **PART II: BACKGROUND**

### **Introduction**

15. The Eisenhower and Snell Locks were constructed between 1955 and 1958 as part of an international cooperative effort to build the Saint Lawrence Seaway. The US portion of the project was authorized by the Wiley-Dondero Act of 13 May 1954. This act also created the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation (SLSDC) to construct, operate, and maintain the locks. SLSDC contracted with the Corps of Engineers to design and construct these two locks.

16. The Eisenhower and Snell Locks are located in the Wiley-Dondero Canal portion of the Saint Lawrence River just north of Massena, NY, (Figure 1). The locks are about 4 miles apart and together they allow vessels to transit around the Saint Lawrence Power Project. Figure 2 illustrates the locations of the locks, and the Long Sault Dam and Moses-Saunders Power Dam that are the hydropower portions of the Saint Lawrence Project.

17. The Eisenhower and Snell Locks have lifts of 38 to 42 ft and 45 to 49 ft, respectively. The chamber dimensions are 80 ft in width, 860 ft in length from upstream miter gate to downstream miter gate, and the locks have 30 ft of water depth over the sills.

18. The locks are concrete gravity type walls founded on rock. Both locks have mitring type gates, fender booms, and stop log closures. Eisenhower Lock has a vertical lift gate to prevent loss of Lake Saint Lawrence in the event something should happen to the miter gates. There is also a vehicular tunnel built through the upstream miter gate sill at Eisenhower Lock. The filling system consists of upper sill intakes, tainter valves, wall culverts, and side ports. This system empties into a floor diffuser system below the lower miter gate. The guide walls are of the concrete gravity type except the downstream guide wall at Snell Lock that is a concrete cap set on steel sheet piles.

## **Historical Problems and Repairs**

19. Eisenhower Lock has experienced problems both with surface concrete deterioration and with structural cracks from the filling/emptying culvert to the land side of both lock walls. Snell Lock has not had a surface concrete deterioration problem, but has experienced the same problem with culvert cracks. This section will briefly present the surface concrete deterioration problem at Eisenhower Lock, and the structural crack problem at both the Snell and Eisenhower Locks.

### **Concrete deterioration**

20. The concrete deterioration problem at Eisenhower Lock has been linked to the natural cement used in the concrete mix. The mix at Eisenhower contained 25 percent by weight natural cement. After review of the available data and reports on the concrete deterioration, the mechanism of the concrete deterioration is freezing of water in the pores of the concrete. While the mechanism of the concrete deterioration is clear, the reason the concrete at Eisenhower lock is less resistant to deterioration than the concrete at Snell Lock is less clear.

21. The concrete mix both Eisenhower and Snell Locks varies throughout the structures depending on the location. The concrete mix design was the same at both locks except for the 25 percent by weight of natural cement. The concrete contain 4 to 6 percent entrained air. A detailed investigation of concrete at the two locks was conducted by the US Army Engineer Waterways Experiment Station (WES) (Buck, Mather, Thorton 1967).

22. Both the Corps (Buck, Mather, Thorton 1967) and Harza Engineering Company (Harza 1981) sighted the slow development of the strength of the concrete at Eisenhower lock as the most plausible reason for the lower resistance to frost damage. The available evidence from the construction records and laboratory experiments show that the Eisenhower concrete developed strength more slowly than did the Snell concrete. Based on the construction data, it would take about 12 and 37 days, respectively, for the Snell and Eisenhower exterior grade concrete made in 1956 to reach a strength of 3,000 psi (Buck, Mather, Thorton 1967). Buck, Mather and Thorton reported that although laboratory tests had not shown one strength level

to be required for adequate durability of concrete for all mixtures, the data did show that a considerable strength development was necessary before concrete becomes durable under freeze-thaw conditions. The value of 3,000 psi compressive strength was used to illustrate the different rates at which equal levels of strength maturity would be attained between the concrete in Eisenhower and Snell Locks. The 3,000 psi compressive strength value had been found at the time of the report to produce durable concrete in the laboratory freezing and thawing tests. However, it stated that under the severe exposure conditions actually experienced at Eisenhower and Snell Locks, a greater maturity would have probably been required.

23. The concrete was required to be kept at a temperature above 40 °F for 5 days and above freezing for 14 days. Buck, Mather, and Thorton reported that climatological data at Eisenhower and Snell Locks show that the cores for the concrete placed 24-27 September and 2-26 October 1956 would have been subject to freezing at an age between 14 and 18 days. The exterior concrete at Eisenhower Lock placed during 1956 had an average 28-day compressive strength of 2,812 psi as compared at 28-day compressive strength at Snell Lock of 3,954 psi. Yet by 1966, samples of nondeteriorated concrete from comparable locations within Eisenhower and Snell Locks had compressive strength approaching one another, 5,160 psi (range 4,190 to 5,860 psi) and 5,550 psi (range 4,760 to 6,450 psi), respectively (Buck, Mather, Thorton 1967).

24. This was regarded by Buck et al (Buck, Mather, Thorton 1967) as the most probable reason for the low durable of the concrete at Eisenhower Lock. If the concrete had matured enough, it should have been just as frost resistant as the Snell concrete has proven to be in service. The freezing of the low frost resistant concrete had the effect of introducing additional void space, such as micro cracks, that would not otherwise be present. This additional void space, beyond that the entrained air-void system had been provided to protect against, would provide the location of additional freezable water that could freeze and produce progressive deterioration of the concrete.

25. Harza Engineering sighted the slow development of strength in the concrete at Eisenhower Lock as the most plausible cause for the low resistant to frost

action and resulting low durability of the concrete. Based on their calculation of maturity factor as defined by ACI Committee 306, March 1978, it appeared to them that concrete placed after 1 October and before 15 April 1957 has less than desirable resistance to damage by frost.

26. At the time the locks were constructed, the winter curing and protection techniques employed were common engineering practice. The contractor was required to maintain concrete temperatures above 40 °F for 5 days followed by additional curing above 32 °F for 9 days.

27. Extensive concrete repairs have been made to the chamber faces, filling and emptying culverts, gate recesses, pintle bases, and sills at Eisenhower Lock. SLSDC has had aggressive program to repair and replace deteriorated concrete. The concrete deterioration at Eisenhower Lock will be a continuing problem.

#### **Culvert cracks**

28. In January 1967, during inspections of the Eisenhower Lock filling and emptying culverts by SLSDC and CE personnel immediately after winter dewatering, a continuous crack was observed along the landward-ceiling corner of the culvert in the north wall. Further investigation revealed that these cracks were continuous from the culvert through to the exterior backfilled face of the lock wall. At the time, the crack leaked water in varying amounts along its entire length and fresh spalls of concrete were found lying on the culvert floor beneath it. Subsequent detailed inspections and other pertinent investigations revealed that the crack extended along the culvert between the upper and lower valve monoliths.

29. After initial discovery of the crack in the north culvert, a close inspection was made in the south culvert. The same kind of crack as existed in the north culvert was present in the south culvert, at its landward-ceiling corner. Its longitudinal extent were the same as that of the north culvert crack. Examination of the Snell Lock culverts revealed similar cracks in that lock.

30. With these cracks extending through to the backfill, the overall stability of the lock walls became a matter of serious concern. Under certain conditions, all wall loads must be taken on the 15-ft-thick section between the culverts and the faces of the lock chambers. This was thought to be especially serious with respect to

Eisenhower Lock where portions of this section were deteriorated and thus less capable of supporting the imposed loads. The core boring program underway concerning the problem of deterioration was enlarged to include exploration of these cracks. To obtain additional data on the extent of the cracks and condition of the surrounding concrete, joint meters were installed across the cracks to measure changes in the size of the cracks during lock operations, bar joints were installed across the lock chambers to measure relative movements of the lock walls and an inclinometer was used to measure tilting of the lock walls during operation, alignment control was set up whereby any lateral displacement of the wall could be measured, piezometers were installed in the backfill areas to provide information on saturation levels and drainage patterns, and correlated flow measurements were taken of flows in the backfill drains.

31. Because of this information in combination with the knowledge gained by the concrete survey in 1966-67, a determination was made by an SLSDC convened Board of Consultants that a complete rehabilitation program was necessary to guarantee continued structural integrity and stability and to assure ability to operate the locks. In a letter of June 26, 1967 from the Administrator, the CE was requested to perform the necessary design and contracting services concerning the proposed rehabilitation program for the Eisenhower and Snell Locks to restore the locks to a condition of full stability.

32. Priority was given to Eisenhower Lock. The rehabilitation work for the crack consisted of placing post-tensioned anchors across the culvert crack, . This was accomplished during the winter shutdown of 1967-68 by contract with Peter Kiewit & Sons. Similar post-tensioned anchors were placed across the culvert cracks at Snell Lock during the winter of 1968-69 under contract with Morrison-Knudsen.

#### **Post-tensioned anchors - lock wall monoliths**

33. In the winters of 1967-68 and 1968-69, post-tensioned anchors were installed in Eisenhower and Snell Locks, respectively. The north and south walls of the Eisenhower and Snell Locks have 14 monoliths with narrow tops and sloping backs (Figure 3). These walls in the chamber portion of the locks are 606 ft long. The typical chamber monoliths with anchors are outlined on a plan view of Eisenhower Lock in Figure 4. Eighty-two and eighty-three anchors were installed in the north and

south walls, respectively, of each lock. Six 636 kips anchors were installed in each monolith. The average spacing of the anchors is 7.33 ft.

34. Review of data and stability analyses show that the saturation level in the backfill was at el\* 221.0 ft at the time of anchor installation. This elevation is 16 ft higher than was designed for originally. Recent field inspection of drainage pipe and dye tracing study by Gannet Fleming Geotechnical Engineering, Inc.(1986) of the drainage blanket show that they are operational and continuous. From historical data and recent observations it was determined that the static groundwater level is at the drain invert in the drainage blanket for the soil below the blanket. This data also shows that the soil is saturated up to 18 ft above the drain in the same locations. These high piezometer levels observed in the upper portion are the result of a perched water table fed by the water level in the nature soil. While the drainage blanket and pipe are functioning, they are not connected to the soil above the drainage blanket.

35. In February 1989, the SLSDC and CE conducted an anchor investigation program at Eisenhower Lock. The objective of the investigation was to determine whether or not the post-tensioned anchors in the chamber monoliths at Eisenhower Lock have sustained any significant corrosion due to water leakage through the existing culvert cracks. Of the 165 anchors in Eisenhower Lock, two anchors were examined, one in monolith N-51 and one in monoliths S-17, at locations near the greatest amount of leakage through the existing culvert cracks. Significant corrosion was considered to have the greatest potential at these locations. The investigation consisted of excavating the concrete from inside the culvert to expose a short section of each anchor for visual inspection and dimensional measurements.

36. Results of the anchor investigation showed that the grout was intact and completely surrounded the anchor strands in the exposed areas. The anchor strands were observed to be as shiny as new and there was no evidence of any surface corrosion or pitting. Based on the results of this investigation, it was concluded that the anchors are in excellent condition. It was further concluded that post-tensioned

---

\* All elevations (el) cited herein are in feet referred to the National Geodetic Vertical Datum (NGVD).

anchors in Eisenhower Lock should remain structurally sound and should adequately serve the anticipated life expectancy of the lock. In any future structural evaluation of the lock, the existing anchors should be assumed 100 percent effective.

## **PART III: FIELD INVESTIGATION AND LABORATORY TESTING PROGRAM**

### **Site Visit**

37. In February 1990, representatives from WES, Buffalo District (NCB), North Central Division (NCD), Headquarters (HQ), and the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation (SLSDC) inspected the Eisenhower Lock while it was dewatered for winter maintenance. The lock was dewatered for repair to the concrete surrounding the miter gates and to replace surface concrete at the toe of the same chamber monoliths. Poor concrete was visible in some locations. A number of locations of unsound concrete were found during the inspection. The recently repaired surface concrete appeared to be sound.

### **Drilling Operation**

38. After completion of inspection of the locks, boring locations were assigned in areas that were representative of the concrete placed after 1 October 1956 and before 1 April 1957. Four boring locations for Eisenhower Lock are shown in Figure 5 and two boring locations for Snell Lock are shown in Figure 6. Personnel from the US Army Engineer District, Mobile, drilled the borings using diamond-tip core barrels. Approximately 750 lin ft of 6-in.-diam cores were obtained from vertical borings. While, larger diameter cores would have been preferable because of a maximum aggregate size of 6 in., but their cost was prohibitive. The borings were located so as not to interfere with the main conduit or any ports for filling and emptying. Personnel from the WES logged the cores on ENG Form 1836. The boring logs are presented in Appendix B. Pertinent information describing each boring including boring number and depth is presented in Table 1.

39. The cores were preserved and handled using procedures described in Test Standard RTH 103-80 (WES 1980). After removal from the core barrel, each core was marked to indicate boring location and depth. Loss of moisture was prevented by

wrapping the core in thin polyethylene, followed by cheese cloth, and then coating with a lukewarm wax. The cores were then placed in a wooden box, cushioned with vermiculite, and shipped to the WES for testing.

40. Two core borings were made at Eisenhower Lock in monoliths S19 and S17 to investigate the possibility of the existence of a crack near the top of the wall where the back of the walls change slope. The borings were located as close as possible to the back of the walls and were extended to a depth of approximately 20 ft. No cracks were found.

41. A borehole camera that was used to visually inspect the existing conditions of the concrete and rock core holes. An examination of the video tapes of the borehole camera inspection showed no voids or unusual conditions in the concrete.

### **Test Specimens and Laboratory Testing**

42. A visual examination of all cores was made in the laboratory to supplement the field boring logs and to assist in the selection of representative test specimens. Concrete test specimens were selected based upon the physical condition of the concrete and depth in order to obtain representative properties throughout the structure. Figure 7 is a schematic showing the general location of samples selected for testing. Rock specimens were selected to be representative of the bedrock in close proximity to the base of the structure. Forty-eight concrete specimens, six rock specimens, and two concrete-bonded-to-rock specimens were tested from Eisenhower Lock. Twenty-two concrete specimens and two rock specimens were tested from Snell Lock.

43. Each specimen was visually examined prior to any destructive testing. The results of the visual examination are given in Table 2. The laboratory testing consisted of the following conducted in accordance with the appropriate test method:

Property	Test Method	
	Rock	Concrete
Unconfined compressive strength	RTM 111	CRC-C 14 (ASTM C 39)
Elastic modulus and Poisson's ratio	RTM 201	CRD-C 19 (ASTM C 469)
Splitting tensile strength	---	CRD-C 77 (ASTM C 496)
Specific gravity, absorption, voids	---	CRD-C 23 (ASTM C 642)
Ultrasonic pulse velocity	RTM 110	CRD-C 51 (ASTM C 597)
Direct shear	RTM 203	CRD-C 90

Direct shear testing was performed on intact concrete specimens and concrete-bonded-to-rock specimens. Results of the laboratory testing are given in Tables 3 to 8.

### **General Comments for Concrete**

#### **Eisenhower Lock**

44. There appears to be considerable variation in the quality of concrete in both the north and south sides of the lock. Compressive strengths range from above 6,000 psi to below 4,000 psi, while splitting tensile strengths range from above 700 psi to below 400 psi. The top 15 ft of concrete appears to be dense and well consolidated. At greater depths, the concrete exhibits varying degrees of voids and poor aggregate-paste interface. Some of the larger voids could have resulted from poor consolidation. However, the mortar fraction of the concrete in these areas appears to be porous, grainy, and generally of poor quality. The test data indicates the poorest quality concrete to be in the lower part of the lock, primarily in areas 15 ft above the bedrock down to the bedrock. Variable quality is also indicated by ultrasonic pulse velocity and voids content. An increase or decrease in compressive strength in a particular area was not always confirmed by an increase or decrease in splitting tensile strength, ultrasonic pulse velocity, or voids content. Average physical properties of the concrete in the upper 15 ft as compared to the lower 15 ft as well as the overall average are given below:

<u>Test</u>	<u>Upper</u>	<u>Lower</u>	<u>Percent Difference</u>	<u>Overall Average</u>
Unit weight, pcf	159.2	155.8	-2.1	157.8
Pulse velocity, fps	18,210	16,834	-7.6	17,505
Compressive strength, psi	6,050	4,070	-32.7	5,230
Splitting tensile str., psi	620	570	-8.1	580
Elastic modulus, x 10 psi	7.55	4.65	-38.4	5.70
Poisson's ratio	0.28	0.22	-21.4	0.23
Percent voids	9.1	10.4	-4.3	10.3

45. There was no bond at the concrete-bedrock interface in three of the four borings. The bedrock was primarily a hard, dense, dark gray dolomite with occasional layers of weak clay or shale.

46. There was little difference in the physical properties on the north side of the lock as compared to those on the south side. The average compressive strength of the concrete in the south side was approximately 10 percent higher than that on the north side. Other properties differed by approximately 4 percent or less. Average properties for the concrete on the north and south sides are given below:

<u>Test</u>	<u>North side</u>	<u>South side</u>
Unit weight, pcf	158.3	157.4
Pulse velocity, fps	17,790	17,248
Compressive strength, psi	4,930	5,500
Splitting tensile strength, psi	585	580
Elastic modulus, x 10 psi	5.75	5.65
Possion's ratio	0.22	0.23
Percent voids	10.3	10.3

### **Snell Lock**

47. The general quality of concrete varies with depth on both sides of the lock, but appears to be somewhat better than that of the Eisenhower Lock. Compressive strengths range from above 8,000 psi to below 4,000 psi, while splitting tensile strengths range from above 900 psi to below 500 psi. The top 15 ft of concrete appears to be dense and well consolidated on the north side of the lock. At greater depths, the concrete exhibits some minor voids and varying strengths. On the south side of the lock, varying degrees of voids, poor aggregate-paste interface, and strengths are indicated from the top surface down to approximately 5 ft above the bedrock. The concrete just above the bedrock is of a poorer quality. There was no bond at the concrete-bedrock interface. There appears to be no correlation between compressive strength, splitting tensile strength, ultrasonic pulse velocity, nor voids content. An increase or decrease in compressive strength in a particular area was not always confirmed by an increase or decrease in splitting tensile strength, ultrasonic pulse velocity, or voids content. Average physical properties of the concrete are given below:

<u>Test</u>	<u>Overall Average</u>	<u>Lower</u>	<u>Percent Difference</u>
Unit weight, pcf	158.3	158.3	0
Pulse velocity, fps	17,810	17,046	-4.3
Compressive strength, psi	6,620	3,730	-43.7
Splitting tensile strength, psi	650	495	-23.8
Elastic modulus, x 10 psi	6.85	4.60	-32.8
Poisson's ratio	0.25	0.20	-20.0
Percent voids	11.0	11.6	5.5

48. Concrete on the south side of the lock appears to be inferior to that in the north side. Splitting tensile strength, elastic modulus, Poisson's ratio, and voids content differed by more than 10 percent while unit weight, pulse velocity, and compressive differed by 4 percent or less. Average concrete properties on the north side and on the south side of the lock are given below:

<u>Test</u>	<u>North side</u>	<u>South side</u>
Unit weight, pcf	158.7	157.9
Pulse velocity, fps	18,127	17,494
Compressive strength, psi	6,750	6,480
Splitting tensile strength, psi	710	590
Elastic modulus, x 10 psi	7.20	6.45
Poisson's ratio	0.26	0.23
Percent voids	10.3	11.7

#### **Petrographic Examination**

49. Cores from both Eisenhower and Snell Locks were taken for evaluation and examination. Portions of two cores from Eisenhower and one from Snell were

selected for examination. The complete test results are presented in Appendix G. The concrete was air-entrained. The air content for the samples examined ranged from 2.3 to 2.8 percent. The low air content of the concrete is not believed to be of any significance. Previous average air contents reported by Buck, Mather, and Thorton (Buck, Mather, Thorton 1967) were 3.5 percent for the two lock structures. It may be due to the relatively small area of sampling. The examination show that the concrete from both structures are similar and free from damaging cement-aggregate reactions and other deleterious reaction. The concrete from the two structures are similar.

### Summary

50. The concrete testing program shows that the three principal properties needed for the finite element analyses, compressive strength, tensile strength, and modulus of elasticity, Figures 8, 9, and 10, respectively, decrease with depth in both Eisenhower and Snell Locks. The average compressive strength for Eisenhower Lock is less than that of Snell by 31 percent, 5,230 psi versus 6,620 psi. The lower value at Eisenhower is biased by the larger number of test specimens from the lower portion of the wall when compared with specimen from Snell, six from Eisenhower and only one from Snell. Using the average compressive strength from specimens taken from the upper portion of Eisenhower borings and comparing that to the Snell average, the difference is only 9 percent which is approximately the same percent difference reported by Buck, Mather, and Thorton (Buck, Mather, Thorton 1967). This same trend of bias by the larger number of specimen from the lower portion of the borings from Eisenhower is found in the overall average value for the modulus of elasticity. This trend is not seen in the tensile strengths. The average tensile strengths from the lower to upper portion of the borings from Eisenhower only vary by 8 percent. The test values for the modulus of elasticity and the unit weight may have been influenced due to the aggregate size when compared to the diameter of the cores which may result in higher test values.

## **PART IV: STATIC STRESS ANALYSIS**

### **Introduction**

51. This section presents the results of the static, nonlinear, soil-structure interaction analysis of three typical concrete chamber wall monoliths, a north and a south wall at Eisenhower Lock and a north wall at Snell Lock. The static stress analysis of Eisenhower and Snell Locks focuses on the evaluation of the internal structural integrity of the chamber walls monoliths. The objective of the study is to determine the current state of stress of the concrete in the chamber monoliths at Eisenhower and Snell Locks using the finite element method and to check these stresses against the strength of the concrete.

### **Problem Description**

52. The Eisenhower and Snell Locks are located in the Wiley-Dondero Canal portion of the Saint Lawrence River just north of Massena, NY. The locks are about 4 miles apart with Snell Lock located downstream of Eisenhower Lock (Figure 2). Eisenhower and Snell Locks are sister locks with chamber dimension of 80 ft in width and 860 ft in length. The lock walls are approximately 110 ft high and 63 ft in width at the base. Figures 11 and 12 show typical cross sections through the lock chamber at Eisenhower and Snell Locks, respectively. The chamber walls are unreinforced mass concrete sections with large filling and emptying culverts, smaller drainage and supply culverts, and a cable gallery at the top of the north walls. The concrete monoliths are founded on dolomite rock which forms the chamber floor of the locks. The backfill behind the lock walls is a compacted glacial till. The natural soil at the site is a glacial till. Figures 13, 14, 15, and 16 show typical chamber wall sections for the two locks. Eisenhower Lock has a high pool level at el 240 ft and a low pool level at el 200 ft. Snell Locks has a high pool level at el 200 ft and a low pool level at el 155 ft.

53. As discussed in Part II, Eisenhower and Snell Locks have suffered structural cracking of the concrete. The chamber wall monoliths have a continuous crack

along the landward ceiling corner of the filling and emptying culverts. The crack extends from the culvert to the surface of the backfilled face of the monolith. The primary loading on the chamber walls that could cause the formation of the crack is from the backfill and the groundwater in the backfill. The backfill is a compacted glacial till with unusually high unit weight, 145 to 150 pcf. In situ tests by Gannett Fleming Engineering, Inc. (1986) to determine the horizontal stresses, i.e., lateral earth pressure, in the backfill showed that the horizontal stresses may be 1.5 to 2.0 times the effective vertical overburden pressure. This suggests a high degree of compaction of the backfill. An additional factor is that the groundwater level in the backfill is approximately 20 ft higher than anticipated in the original design.

54. With the backfill as the primary source of loading, the assessment of the stress in the concrete of the chamber walls involves significant soil-structure interaction. Because of the nonlinear stress-strain behavior of the soil and the formation of the crack in the concrete, a nonlinear soil-structure interaction finite element analysis is necessary to accurately estimate the stress in the chamber wall monoliths. Conventional equilibrium method and linear elastic finite element models cannot capture these important aspects of this problem.

55. The analyses for the assessment of static stresses in the chamber wall monoliths were performed using the computer program SOILSTRUCT. SOILSTRUCT is a general purpose finite element computer program for two-dimensional, plane strain analysis of soil-structure interaction and soil-inclusion interaction problems. It calculates displacements and stresses due to incremental construction and/or load application and is capable of modeling nonlinear stress-strain material behavior. The simulation of incremental construction may include embankment construction or backfilling, the placement of layer(s) of a reinforcement material during backfilling or embankment construction, dewatering, excavation, installation of a strut or tie-back anchor excavation support system, removal of the same system and the placement of concrete or other construction materials. The incremental loading simulation may consist of the application of concentrated loads, boundary pressures or loads due to temperature changes in nonsoil materials.

56. The initial version of *SOILSTRUCT* was developed by Professors G. W. Clough and J. M. Duncan for use in the analysis of Port Allen and Old River U-frame locks (Clough and Duncan 1969). This version of the program reflects modifications made in conjunction with a number of projects at WES to expand the capabilities of the finite elements constitutive models, load vector formulation algorithms, the size of problem which may be analyzed, and the transfer of input, output, restart and plot data files by means of disc storage. A detailed description of the program is provided in Appendix C.

### **Finite Element Model**

57. The study commenced by reviewing construction drawing and records and the reports from previous studies of the locks. From this information, the characterization of the backfill and foundation and a preliminary characterization of the concrete was made. The next step in the analysis was to select the dimensions and elevations for the chamber wall monoliths to be analyzed. NCB requested the analysis of three chamber monoliths, a north and south at Eisenhower Lock and one from Snell Lock. In the detail scope of work, a south monolith at Snell Lock was scheduled for analysis. A review of the data revealed that the north chamber monoliths have a slightly higher backfill behind them resulting in the decision to analyze a north monolith at Snell Lock. Figures 17, 18, and 19 show the basic elevations and dimension for each lock wall sections selected for analysis. The dimensions and elevations are not for specific monoliths at Eisenhower and Snell Locks, but are lower bound possibilities formed from the typical sections shown in Figures 13 through 16. The boring data shows the rock surface to range from el 139 to el 143 ft at Eisenhower Lock and from el 99 to el 102 ft for Snell Lock. The Eisenhower models used el 140 ft for the rock surface and Snell model used el 100 ft for the rock surface. Figures 20, 21, and 22 shows the overall model configuration including the wall, backfill, and foundation. The backfill surface begins at the top of the wall for both locks and connects to the surface of the natural soils. The surface of the natural soils and the slopes of the excavation (Figures 20, 21, and 22) are consistent with preconstruction drawings for the two locks.

58. This information provided the basic data to construct the finite element meshes for three monoliths to be analyzed. Symmetry about the center line of the chamber allows for modeling of only one wall of the lock at a time. This significantly reduces the required mesh size. Each mesh contains a section through a lock wall and a representative portion of the foundation rock, backfill, and in situ soil. One of the side boundaries of the meshes is at the center line of the lock chamber. The other side boundary is 500 ft from the center line of the lock, in a position such that simulation of the construction of the lock wall and backfill placement should not effect the stresses near this boundary. The rock foundation extends 200 ft below the base of the lock walls.

59. Construction of the mesh for the north chamber wall monolith at Eisenhower Lock, the first mesh generated, consisted of several stages with certain constraints applied to the configuration of the mesh. Initially, a mesh was constructed with approximately half the elements of the final mesh and a backfill placement was simulated to test for accuracy. The mesh had to allow for the simulation of a crack extending from the landward ceiling corner of the filling and emptying culverts to the surface of the backfilled face of the wall. Special interface elements had to be used between the wall and the foundation and between the wall and the backfill.

60. Clough and Duncan (1969) found that an accurate mesh for the simulation of backfill placement was obtained if the stresses in the soil elements in the mesh did not vary more than 10 percent during a placement of a lift. Maintaining this criteria allows the soil constitutive model in the finite element computer program to follow the nonlinear stress-strain response of the soil. The initial mesh was refined until the changes in stresses were below 10 percent. Other criteria followed in the construction of the mesh was maintaining an aspect ratio less than 4 in the wall and surrounding soil. The QM5 element used in SOILSTRUCT is accurate for aspect ratios up to eight. The highest aspect ratios in the wall, less than four, are along the slope of backfilled face of the wall. In this area, the criteria was to have four or more elements parallel to the crack to allow for accurate prediction of stresses in the direction of the crack.

61. Figure 23 shows the mesh for a section through a typical chamber monolith of the north lock wall at Eisenhower Lock. The mesh consists of 2,505 nodal points to define 2,200 two-dimensional elements representing the lock wall, soil, rock, and 221 one-dimensional interface elements. This was the first mesh generated and was used to set a minimum standard for the two remaining meshes. Figure 24 shows the mesh for a section through a chamber monolith of the south lock wall at Eisenhower Lock. The mesh consists of 2,898 nodal points to define 2,818 two-dimensional elements representing the lock wall, soil, rock, and 290 one-dimensional interface elements. Figure 25 shows the mesh for a section through a chamber monolith of the north lock wall at Snell Lock. The mesh consists of 2,353 nodal points to define 2,278 two-dimensional elements representing the lock wall, soil, rock, and 245 one-dimensional interface elements. The interface elements are at the interface between the concrete and soil backfill, concrete and rock foundation, and soil and bedrock.

### **Simulation of the Construction and Loading Conditions**

62. The finite element modeling technique used for this study is a nonlinear analysis, where loads are applied incrementally to simulate the actual conditions in the field. The key stages in the modeling are the initial conditions after excavation for the construction of the lock, placement of the lock wall, placement of the backfill, raising of the water table in the backfill, formation of the crack, placement of the anchors, and operation of the lock. These are depicted schematically in Figure 26.

63. To establish the in situ stresses after the excavations for the construction of the locks, the natural soil was placed incrementally in the configuration of the excavations. This established the necessary in situ stresses to start the modeling of the structure and the backfill placement and is more expedient than trying to model the excavation process. During this stage of the analysis, the elements in the rest of the mesh are weightless with no stiffness. After establishment of the natural soil and excavation, the lock wall is placed under gravity load. At this point, all displacements in the mesh are set to zero, thus creating the reference point for the remaining stages of construction and loading simulation.

64. The placement of backfill is simulated by placing the soil in load steps or lifts of one row of elements each. Five iterations for each lift were used to permit the stress-strain curves of the soils to be followed as closely as possible. This number of load steps and iterations has been found to generate an accurate response for earth pressures (Clough and Duncan 1969). In order to develop sufficient earth pressures on the lock walls to cause a crack to develop, the effects of compaction had to be included in the analysis. The program did not have a procedure to account for compaction, thus a procedure had to be developed. Elements above the lift being placed are considered inactive and have zero weight and no stiffness.

65. Compaction equipment moving across a backfill adjacent to a wall induces additional lateral earth pressures on the wall. When the compaction equipment moves away from the wall, a portion of the additional lateral earth pressures continues to act on the wall due to the inelastic nature of the soil. A typical pressure distribution against a wall resulting from compaction is shown in Figure 27. This is similar in shape to the pressure distribution reported in the Gannett Fleming report (1986) from the pressuremeter and hydrofracture testing. A simplistic approach was taken to simulate the effects of compaction in the backfill for this study. The procedure used was to increase the vertical forces being applied during simulation of the placement of a lift of the backfill. This was accomplished by increasing the unit weight of the backfill lift being placed by a magnification factor. The magnitude of the factor was determined by performing a series of analyses where the factor was increased until the minor principal stress at the landward ceiling corner of filling and emptying culvert reaches a value that would initiate a crack.

66. After placement of the backfill, the water level in the backfill was raised. The increase in water level was simulated by applying the water pressure in the backfill resulting from the change in elevation of the water table and applying boundary pressures to the back and base of the lock wall to equal the hydrostatic head due to the change in water table. The static groundwater level in the backfill below the drainage blanket is at the drain pipe invert in the drainage blanket. For the soil above the drainage blanket, the location of the perched water table, the groundwater level is set equal to the groundwater level in the natural soil.

67. Once it was determined that the earth pressures were sufficient to initiate the crack, another complete analysis was performed with zero strength and stiffness in tension along the crack. This provided the state of stress in the lock wall after the crack had occurred. Next, the placement of the post-tensioned anchor was simulated by applying point loads to the lock wall equal to the value for post-tensioning of the anchors in the field. In the subsequent load step, the stiffness of the anchor is activated. Six 636-kip anchors were installed in each monolith. The average spacing of the anchors is 7.33 ft. *SOILSTRUCT* uses the plain strain assumption. Thus, the load applied to simulate the post-tensioning of the anchors is equal to the post-tensioning loads, 636 kips, divided by the average spacing of 7.33 ft. The force due to post-tensioning of anchors is applied at the head of the anchor, while an equal but opposite force is applied to four nodes below the crack in the direction of the line of action of the anchor.

68. Operation loading conditions evaluated are a result of raising the water level in the chamber of the lock from the dewatered condition to the lower pool water level and then to the upper pool level. These are simulated by applying boundary pressures to the chamber wall face, surfaces of the culverts, and base of the chamber wall monolith equal to the hydrostatic water pressure for the different pool levels.

### **Soil and Concrete Parameters for Finite Element Analyses**

69. The finite element models require input parameters for the concrete in the lock walls, foundation rock, backfill, and natural soil at the site that describes their stress-strain characteristics, unit weights, and initial stress conditions. These parameters were determined from the laboratory tests described in Part III and from the reports provided by the SLSDC and NCB.

#### **Unit weights**

70. The in-place relative soil density of the backfill soil has been a point of controversy for sometime because of the high values measured by in-place tests. Assumed wet densities from previous studies have ranged from 125 pcf in the 1955 Corps Design Memorandum to 140 pcf used in Harza Engineers' study (1981).

Measured backfill density values from in-place tests range from a low of 135.5 pcf to a high of 150.6 pcf. Measured values from laboratory tests of reconstituted soil samples showed an average maximum dry density ranging from approximately 135 to 140 pcf that would result in wet density values ranging from approximately 144 to 149 pcf.

Based on this information, a wet unit weight of 148 pcf was used in these analyses.

#### **Angle of internal friction and cohesion**

71. Because of the difficulty involved in obtaining undisturbed samples, laboratory testing has only been performed on reconstituted samples. Measured values for the angle of internal friction from reconstituted samples ranged from 35 deg reported in the Corps Post Construction Report (US Army Engineers, Buffalo District 1957) to 42 deg reported by Empire Soils Investigations, Inc. (1985) and from zero to 5.4 ksf for cohesion. During the engineering study by Gannett Fleming Geotechnical Engineers, Inc., (1986) a value of 45 deg for angle of internal friction and zero cohesion was used in their stability computations. This angle of internal friction value was estimated from the results of pressuremeter tests.

72. The report by Empire Soils Investigation, Inc. (1985) recommended an angle of internal friction of 40 deg and zero cohesion, based on the average of three sets of triaxial tests of reconstituted samples (37, 40, and 42 deg, and 0,0, and 0.3 ksf, respectively). Our reanalysis of these tests, Appendix D, shows the angle of internal friction ranging from a low of 35.2 deg with cohesion of .23 ksf to a high of 41.7 deg with a cohesion of 1.5 ksf. The greater strengths were for the materials classified as SM. The lower strength materials were classified as CL.

73. It has been found that the angle of internal friction obtained from a triaxial test is from 4 to 9 deg smaller than from a plane strain test. Plane strain conditions develop along the chamber lock wall in this study. Therefore, the values from triaxial tests will under estimate the angle of internal friction of the backfill behind the lock walls. A conservative estimate of the plane strain angle of internal friction may be found using the value from a triaxial test in the correlation:

$$\phi_{ps} = 1.5\phi_{\alpha} - 17$$

for an angle of internal friction greater than 34 deg (Lade 1976). Using this correlation the plane strain angle of internal friction from a triaxial test performed by Empire Soils Investigation, Inc. would be 38.5, 43, and 46 deg, respectively, and a similar range for our reanalysis. In light of this, the value of 45 deg for angle of internal friction used by Gannett Fleming Geotechnical Engineers, Inc. (1986) seems reasonable and was used in this study. The reanalysis of the Empire Soil tests showed significant values of cohesion. It was felt that a cohesion of 0.5 ksf should be used in the analyses.

#### **Stress-strain parameters for the soil**

74. Using the procedures outlined by Duncan et al. (Duncan 1970) the necessary stress-strain parameters can be computed from the results of drained triaxial tests. These procedures were used to determine the stress-strain parameters from the triaxial tests reported by Empire Soil Investigation Inc. The results are presented in Appendix D. They show the strength correlation factor,  $R_f$ , with values ranging from 0.31 to 0.76, hyperbolic exponent factor,  $n$ , with values ranging from 0.2 to 0.69, and the modulus constant,  $K$ , with values ranging from 223 to 1,232. The modulus constant values seemed low for soil with such high density. Considering the fact that the stiffness of a soil increases significantly with prestressing from loads such as compaction and the authors' personal experience, the stress-strain parameters used in the analyses are shown in Table 5.

#### **Concrete properties**

75. The concrete lock walls are assumed to behave linearly elastic in the finite element analyses in this study. The primary properties of the concrete needed for these analyses are the modulus of elasticity, Poisson's ratio, and unit weight. The most important of these is the modulus of elasticity. The modulus is the primary parameter controlling the magnitude of the displacement of the wall. In Part III, the test results show that modulus value decrease from the top of the wall to the bottom. The value ranged from  $3.5$  to  $7.7 \times 10^6$  psi with a mean value of  $6.08 \times 10^6$  psi and a standard deviation of  $1.20 \times 10^6$  psi (approximately 20 percent). Having a lower value of the modulus in the bottom 25 ft of wall had less than a 5 percent change in the stresses and less than a 3 percent difference in the displacements for the Eisenhower north wall model. These differences are not significant enough to justify using a

varying modulus for the concrete walls. Therefore, a value of  $5.0 \times 10^6$  psi was used in the analyses. The unit weight of the concrete ranged from 153.7 pcf to 163.8 pcf. A value of 150 pcf was used. The lower than average values for the elastic modulus and unit weight used in the analysis were chosen because concern over the influence of large aggregate size on biasing the average values. Poisson's ratio values ranged from 0.16 to 0.30. A value of 0.25 was used. The tensile strength was needed in the analyses to determine the stress level where cracking would occur. The laboratory tests showed a range for the splitting tensile strength from a value below 400 psi to values over 700 psi. The tensile stress range assumed for initiation of a crack was 300 to 400 psi.

### **Analysis Results**

76. Since the results for the three monoliths show the same general trends and approximately the same maximum and minimum stress levels, only the results for the north wall at Eisenhower Lock will be discussed in detail. The results for the other two monoliths are presented in Appendixes E and F.

#### **Initial stress state after dewatering and excavation**

77. The first important step in the analysis was to establish the initial state of stress in the natural soil after the excavation for construction of the lock and in the lock walls after placement of the concrete. This was accomplished in two steps; (1) placement of the natural soil at the configuration of the excavation and (2) placement of the wall. Figure 28 shows a plot of the mobilized shear strength of the natural soil. Figure 29 shows the distribution of vertical stresses in the lock wall after its placement. Figure 30 shows the distribution of the minor principal stress in the wall after its placement. When minor principal stresses in an element exceed the limiting value of negative 57,600 psf (400 psi) or a zone of element has stresses greater than 43,200 psf (300 psi), a crack is assumed to occur. Negative values denote tensile stresses, while positive values denote compression.

## **Placement of backfill**

78. Figures 31 and 32 show the contours of the vertical and horizontal displacement, respectively, resulting from the placement of the backfill prior to the establishment of the crack at the corner of landward ceiling of the filling/emptying culvert. The greatest vertical displacement is 0.29 ft and is located on the boundary between the backfill and natural soil. As found by Clough and Duncan (1969), the maximum displacement is located midway in the soil stratum being placed. The maximum vertical displacement in the wall occurs near the top of the wall and is less than 0.04 ft. The maximum horizontal displacement is 0.12 ft and is located at the top of the chamber wall. These displacements occur during the placement of the backfill and to our knowledge no measurements are available for comparison. Figure 33 shows mobilized shear strength for the soil after backfill placement. The shear strength in the backfill is fully mobilized near the top of the wall. This is expected because the wall is moving away from the backfill initiating the beginning of the development of active earth pressures.

79. Figure 34 shows the distribution of the minor principal stresses and the deformed shape of the wall and surrounding backfill after placement of the backfill. Figure 35 shows that the value of the minor principal stress near the landward corner of the ceiling of the culvert has exceeded the limiting value for initiation of a crack. Figure 35 shows that one element has exceeded the 57,600 psf (400 psi) level and Figure 36 shows a zone surrounding the landward ceiling corner with stresses greater than 42,000 psf (290 psi). The differences in stress levels shown in Figures 35 and 36 is due to the contouring algorithm in the plotting software. In Figures 35 and 36, the initiation of the crack can be seen. Figure 37 shows the distribution of the major principal stresses and the deformed shape of the wall and surrounding backfill after placement of the backfill. The maximum compressive stresses ranging from 120,000 (833 psi) to 110,000 psf (764 psi) are found on the chamber face of the wall at the change in slope near the toe and surrounding the chamber side of the ceiling corner of the culvert. Figure 38 shows the major principal stresses surrounding the landward ceiling corner of the culvert. The major principal stresses at the corner are approaching zero. This analyses was used to establish the lateral earth pressure

required to cause the existing crack at the landward ceiling corner of the filling and emptying culvert.

80. Once the crack has formed, zero tensile strength and stiffness is provided across the crack and stresses carried across prior to the formation of the crack are redistributed into other portions of the wall. Figures 39 and 40 show the distribution of vertical and horizontal displacements, respectively. The displacements are essentially the same with or without the crack. Figure 41 shows the distribution of the minor principal stresses and the deformed shape of the wall and surrounding backfill after placement of the backfill for this case. In Figure 42, a close-up of the culvert region is shown. From this figure, the opening of the crack can be seen. A gap to the back-filled face of the wall is not seen in this figure because the computed displacements are so small, but the crack is open to the backfill face of the wall. Comparing the minor principal stress distribution in Figure 41 with that in Figure 34 shows that the tensile stresses once carried across the crack are redistributed to the concrete along the chamber side of the culvert and to the concrete below the culvert. Before cracking, the minor principal stress in these regions ranged from approximate 0 to -12,000 psf (83.33 psi). After the formation of the crack the minor principal stresses increased in tension in these regions to a range from -4,000 psf (27.8 psi) to -16,000 psf (111.1 psi). Figure 43 shows the distribution of the major principal stresses and the deformed shape of the wall and surrounding backfill after placement of the backfill for this case. The maximum compressive stresses ranging from 120,000 psf (838 psi) to 108,000 psf (750 psi) are found on the chamber face of the wall at the change in slope near the toe and surrounding the chamber side of the ceiling corner of the culvert. These stress levels and locations are approximately the same as seen in Figure 37. Figure 44 shows the major principal stresses surrounding the landward ceiling corner of the culvert. The major principal stresses at the corner are approaching zero.

81. Figure 45 show the resulting lateral earth pressures acting on a vertical plane directly over the heel and the pressuremeter results from Gannet Fleming Engineering's investigation (1986). The predicted lateral earth pressures show good agreement with the pressuremeter results in the upper portion of the backfill. In the

mid height range, predicted values are higher than the pressuremeter results. In the lower portion of the backfill, there were no pressuremeter results for comparison.

Figure 46 shows the shear stress from the finite element analysis on the vertical plane above the heel. The shear stress in the upper portion of the backfill relates to a wall friction of 8 to 10 deg and in the lower portion of the backfill, it relates to a wall friction of 28 to 30 deg.

### **Placement of the anchors**

82. Figure 47 shows contours of the horizontal displacements. It shows that the post-tensioning of the anchor moves the top of the wall back into the backfill by 0.003 ft. This is an expected result of the post-tensioning of the anchors. Figure 48 shows the distribution of the minor principal stresses and the deformed shape of the wall and surrounding backfill after placement of the anchors. It shows a slight increase in the compressive stresses on the face of the chamber and surrounding the culvert. Also, there is a change in the stresses at the anchor head. Figure 49 shows the distribution of the minor principal stresses and the deformed shape of the wall and surrounding backfill after placement of the anchors. The distribution of stresses is only changed in the top of the wall with a slight reduction in the minimum value of the tensile stresses, 26,390 psf (183 psi) to 24,610 psf (171 psi). Figure 50 shows a close-up near the culvert. The crack has partially closed with the placement of the anchors. This is consistent with the leakage found in the field. The leakage suggests that the crack is not completely closed.

### **Lower pool**

83. Figure 51 shows the distribution of horizontal displacements. It shows that the top of wall moved 0.001 ft toward the backfill due to the raising of the water in the lock chamber to the lower level. Figures 52 and 53 show the distribution of the major and minor principal stresses, respectively, and the deformed shape of the wall and surrounding backfill after raising the pool to el 200 ft. The distribution of stresses shows a slight reduction in the maximum and minimum stress levels. These results show that this load case is less critical than the dewatered case.

## **Upper pool**

84. Figure 54 shows the distribution of horizontal displacements. It shows that the top of wall moved 0.009 ft toward the backfill due to the raising of the water in the lock chamber to the lower level. Figures 55 and 56 show the distribution of the major and minor principal stresses, respectively, and the deformed shape of the wall and surrounding backfill after raising the pool to el 240 ft. The distribution of stresses shows a slight reduction in the maximum and minimum stress levels.

## **Summary and Conclusions**

85. The static stress analyses have shown that the most critical loading condition is when the lock is completely dewatered. For this condition, the static analyses have shown that the chamber lock walls were overstressed in the past, due most likely to over compaction of backfill and the 20 ft higher than anticipated water level in the backfill. This overstressing was sufficient to cause the present crack from the upper landward corner of the filling/emptying culvert and extending to the surface of wall on the landward. Once the crack had occurred and the anchors were placed (the current state of the walls), the analyses show that the tensile stress that caused the crack to form has been redistributed to the concrete along the chamber side of the culvert and to the section below the culvert. This redistribution of tensile stresses has not overstressed the lock walls and leaves them with a factor safety greater than 2.0 (tensile stress of 180 psi from analyses versus 400 psi cracking limit) against tensile stress induced cracking. The compressive stresses are well below (3.5 times) the lowest compressive strength found in the laboratory test program. The location of the highest compressive strength is in an area where the concrete deterioration has been a problem.

Location	Soil Type	Unit Weight (lbs/ft)	Strength Parameters		Hyperbolic Parameters					
			C (psf)	$\phi$ (degrees)	K	n	$K_{ur}$	$\nu$	$R_f$	
Backfill	Compacted Glacial Till	148	500	45	1800			2000	0.35	
Natural Soil	Glacial Till	135	500	38	1200			1500	0.35	

**EQUATIONS FOR SOIL STRESS-STRAIN MODEL**

$$E_t = KP_A \left(\frac{\sigma_3}{P_A}\right)^n$$

$$SL = \frac{(\sigma_1 - \sigma_3)}{(\sigma_1 - \sigma_3)_{FAILURE}}$$

$$E_t = E_i(1 - R_f SL)^2$$

$$E_{UR} = K_{UR} P_A \left(\frac{\sigma_3}{P_A}\right)^n$$

$P_A$  = atmospheric pressure

Table 5. Soil Model Parameters

## **PART V: SEISMIC ANALYSIS OF THE NORTH WALL OF THE EISENHOWER LOCK INCLUDING FLUID-SOIL-STRUCTURE INTERACTION**

### **Introduction and Objectives**

86. The active earth pressures and water pressures due to a horizontal seismic motion on the lock have been estimated for the Eisenhower Project Site. Response spectra from the Operating Basis Earthquake (OBE) and Maximum Credible Earthquake (MCE) were used to perform the linear dynamic stress analysis. Two dimensional plane strain analysis was used to estimate earth pressures and water pressures. These pressures were then added to the dynamic results to yield the final stress values. Figure 57 shows a typical section of the north wall of the lock.

87. The purpose of the present report is to use current analysis methods, which could incorporate the effects of soil structure interaction for a seismic analysis of the lock. In addition, the report provides pertinent state-of-the-art information on soil-structure interaction and identifies critical areas of the lock structure that should be carefully engineered.

### **General Overview of Analysis**

88. Retaining walls designed for earthquake effects may be grouped into two main categories on the basis of their failure mode:

- a. Gravity retaining walls, using the mass of the wall for stability, which fail by sliding or by overturning. These may be called displacement-governed walls. The internal force levels in such walls are of secondary importance.
- b. Cantilever, tied-back or braced walls, which fail by fracture or yield of one of the structural components involved. These walls may be called force-governed walls. For at least some part of such structural systems the internal force level is important.

The present analysis assumes that no displacement failure is anticipated, and the Eisenhower Lock is composed of force-governed walls.

89. Generally the objectives in earthquake-resistant design are as follows:

- a. To ensure that no significant structural damage results from a moderate earthquake having a reasonable likelihood of not being exceeded during the life of the structure.
- b. To ensure against collapse or major structural failure for a rare severe earthquake.

90. The first design objective can be met by sizing the structural members such that their strengths will not be significantly exceeded in an earthquake of moderate intensity. At this design level, the behavior is essentially linear elastic and application of elastic response spectrum analysis can be used to arrive at critical member forces.

91. The second design objective of ensuring against a major structural failure is often met by employing design details that ensure ductile behavior.

92. These two objectives can be met if the necessary steel reinforcement is provided. This is always the case for residential buildings and a certain class of life-line structures such as bridges. For retaining walls that are very lightly reinforced however, the objectives are still the same, but the objectives are met in a somewhat different way.

93. The "dual spectrum approach" is used if two distinct levels of prescribed earthquake excitations are employed to meet the two aforementioned design objectives. The higher intensity motion is often called "maximum credible earthquake" (MCE) or ductility level earthquake and the lower level motion is referred to as "operating basis earthquake" or strength level earthquake. The MCE spectrum reflects an envelope of response values which have a high probability (e.g., 85-95 percent) of not being exceeded during the lifetime of the structure. The OBE spectrum has a moderate probability (e.g., 50-60 percent) of not being exceeded. The structure should not suffer any damage from the OBE. Damage is acceptable for the MCE, but the structure should remain mostly intact and not experience a catastrophic failure.

94. For gravity retaining walls and in particular for forced-governed walls, the members are sized so that failure is avoided and only reparable damage is allowed to develop. This is accomplished by sizing the wall sections so that the strength of the contraction material will be exceeded in limited areas that retain the function of the structure and are accessible to retrofitting after the earthquake.

95. The analysis reflects the "dual approach." The procedure for both the OBE and MCE is the same with the only difference being the intensity of the lateral forces acting on the lock wall.

96. The following steps comprise the analysis:

- a. Evaluate lateral stiffness of soil in contact with the wall.
- b. Evaluate earth pressures on the wall.
- c. Stress analysis using the OBE and MCE loading conditions.

The dynamic analysis of the wall was performed with ADINA (ADINA 1988).

97. The wall was modeled with plane strain rectangular elements, while spring elements were used to represent the soil. The evaluation of the spring constants is based on state-of-the-art soil dynamics procedures. The minor differences of the frictional angle of the soil, and the modulus of elasticity of the concrete  $E_c$ , used in the static analysis and the dynamic analysis are insignificant given the complexity of the system and the computational procedures in both analyses. The finite element method (FEM) modelling of the lock, i.e., size of elements, and mesh were performed according to guidelines found in FEM literature (Bathe 1982). The FEM model used to extract the mode shapes as well as performing the response spectra analysis is shown in Figure 58.

98. The analysis revealed that the soil-structure interaction (SSI) does not effect the dynamic response of the lock significantly - at least the effects on the natural frequency of the fundamental mode shape. Without the soil, the natural frequency was 12.1 Hz; with the soil, the natural frequency was 12.7 Hz, for a total percent difference of 4.7 percent.

99. As a consequence of this small change, the earth pressures acting on the wall have been changed insignificantly from the ones evaluated without soil-structure interaction.

100. It should be pointed out that SSI, as has been accounted for in this analysis, is a rough approximation of SSI behavior under seismic loads. Salient deficiencies of the analysis include:

- a. Evaluation of the soil spring stiffness from a shear modulus,  $G_s$ , estimated from earthquake induced strains.

- b. Assumption that the soil stiffness is constant. This is not always a conservative assumption since the magnitude of the soil stiffness is highly dependent on the frequency of the excitation (Wolf 1985).
- c. Neglect of radiation damping in the soil. Radiation damping is a measure of the energy loss from the structure through radiation of waves away from the footing, i.e., it is a purely geometrical effect. For horizontal and vertical translations, radiation damping may be large (greater than 10 percent of critical damping).

### **Analysis**

101. The seismic analysis used the response spectra method. Two cases were considered:

- a. OBE with 5 percent damping.
- b. MCE with 10 percent damping.

The 10 percent damping for the MCE is an approximation that accounts for structural damage. This is a standard method used in response spectra and thus linear for seismic analysis.

102. The response spectra for both the OBE and MCE is an envelope of maximum values of the site specific response spectra provided by Krinitzsky (1991). The response spectra are for a Modified Mercalli intensity VIII earthquake. The time histories and response spectra are for a near field, hard site, and shallow earthquake. The response spectra used are shown in Figure 59.

103. A total of 10 mode shapes were used to compute the seismic stresses. The method used a standard response spectra method to combine the stresses from each mode shape to calculate the net stresses. This method was a square root sum of squares (SRSS) method, thus all stress values are positive. Although this is confusing at first, it causes no problems in interpreting the results. Since it is an earthquake loading and thus a cyclic loading, the stresses are equally likely to be tensile or compressive. Simply adding the dynamic stress to the static stresses will give the largest tensile stresses which are important to determine if failure is occurring.

104. The static stresses are from the SSI calculations covered previously in this report. Note that the sign convention for the stresses are different. Tensile

stresses are positive while compressive stresses are negative. Also, note that all dimensions and elevations are given in inches and stresses are in pounds per square inch.

## Results

105. The results from the dynamic analysis are shown starting with Figure 60. This figure is a contour plot of the maximum principal stresses for the OBE loading. The largest stress value is 300 psi located at el 2,678 on the exterior or right face of the lock. This stress is well within the tensile strength of the concrete ( $f_t=500$  psi).

106. The results for the MCE are shown in Figure 61. The maximum stress value is in the same location as is the OBE. Now, the *maximum principal stress* is 405 psi. This is getting close to the tensile strength of the concrete.

107. Combining the OBE stresses with the static stresses changes the maximum stress value very little. The OBE combined with the static load case is shown in Figure 62. The combination did create another high stress region near the base of the right face. This new stress is 225 psi.

108. Figure 63 shows the MCE stresses combined with the static stresses. Again, very little change occurs in the location or magnitude of the maximum stress value. It is at el 2,678 on the exterior face of the lock. The stress near the base of the right face is now 250 psi.

109. For this structure, since the maximum dynamic stresses occur near the top of the structure, which is a low stress area for the static load case, and since the static stresses are high in a region where the dynamic stresses are low, the combination of static and dynamic stresses does not generate very high stress levels.

## Conclusions

110. For both the OBE and MCE conditions, catastrophic failure of the lock wall is unlikely to occur. No damage should occur during the OBE event with a maximum principal stress of 300 psi. There is a possibility of damage to the structure

during the MCE event near the top of the structure where the sloping face transitions into a vertical face. If damage does occur during the MCE event, no more than about 5 to 10 percent of the section would be damaged.

## PART VI: CONCLUSIONS

111. For static loading and with the current condition as analyzed, the chamber wall monoliths at Eisenhower and Snell Locks show no evidence of being overstressed. The results of the static analyses show that the chamber wall monoliths have tensile stresses below 200 psi and compressive stresses less than 1,000 psi. These stress levels are below any of the strengths determined from the laboratory testing program (390 psi for tensile splitting tests and 3,660 psi for compression tests). The highest stresses under static loading are in areas of low strength as determined in the testing program. If for some reason the cross sectional area is significantly reduced, such as concrete deterioration as found in the history of Eisenhower Lock, the structural integrity would be in question. It is important for the SLSDC to maintain an aggressive maintenance program of replacing deteriorated concrete. Immediate attention should be given to the repair of deteriorated concrete near the bottom of the lock walls at Eisenhower Lock.

112. For seismic loading events, catastrophic failure of the lock walls is unlikely. No damage should occur during the OBE event where combined static and dynamic tensile stresses reaches 300 psi. There is a possibility of some damage to the walls during the MCE event near the top of the structure where the sloping face transitions into a vertical face. If damage does occur during the MCE event, no more than about 5 to 10 percent of the section would be damaged. Where the MCE event has a low likelihood of occurrence and the damage level is low, it would be prudent to wait and make repairs to the chamber walls after such an earthquake event.

## REFERENCES

- ADINA. 1988. Adina Users Manual, ADINA R & D, INC.
- Bathe, K. J. 1982. Finite Element Procedures in Engineering Analysis, Prentice Hall, NJ.
- Buck, A. D., Mather, B., and Thorton, H. T. 1967 (Jul). Investigation of Concrete in Eisenhower and Snell Locks, St. Lawrence Seaway, Technical Report No. 6-784, US Army Engineer Waterways Experiment Station, Vicksburg, MS.
- Clough, G. W. and Duncan, J. M. 1969 (Sep). *Finite Element Analyses of Port Allen and Old River Locks*, Report No. TE 69-3, College of Engineering, Office of Research Services, University of California, Berkeley, California.
- Empire Soils Investigation, Inc. 1985 (Jan). *Geotechnical Parameters/Glacial Till Backfill/Eisenhower and Snell Locks/St. Lawrence Seaway*, Groton, New York.
- Gannett Fleming Geotechnical Engineering, Inc. 9186 (Nov). *Data Collection and Evaluation for Engineering Study of Lock Stability - Eisenhower and Snell Locks, Massena, New York*, Volume I-V, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania.
- Harza Engineering Company. 1981 (Jan). *Survey Report - Eisenhower and Snell Locks*, Chicago, Illinois.
- Krinitzsky, E. L. in preparation. *Geological-Seismological Evaluation of Earthquake Hazards at Eisenhower and Snell Locks, Saint Lawrence Seaway, Massena, New York*, US Army Engineer Waterways Experiment Station, Vicksburg, MS.
- Spyrakos, Constantine C. and Ioannidis, George. 1991 (May). *Seismic Analysis of the North Wall of the Eisenhower Lock*, Prepared for Structural Mechanics Division, Waterways Experiment Station, Vicksburg, MS.
- US Army Engineers, Buffalo District. 1957 (Mar). *Saint Lawrence Seaway - Dwight D. Eisenhower Lock - Foundation Report*, Massena, New York.
- US Army Engineers, Buffalo District. 1957 (Mar). *Saint Lawrence Seaway - Grass River (Snell) Lock - Foundation Report*, Massena, New York.
- US Army Engineers, Buffalo District. 1985 (Feb). *Reconnaissance Report for Major Rehabilitation, Eisenhower and Snell Locks, Saint Lawrence Seaway, Massena, New York, Buffalo, NY*.
- Wolf, L.P. 1985. *Dynamic Soil Structure Interaction*, Prentice Hall, NY.

Table 1

Lock	Boring No.	Elevation Top of Boring, ft.	Elevation Top of Rock, ft	Concrete Bonded to Rock	Elevation Bottom of Boring	Boring Depth, ft.
Eisenhower	N-53	251.5	141.1	No	120.4	131.1
Eisenhower	N-57	251.5	138.9	No	126.5	125.0
Eisenhower	S-17	251.5	141.9	Yes	128.7	122.8
Eisenhower	S-19	251.5	140.8	No	122.5	129.0
Eisenhower	SS-18	251.5	*	NA	215.7	35.8
Eisenhower	SS-19	251.5	*	NA	216.5	35.0
Snell	N-56	205.0	*	NA	131.1	73.9
Snell	S-15	205.0	105.9	No	100.7	104.3

\* Boring did not extend to concrete rock interface.

NA - Not applicable.

Table 2. Visual Inspection of Cores for Eisenhower and Snell Locks

Hole	Box No.	Specimen No.	Concrete or Rock	Comments
N-53	4	38	Concrete	Dense, well consolidated
		39	Concrete	Dense, well consolidated
	10	40	Concrete	Minor voids; poor agg/paste interface
		41	Concrete	Minor voids
	19	42	Concrete	Considerable voids; poor interface; chipped end
		43	Concrete	Poor consolidation; broke while sawing
	25	44	Concrete	Minor voids; poor agg/paste interface
		45	Concrete	Considerable voids
	26	46	Concrete	Minor voids
		47	Concrete	Considerable voids; poor agg/paste interface
	28	48	Rock	Sound, intact
		49	Rock	Sound, intact
	19	43R	Concrete	Minor voids; poor agg/paste interface
	N-57	7	1	Concrete
2			Concrete	Minor voids
15		3	Concrete	Minor voids; poor interface
		4	Concrete	Minor voids
19		5	Concrete	Minor voids; chipped end; poor interface
		6	Concrete	Considerable voids; chipped end
25		7	Concrete	Considerable voids; poor agg/paste interface; big rock
		8	Concrete	Considerable voids; poor interface

Table 2. (Continued)

Hole	Box No.	Specimen No.	Concrete or Rock	Comments
	26	9	Concrete	Minor voids; poor interface; chipped end
		10	Concrete	Considerable voids
	29	11	Rock	Sound, intact
		12	Rock	Sound, intact
	7	1R	Concrete	Minor voids: poor agg/paste interface; big rock
S-17	7	13	Concrete	Minor voids; one big rock in specimen
		14	Concrete	Minor voids
	10	15	Concrete	Minor voids
		16	Concrete	Minor voids
	17	17	Concrete	Minor voids; #5 steel anchor in specimen
		18	Concrete	Minor voids; poor agg/paste interface
	24	19	Concrete	Minor voids
		20	Concrete	Minor voids
	26	21	Concrete	Minor voids
		22	Concrete	Minor voids; poor interface; big rock
	27	23	Both	Good bond @ C/R interface
	29	24	Rock	Sound, intact
		25	Rock	Sound, intact

Table 2. (Continued)

Hole	Box No.	Specimen No.	Concrete or Rock	Comments
S-19	1	26	Concrete	Minor voids; poor interface
		27	Concrete	Minor voids; poor interface; chipped end; big rock
	11	28	Concrete	Minor voids; chipped end
		29	Concrete	Minor voids; chipped end
	16	30	Concrete	Considerable voids
		31	Concrete	Minor voids
		32	Concrete	Minor voids
		33	Concrete	Minor voids; big rock
		34	Concrete	Minor voids; big rock
		35	Concrete	Minor voids; poor interface; big rock
N-56	3	62	Concrete	Dense, well consolidated
		63	Concrete	Dense, well consolidated
	9	64	Concrete	Minor voids
		65	Concrete	Minor voids
	12	66	Concrete	Minor voids
		67	Concrete	Minor voids
	16	68	Concrete	Minor voids
		69	Concrete	Minor voids
	17	70	Concrete	Minor voids
		71	Concrete	Minor voids; chipped end

Table 2. (Concluded)

Hole	Box No.	Specimen No.	Concrete or Rock	Comments
S-15	1	50	Concrete	Minor voids
		51	Concrete	Minor voids
	6	52	Concrete	Minor voids; poor interface
		53	Concrete	Minor voids
	11	54	Concrete	Considerable voids; poor interface
		55	Concrete	Considerable voids; poor agg/paste interface
	19	56	Concrete	Minor voids
		57	Concrete	Minor voids
	23	58	Concrete	Minor voids
		59	Concrete	Minor voids
	24	60	Rock	Sound, intact
		61	Rock	Sound, intact

Table 3. Results of Tests on Cores from Eisenhower Lock, Hole N-53

Spec. No.	Core Run, ft		Concrete or Rock	Description	Density, pcf	Percent Voids	Pulse Velocity, fps	Compressive Strength, psi	Elastic Modulus, million psi	Poisson's Ratio	Splitting Tensile Strength psi
	From	To									
4-38	10.7	14.8	Concrete	Dense, well consolidated	163.8	-----	18942	6000	7.75	0.28	-----
4-39	10.7	14.8	Concrete	Dense, well consolidated	163.4	9.3	-----	-----	-----	-----	665
10-40	34.6	39.4	Concrete	Minor voids; poor egg/paste interface	158.5	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	580
10-41	34.6	39.4	Concrete	Minor voids	159.6	11.7	18269	6060	6.00	0.23	-----
19-42	75.3	79.5	Concrete	Considerable voids; poor interface; chipped end	158.8	13.9	-----	-----	-----	-----	590
19-43R	75.3	79.5	Concrete	Poor consolidation; broke while sawing	158.9	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	610
25-44	100.2	104.8	Concrete	Minor voids; poor egg/paste interface	157.8	8.9	-----	-----	-----	-----	760
25-45	100.2	104.8	Concrete	Considerable voids	154.2	7.8	16943	4430	3.50	0.16	-----
26-46	104.8	108.6	Concrete	Minor voids	157.6	-----	17824	3610	5.20	0.22	-----
26-47	104.8	108.6	Concrete	Considerable voids; poor egg/paste interface	157.0	9.7	-----	-----	-----	-----	525
28-48	112.0	116.0	Rock	Sound, intact	175.2	-----	21137	34810	14.50	0.31	-----
28-49	112.0	116.0	Rock	Sound, intact	172.7	-----	19841	41150	11.60	0.27	-----



Table 5. Results of Tests on Cores from Eisenhower Lock, Hole S-17

Spec. No.	Core Run, ft		Concrete or Rock	Description	Density, pcf	Percent Voids	Pulse Velocity, fps	Compressive Strength, psi	Elastic Modulus, million psi	Poisson's Ratio	Splitting Tensile Strength, psi
	From	To									
7-13	25.1	29.4	Concrete	Minor voids; one big rock in specimen	161.0	5.3	-----	-----	-----	-----	635
7-14	25.1	29.4	Concrete	Minor voids	158.2	10.5	17990	5980	7.05	0.26	-----
10-15	37.3	42.3	Concrete	Minor voids	158.7	10.6	-----	-----	-----	-----	645
10-16	37.3	42.3	Concrete	Minor voids	156.7	9.5	17183	4490	6.10	0.20	-----
17-17	67.5	71.9	Concrete	Minor voids; #5 steel anchor in specimen	161.4	9.4	17509	7280	5.35	0.23	-----
17-18	67.5	71.9	Concrete	Minor voids; poor egg/paste interface	156.6	9.1	-----	-----	-----	-----	410
24-19	95.1	99.7	Concrete	Minor voids	156.5	-----	17816	6150	5.55	0.18	-----
24-20	95.1	99.7	Concrete	Minor voids	155.7	11.1	-----	-----	-----	-----	790
26-21	103.8	108.0	Concrete	Minor voids	156.4	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	555
26-22	103.8	108.0	Concrete	Minor voids; poor interface; big rock	155.0	11.6	15975	3750	3.70	0.17	-----
27-23	108.0	111.6	Both	Good bond @ C/R interface	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
29-24	116.2	120.4	Rock	Sound, intact	-----	-----	20113	40280	12.25	0.30	-----
29-25	116.2	120.4	Rock	Sound, intact	-----	-----	19950	17010	11.90	0.25	-----

Table 6. Results of Tests on Cores from Eisenhower Lock, Hole S-19

Spec. No.	Core Run, ft		Concrete or Rock	Description	Density, pcf	Percent Voids	Pulse Velocity, fps	Compressive Strength, psi	Elastic Modulus, million psi	Poisson's Ratio	Splitting Tensile Strength, psi
	From	To									
1-26	0	5.0	Concrete	Minor voids; poor interface	155.7	8.8	17478	6100	7.35	0.27	-----
1-27	0	5.0	Concrete	Minor voids; poor interface; chipped end; big rock	153.7	10.6	-----	-----	-----	-----	570
11-28	44.4	48.4	Concrete	Minor voids; chipped end	158.8	12.6	-----	-----	-----	-----	555
11-29	44.4	48.4	Concrete	Minor voids; chipped end	158.1	-----	17589	5320	6.75	0.30	-----
16-30	65.6	69.6	Concrete	Considerable voids	154.7	12.0	-----	-----	-----	-----	505
16-31	65.6	69.6	Concrete	Minor voids	155.1	-----	16752	5900	5.10	0.24	-----
20-32	83.1	88.0	Concrete	Minor voids	160.8	-----	17965	5890	5.00	0.17	-----
20-33	83.1	88.0	Concrete	Minor voids; big rock	160.0	12.3	-----	-----	-----	-----	490
24-34	100.4	105.0	Concrete	Minor voids; big rock	155.8	9.4	-----	-----	-----	-----	650
24-35	100.4	105.0	Concrete	Minor voids; poor interface; big rock	158.4	11.8	16239	4090	4.60	0.29	-----
26-36	108.2	112.4	Both	No bond @ C/R interface	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
30-37	124.7	129.0	Rock	Sound, intact	174.0	-----	9873	19700	6.20	0.27	-----

Table 7. Results of Tests on Cores from Snell Lock, Hole S-15

Spec. No.	Core Run, ft		Concrete or Rock	Description	Density, pcf	Percent Voids	Pulse Velocity, fps	Compressive Strength, psi	Elastic Modulus, million psi	Poisson's Ratio	Splitting Tensile Strength, psi
	From	To									
1-50	0	4.5	Concrete	Minor voids	156.5	13.6	17362	7420	6.60	0.24	-----
1-51	23.9	28.0	Concrete	Minor voids	159.9	8.4	-----	-----	-----	-----	680
6-52	23.9	28.0	Concrete	Minor voids; poor interface	159.1	-----	17343	5940	6.95	0.25	-----
6-53	23.9	28.0	Concrete	Minor voids	159.6	7.2	-----	-----	-----	-----	625
11-54	45.9	50.4	Concrete	Considerable voids; poor interface	155.5	-----	17686	7460	7.70	0.25	-----
11-55	45.9	50.4	Concrete	Considerable voids; poor egg/paste interface	155.3	17.8	-----	-----	-----	-----	635
19-56	80.5	84.5	Concrete	Minor voids	157.4	-----	18032	7870	6.40	0.23	-----
19-57	80.5	84.5	Concrete	Minor voids	158.6	11.5	-----	-----	-----	-----	520
23-58	96.2	100.2	Concrete	Minor voids	155.9	9.0	17046	3730	4.60	0.20	-----
23-59	96.2	100.2	Concrete	Minor voids	160.8	14.1	-----	-----	-----	-----	495
24-60	100.2	104.2	Rock	Sound, intact	-----	-----	16219	21700	8.05	0.27	-----
24-61	100.2	104.2	Rock	Sound, intact	-----	-----	16797	22560	9.05	0.34	-----

Table 8. Results of Tests on Cores from Snell Lock, Hole N-56

Spec. No.	Core Run, ft		Concrete or Rock	Description	Density, pcf	Percent Voids	Pulse Velocity, fps	Compressive Strength, psi	Elastic Modulus, million psi	Poisson's Ratio	Splitting Tensile Strength psi
	From	To									
3-62	8.7	12.9	Concrete	Dense, well consolidated	164.3	6.6	-----	-----	-----	-----	875
3-63	8.7	12.9	Concrete	Dense, well consolidated	162.9	5.4	18931	8360	7.50	.25	-----
9-64	33.7	37.7	Concrete	Minor voids	161.1	-----	18370	5980	6.45	0.26	-----
9-65	33.7	37.7	Concrete	Minor voids	161.6	10.2	-----	-----	-----	-----	495
12-66	45.8	50.0	Concrete	Minor voids	158.0	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	930
12-67	45.8	50.0	Concrete	Minor voids	158.7	9.1	17493	8590	8.95	0.28	-----
16-68	62.6	67.1	Concrete	Minor voids	150.7	16.4	-----	-----	-----	-----	530
16-69	62.6	67.1	Concrete	Minor voids	157.2	11.8	17883	4540	6.90	0.28	-----
17-70	67.1	71.6	Concrete	Minor voids	155.3	-----	17956	6260	6.25	0.25	-----
17-71	67.1	71.6	Concrete	Minor voids; chipped end	156.8	12.9	-----	-----	-----	-----	710




Figure 1. Vicinity map




Figure 2. Location of Eisenhower and Snell Locks on the Wiley-Dondero Canal at Massena, New York




Figure 3. Plan view of Eisenhower Lock (not to scale)




Figure 4. Typical section through south wall chamber monoliths (not to scale)




Figure 5. Boring locations at Eisenhower Lock

SCALE 1"=50'




Figure 6. Boring locations at Snell Lock




Figure 7. Schematic representation of locations of test samples




Figure 8. Variation of concrete compressive strengths with depth




Figure 9. Variation of concrete tensile strengths with depth




Figure 10. Variation of modulus of elasticity of the concrete with depth




Figure 11. Typical cross section through the chamber at Eisenhower Lock




Figure 12. Typical cross section through the chamber at Snell Lock




Figure 13. Typical cross section of chamber wall monolith on the south side at Eisenhower Lock




Figure 14. Typical cross section of chamber wall monolith on the north side at Eisenhower Lock




Figure 15. Typical cross section of chamber wall monolith on the south side at Snell Lock




Figure 16. Typical cross section of chamber wall monolith on the north side at Snell Lock





Figure 17. Basic elevations and dimensions for the model of north chamber wall monoliths at Eisenhower Lock



**Figure 18. Basic elevations and dimensions for the model of south chamber wall monoliths at Eisenhower Lock**




Figure 19. Basic elevations and dimensions for the model of north chamber wall monoliths at Snell Lock




Figure 20. Configuration for the model of north chamber wall monoliths at Eisenhower Lock





Figure 21. Configuration for the model of south chamber wall monoliths at Eisenhower Lock



**Figure 22. Configuration for the model of north chamber wall monoliths at Snell Lock**




Figure 23. Finite element mesh for the model of north chamber wall monoliths at Eisenhower Lock




Figure 24. Finite element mesh for the model of south chamber wall monoliths at Eisenhower Lock




Figure 25. Finite element mesh for the model of north chamber wall monoliths at Snell Lock




Figure 26. Schematic of the model process









Figure 27. Effects of compaction of lateral earth pressures (Clough and Duncan 1969)












CONTOURS OF

NOORL RESULTS

VIEW : 0.00E+00

RANGE : 1.00E+00



1.000

0.9100

0.8400

0.7700

0.7000

0.6300

0.5600

0.4900

0.4200

0.3500

0.2800

0.2100

0.1400

7E-02

0.0

RX= 0

RY= 0

RZ= 0

Y

Z

X

Figure 33. Mobilized shear strength mobilization after backfill placement.

CONTOURS OF

MODAL RESULTS

VIEW : -4.72E+04

RANGE : 3.07E+04

307.0  
300.0  
240.0  
180.0  
120.0  
60.00  
0.0  
-60.00  
-120.0  
-180.0  
-240.0  
-300.0  
-360.0  
-420.0  
-472.3




Figure 34. Distribution of minor principal stresses and the deformed shape of the wall and surrounding backfill after placement of backfill without crack

Y RX= 0  
Z RY= 0  
X RZ= 0

ELEMENT STRESSES

STEP 26

VIEW : -6.05E+04

RANGE : 3.66E+04



365.9

280.0

210.0

140.0

70.00

0.0

-70.00

-140.0

-210.0

-280.0

-350.0

-420.0

-490.0

-560.0

-604.8

RX= 0

RY= 0

RZ= 0

Y

X

Figure 35. Minor principal stresses level in element near the culvert without crack

CONTOURS OF

MINOR PRINCIPAL STRESSES

UNIT : -4.721 +04

RANGE : 3.071 +04

307.0

300.0

240.0

180.0

120.0

60.00

0.0

-60.00

-120.0

-180.0

-240.0

-300.0

-360.0

-420.0

-472.3

Y RX= 0

Z RY= 0

X RZ= 0




Figure 36. Distribution of minor principal stresses near the culvert without crack

CONTOURS OF

NODAL RESULTS

VIEW : -4.29E+02

RANGE : 1.21E+05

121.1  
120.0  
110.0  
100.0  
90.00  
80.00  
70.00  
60.00  
50.00  
40.00  
30.00  
20.00  
10.00  
0.0  
-4294

Figure 37. Distribution of major principal stresses and the deformed shape of the wall and surrounding backfill after placement of backfill without crack


Y RX= 0  
Z RY= 0  
X RZ= 0

CONTOURS OF

NOBLE RESULTS

UTER : - 1.29E+02

RANGE : 1.211 +015



RX= 0  
RY= 0  
RZ= 0

X

Figure 38. Distribution of major principal stresses near the culvert without crack

NODAL DISPLACEMENT

STEP 26

VIEW : -1.71E-01

RANGE : 3.02E-03

3E-03

-4E-09

-4E-03

-8E-03

-1E-02

-2E-02

-2E-02

-2E-02

-3E-02

-3E-02

-4E-02

-4E-02

-4E-02

-5E-02

-.1710

Y RX= 0

Z RY= 0

X RZ= 0





Figure 39 Distribution of vertical displacements after backfill placement with crack

NODAL DISPLACEMENT

STEP 26

VIEW : -1.21E-01

RANGE : 1.48E-02



Y RX= 0  
Z X RY= 0  
RZ= 0




Figure 40. Distribution of horizontal displacements after backfill placement with crack

CONTOURS: 01

NOIUAL RESULTS

VIEW : -2.64E+04

RANGE : 3.16E+04

315.7  
240.0  
200.0  
160.0  
120.0  
80.00  
40.00  
0.0  
-40.00  
-80.00  
-120.0  
-160.0  
-200.0  
-240.0  
-263.9





Figure 43. Distribution of minor principal stresses and the deformed shape of the wall and surrounding backfill after placement of backfill with crack

CONTOURS OF

NODAL RESULTS

VIEW : -2.64E+04

RANGE : 3.16E+04



Y      RX= 0  
Z      X      RY= 0  
                        RZ= 0


Figure 42. Distribution of minor principal stresses near the culvert with crack

CONTOURS OF

NOORAL RESULTS

VIEW : 3.12E+02

RANGE : 1.21E+05



120.6
108.0
99.75
91.50
83.25
75.00
66.75
58.50
50.25
42.00
33.75
25.50
17.25
9.000
0.3124




Figure 43. Distribution of major principal stresses and the deformed shape of the wall and surrounding backfill after placement of backfill with crack

CONTOURS OF

NODAL RESULTS

VIEW : 3.02E+03

RANGE : 1.21E+05

120.6

108.0

99.75

91.50

83.25

75.00

66.75

58.50

50.25

42.00

33.75

25.50

17.25

9.000

3.017

Y RX= 0

Z RY= 0

X RZ= 0

Figure 44. Distribution of major principal stresses near the culvert with crack




Figure 45. Lateral earth pressure on a vertical plane above the heel after backfill placement




Figure 46. Shear stress on a vertical plane above the heel after backfill placement

NORMAL DISPLACEMENT

STEP 27

VIEW : -1.18E-01

RANGE : 1.50E-02

2E-02  
1E-02  
8E-04  
-8E-03  
-2E-02  
-3E-02  
-4E-02  
-5E-02  
-5E-02  
-6E-02  
-7E-02  
-8E-02  
-9E-02  
-,1000  
-,1176



Y RX= 0  
Z X RY= 0  
RZ= 0






Figure 47. Distribution of horizontal displacements after placement of the anchors





CONTOURS OF

NODAL RESULTS

VIEW : -2.16E+04

RANGE : 3.12E+04





Figure 30. Distribution of minor principal stresses near the culvert after placement of the anchors

NODAL DISPLACEMENT

STEP 30

VIEW : -1.17E-01

RANGE : 1.60E-02

2E-02

1E-02

8E-04

-8E-03

-2E-02

-3E-02

-4E-02

-5E-02

-5E-02

-6E-02

-7E-02

-8E-02

-9E-02

-.1000

-.1165





Figure 51. Distribution of horizontal displacements after raising the pool to El 200 ft

CONTOURS OF

NODAL RESULTS

VIEW : 3.24E+02

RANGE : 1.21E+05



120.7

108.0

99.75

91.50

83.25

75.00

66.75

58.50

50.25

42.00

33.75

25.50

17.25

9.000

0.3239

Figure 52 Distribution of major principal stresses and the deformed shape of the wall and surrounding backfill after raising the pool to H: 200 ft

CONTOURS OF

NODAL RESULTS

VIEW : -2.43E+04

RANGE : 3.17E+04



317.1  
240.0  
200.0  
160.0  
120.0  
80.00  
40.00  
0.0  
-40.00  
-80.00  
-120.0  
-160.0  
-200.0  
-240.0  
-242.5

Figure 53 Distribution of minor principal stresses and the deformed shape of the wall and surrounding backfill after raising the pool to El 200 ft

NODAL DISPLACEMENT

STEP 32

VIEW : -1.07E-01

RANGE : 2.00E-02

2E-02

1E-02

8E-04

-8E-03

-2E-02

-3E-02

-4E-02

-5E-02

-5E-02

-6E-02

-7E-02

-8E-02

-9E-02

-.1000

-.1073






Figure 54. Distribution of horizontal displacements after raising the pool to El 240 ft










Figure 57. Typical section of the north wall of Eisenhower lock

1st MODE SHAPE

FR. 12.7 Hz

DYNAMIC MODEL



EISENHOWER LOCK - NORTH WALL

Figure 58. Finite element model and first mode shape




Figure 59. OBE and MCE response spectra for Eisenhower locks

# MAXIMUM PRINCIPAL STRESS (PSI)





Figure 60. Principal stress contours for OBE event

# MAXIMUM PRINCIPAL STRESS (PSI)



**Figure 61. Principal stress contours for MCE event**

# MAXIMUM PRINCIPAL STRESS (PSI)




Figure 62. Static and principal stress contours for OBE event

# MAXIMUM PRINCIPAL STRESS (PSI)




Figure 63. Static and principal stress contours for MCE event

**APPENDIX A: INTERGOVERNMENTAL AGENCY AGREEMENT**

CEWES IM-DI  
APR 12 1990 (Reed Mosher)

Study Management/Project Engineering Branch

SUBJECT: Structural Evaluation, Eisenhower/Snell Locks

Mr. Steven Hung  
Contracting Officer's Representative  
Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation  
Office of Engineering and Planning  
Post Office Box 520  
Massena, New York 13662-0520

Dear Mr. Hung:

Enclosed is the final Scope of Work for the subject study. The Waterways Experiment Station (WES) will be performing the bulk of the work for this study. Their Detailed Scope of Work is incorporated into the final Scope of Work. The Mobile District of the Corps of Engineers will be doing the core drilling and sampling under the direction of WES. The Buffalo District will be preparing the final report and is also responsible for study coordination and overall project management. The North Central Division (NCD) of the Corps in Chicago and the Office of the Chief of Engineers (OCE) in Washington are providing technical assistance.

The study cost is estimated at \$570,000. A detailed cost estimate and study schedule are contained in the enclosed scope.

The study is proceeding in accordance with the schedule contained in the interagency agreement between your agency and the Corps of Engineers. The agreement was signed on February 2, 1990 by General Patin. I anticipate on-site work will commence on May 15, 1990. My project manager will provide you a monthly report on the progress of the study.

Study Management/Project Engineering Branch  
SUBJECT: Structural Evaluation, Eisenhower/Snell Locks

My point of contact pertaining to this matter is Mr. Michael Barton, P.E., of the Study Management/Project Engineering Branch who may be contacted at 716-879-4231 or by writing to him at the above address.

Sincerely,  
**BRUCE W. HAIGH**  
**U.S. ARMY**  
**COMMANDER**

Bruce W. Haigh  
Lieutenant Colonel, U.S. Army  
Acting District Commander

Enclosure

CF:  
CECW-EG (Tony Liu)  
CENCD-ED-TT (Joe Schmidt)  
CEWES-IM-DI (Reed Mosher)

Barton/mb \_\_\_\_\_  
Gorecki \_\_\_\_\_  
Nicaise \_\_\_\_\_  
Gilbert \_\_\_\_\_  
Brooks \_\_\_\_\_  
Haigh \_\_\_\_\_

STRUCTURAL EVALUATION OF EISENHOWER AND SNELL LOCKS

SAINT LAWRENCE SEAWAY

MASSENA, NEW YORK

FINAL SCOPE OF WORK

PREPARED FOR

SAINT LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

MASSENA, NEW YORK

PREPARED BY

U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS  
BUFFALO DISTRICT

APRIL 1990

STRUCTURAL EVALUATION OF EISENHOWER AND SNELL LOCKS

SAINT LAWRENCE SEAWAY

MASSENA, NEW YORK

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Paragraph</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Page</u>
1	PURPOSE AND SCOPE	1
2	PROJECT MANAGEMENT	2
3	DETAILED SCOPE OF WORK	2
4	SCHEDULE SUMMARY	6
5	FINAL REPORT	7
6	SUMMARY OF COSTS	7

# STRUCTURAL EVALUATION OF EISENHOWER AND SNELL LOCKS

## SAINT LAWRENCE SEAWAY

### MASSENA, NEW YORK

#### 1. PURPOSE AND SCOPE

The purpose of the structural evaluation of Eisenhower and Snell Locks is to determine the adequacy of the existing locks in light of their present condition and future needs, and the advisability of their rehabilitation. The scope of this study will focus on the internal structural integrity of the chamber wall monoliths at each lock. The study will review the past history of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation (SLSDC) structural repairs to these monoliths and will evaluate their current internal condition based on field investigations, detailed finite element analyses and seismic analyses. The Corps will also review previous reports, including the Gannett Fleming reports to identify pertinent information and acceptable existing data for use in the subject evaluation.

The study will be divided into three phases:

Phase I - Field Investigation and Laboratory Testing Program: This phase of the study will determine the current state of the in-situ concrete in the chamber wall monoliths and determine the concrete properties needed for the stress analyses.

Phase II - Static Stress Analysis: The state of stress within the chamber wall monoliths will be examined by performing two-dimensional soil-structure interaction finite element analyses of two monoliths at Eisenhower and one at Snell.

Phase III - Seismic Stress Analysis: Dynamic finite element analyses of two monoliths will be performed to assess their structural integrity during an earthquake. To support the dynamic analysis, a geological-seismological investigation will be conducted to provide the ground motions, time histories, and corresponding response spectra that could be expected during a seismic event.

The findings from these three phases will be used by the Waterways Experiment Station (WES) to assess the adequacy of the existing locks, and for WES to make recommendations on the possible needs for future rehabilitation.

## 2. PROJECT MANAGEMENT

The Buffalo District will be responsible for project management during this evaluation. These duties include the following:

a. Provide monthly progress reports to the SLSDC with copies furnished to North Central Division and Office of the Chief of Engineers.

b. Coordinate the schedule for work being done by various Corps agencies.

c. Initiate funding documents for work by other Corps agencies relating to this evaluation.

d. Monitor funds used and report usage to the SLSDC.

e. Serve as point of contact for SLSDC and all Corps agencies involved.

f. Coordinate OCE and NCD review of all documents generated by this evaluation.

g. Perform other miscellaneous project management tasks as required (example: arrange purchase and delivery of core boxes for drilling)

## 3. DETAILED SCOPE OF WORK

In the following sections, the general scope of work presented in the Intergovernmental Agency Agreement has been expanded to provide the SLSDC the necessary information to assess the adequacy of the proposed study.

### Phase I - Field Investigation and Laboratory Testing Program

The field investigation and laboratory testing program will be conducted to provide the necessary parametric data to support the static and seismic analyses. The Mobile District will be conducting the drilling operation. Continuous six inch diameter core will be obtained from vertical core borings will be made six representative locations, four at Eisenhower Lock (in monoliths - N53, N57, S19, and S18) and two at Snell Lock (in monoliths - N56 and S15). Each boring will be approximately 125 feet deep and will penetrate 10-15 feet into the bedrock beneath the locks to check for any unknown rock cavities. A total of 750 linear feet of 6-inch diameter core will be obtained. Core drilling will be performed from the top of the lock walls. For monoliths N53 and N57 at Eisenhower Lock and N56 at Snell Lock, the borings will be located approximately 4 ft from the face of the lock wall to avoid the cable gallery. All borings will be located to insure no interference with the main conduit or any ports for filling and emptying. All coring will be accomplished with a single drill rig and with only one mobilization. Mobile District will

provide a borehole camera to be used to visually inspect the existing conditions of the concrete and rock core holes. WES will have a concrete technologist on site to log and inspect the cores. All core will be wrapped with material to resist drying. The core will be stored on site in space provide by SLSDC.

Three additional core borings will be made depending on the budget and if a distinction can be made between lift joints and cracks. Two will be made at Eisenhower Lock in monoliths S19 and S18 and one in monolith S15 at Snell Lock. The borings will be located as close as possible to the back of the walls. The borings will extend to a depth of approximately 20 feet. These will be used to investigate the possibility of the existent of a crack near the top of the wall where the back of walls changes slope. If the budget permits, these borings will be made in addition to the six primary borings. If not, three of the six primary borings will be reduced in depth to allow these borings to be made.

Once the coring is complete, samples will be selected for laboratory testing. The following tests will be performed.

#### Concrete Tests

	Type of Test	Number of Tests*
1.	Unconfined Compressive Strength	30
2.	Poisson's Ratio	30
3.	Elastic Modulus	30
4.	Splitting Tensile	30
5.	Specific Gravity, Absorption, Voids	30
6.	Ultrasonic Pulse Velocity	30
7.	Direct Shear	10
8.	Petrographic Examination	2

\* These are only approximate numbers of tests and are subject to change after viewing the cores. Extra laboratory tests have been included to compensate for any inconsistent test results due to the 6-inch maximum size aggregate. The results will be presented in a report.

## Rock Tests

	Type of Test	Number of Tests*
1.	Unconfined Compressive Strength	12
2.	Poisson's Ratio	12
3.	Elastic Modulus	12
4.	Ultrasonic Pulse Velocity	12
5.	Direct Shear at Interface	2

\* These are only approximate numbers of tests and are subject to change after viewing the cores. Extra laboratory tests have been included to compensate for any inconsistent test results due to the 6-inch maximum size aggregate. The results will be presented in a report.

### Phase II - Static Stress Analysis

The static stress analysis phase focuses on the evaluation of internal structural integrity of the chamber walls monoliths at Eisenhower and Snell Locks. Of primary concern is the state of stress of the concrete in the chamber walls. The stress conditions in the chamber walls results from gravitational forces on the walls and from external forces applied by the backfill, water, and other possible external loads. The stress analyses will be performed by using the finite element method. Three typical concrete chamber wall monoliths will be analyzed, a north and a south wall at Eisenhower and a south wall at Snell. Each monolith will be analyzed for three loading conditions: normal operation with upper pool in the chamber; normal operation with lower pool in the chamber; and the maintenance condition with the chamber fully dewatered.

The analyses will be performed using the computer program "SOILSTRUCT" written by Dr. G. Wayne Clough and co-workers at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University. SOILSTRUCT was specifically developed to model complex soil-structure interaction problems by the finite element method. The code has been used to analyze a wide variety of problems, such as navigation locks, retaining walls, supported excavations, dams, tunnels, foundations, and cofferdams. The analysis will be an incremental soil-structure interaction analysis where the placement of the concrete and the backfill is simulated in order to obtain the induced stresses in the system. The incremental analysis applies the loads to the model in small increments to allow the nonlinear constitutive model for the soil and interface to adjust during the loading increment.

The study will commence by reviewing construction records and previous studies of the locks. From this information, the characterization of the backfill and foundation and a preliminary characterization of the concrete will be made. The chamber wall monoliths will be reviewed for selection of the monoliths for analysis. After selection of the monoliths, a finite element grid will be developed for one of the selected monoliths. The grid will allow for a simulation of a crack from the upper corner of the culvert to exterior surface of the wall and the placement of a post-tension anchor across the crack. The grid will include a sufficient portion of the foundation and backfill as needed to represent their interaction with the structure. Special interface elements will be used between the wall and the foundation and between the wall and the backfill. The rock foundation will be modeled as a linear elastic material with its properties determined from the laboratory testing program. The backfill soil will be represented as a nonlinear material using the Duncan-Chang hyperbolic model. The parameters for the model will be developed from previous soil tests and correlations with published values. The grid will be evaluated for accuracy and adjustments will be made if found necessary. Using the initial characterizations for foundation, backfill, and concrete, a complete analysis of this monolith will be made so that the accuracy of the model can be assessed. Adjustments to the model may also be necessary at this point. Once the model has been proven to be sufficiently accurate, grids for the other selected monoliths will be generated. This work can be done concurrently with the field investigation and laboratory testing.

After the field investigation and laboratory testing has been completed, the final material characterizations will be made for the analyses. Once the final material characterizations have been completed, each of the three monoliths will be analyzed for the three loading conditions. The results from the three analyses will be processed and evaluated in light of the internal structural integrity of the walls. The results will be presented in a report.

### Phase III - Seismic Stress Analysis

A seismic analysis will be conducted on either Eisenhower or Snell lock depending upon which structure will be subjected to the highest seismic accelerations. If earthquake-ground accelerations are approximately the same, the seismic analysis will be conducted on Eisenhower Lock, since it has the poorest concrete conditions. To determine the strongest ground motions, a geological-seismological investigation will be conducted to provide the peak values of acceleration, velocity, and duration for comparison of earthquake ground shaking between both sites. Time histories (accelerograms) and corresponding response spectra will be provided to represent site-specific cyclic shaking as it would be felt at the structure experiencing the strongest disturbance.

Once the most critical structure is determined, it will be analyzed considering three loading conditions in conjunction with an operating basis earthquake (OBE). The three load cases are: normal operation with upper pool in the chamber; normal operation with lower pool in the chamber; and the maintenance condition with the chamber fully dewatered. Two different typical lock-wall monoliths will be analyzed using two-dimensional (2-D) finite element procedures with a response spectra from the OBE. These analyses will consider the 2-D dynamic behavior of the structure, hydrodynamic response of the water in the lock, and the dynamic lateral earth pressures. The active dynamic soil pressures will be computed using the Mononobe-Oakbe equation, and the passive pressures will be computed from either a Coulomb or log spiral analysis. The foundation of the lock will be considered rigid. Static stresses from Phase II will be used with the dynamic stresses in order to determine the total state of stress within the structures.

These analyses will provide a preliminary structural evaluation of this structure for a seismic event of the site. If the total state of stress is within the allowable limits of the material, no further seismic stress analyses will be necessary. However, if these analyses indicate that cracking is likely, a seismic analysis using a time-history acceleration record and a nonlinear concrete model should be considered. Such an analysis is beyond the scope of work for this study and would require additional funds.

Mr. Mosher will be the WES point of contact for the study. He will also be the principal investigator for the static analysis. Dr. Hall will be the principal investigator for the seismic analysis. Dr. Krinitzsky will be responsible for conducting the geological-seismological investigation. Dr. Denson will be responsible for overseeing WES personnel performing the logging and inspection of core at the site and directing the concrete testing program.

#### 4. SCHEDULE SUMMARY

The following is a summary of the schedule for the completion of the structural evaluation.

<u>TASK</u>	<u>START DATE</u>	<u>COMPLETE DATE</u>
Notice to Proceed	-----	1/29/90
Initial Site Visit	2/20/90	2/22/90
Prepare Detailed Scope of Work	2/22/90	4/9/90
Field Investigation	5/1/90	10/15/90
Static Analysis	5/1/90	4/15/91
Seismic Analysis	5/1/90	4/15/91

<u>TASK</u>	<u>START DATE</u>	<u>COMPLETE DATE</u>
Draft Report	4/1/91	5/15/91
Review Period	5/15/91	6/15/91
Final Report	5/15/91	7/15/91

#### 5. FINAL REPORT

The Buffalo District will be responsible for preparing the final report. The report will summarize all work which took place during the evaluation and review recommendations relating to future maintenance of the locks. The reports generated by WES will be appendices to the main report. The report will be created in draft format for technical review by OCE, NCD, WES, and Buffalo District personnel. Review comments will be addressed and when required will be incorporated into the final report. Following a short Corps review, the final document will be forwarded to SLSDC.

#### 6. SUMMARY OF COSTS

Following is a summary of costs necessary to conduct the study:

Drilling, sampling, borehole camera work, and other misc. field work (Mobile District)	\$116,000
Site engineer/geologist (WES)	30,000
Laboratory testing program (WES)	40,000
Static analysis (WES)	165,000
Seismic analysis (WES)	152,000
Project management (Buffalo District)	24,000
Final report and coordination (Buffalo District)	34,000
OCE technical assistance	3,000
NCD technical assistance	6,000
<b>TOTAL STUDY COST</b>	<b><u>\$570,000</u></b>

**APPENDIX B: FIELD BORING LOGS**

DRILLING LOG		DIVISION	INSTALLATION		SHEET 1 OF 11 SHEETS	
1. PROJECT EVALUATION OF EISENHOWER AND SNELL LOCKS			10. SIZE AND TYPE OF BIT 7 3/4 INCH		11. DATUM FOR ELEVATION SHOWN (TBM or MSL) US LAKE SURVEY (USLS) - MSL 251.5'	
2. LOCATION (Coordinates or Station) MONOLITH: N-53 LOCK STATION 328.62			12. MANUFACTURER'S DESIGNATION OF DRILL DIAMOND A			
3. DRILLING AGENCY MOBILE DISTRICT			13. TOTAL NO. OF OVER-BURDEN SAMPLES TAKEN		DISTURBED	UNDISTURBED
4. HOLE NO. (As shown on drawing title and Title number) N-53			14. TOTAL NUMBER CORE BOXES		29	
5. NAME OF DRILLER CARL MOON			15. ELEVATION GROUND WATER			
6. DIRECTION OF HOLE <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> VERTICAL <input type="checkbox"/> INCLINED _____ DEG. FROM VERT.			16. DATE HOLE		STARTED	COMPLETED
7. THICKNESS OF OVERBURDEN 0			17. ELEVATION TOP OF HOLE		251.5	
8. DEPTH DRILLED INTO ROCK 10'			18. TOTAL CORE RECOVERY FOR BORING			
9. TOTAL DEPTH OF HOLE 120.4'			19. SIGNATURE OF INSPECTOR M.EILEEN GLYN			
ELEVATION	DEPTH	LEGEND	CLASSIFICATION OF MATERIALS (Description)	% CORE RECOVERY	BOX OR SAMPLE NO.	REMARKS (Drilling fluid, water, loss, depth of weathering, etc., if significant)
251.5			0.0' - 1.3' GOOD CONCRETE MOSTLY SM. AGG. 1 - 3 cm LONG. VERTICAL CRACK ALMOST CONTINUOUS ABUNDANT AIR 1 mm - 1 cm DIA.			0.0' - 2.5' 1 PC. 1.3'
251	1			56	1	
250	2		1.3' - 2.2' GOOD, SOLID CONCRETE. VERTICAL CRACKS CONTINUOUS. ABUNDANT ENTRP. AIR 1 mm - 5 mm DIA.	50		1.4' - 2.5' DRILLED OVER REMAINING CORE IN HOLE.
249			2.2' - 2.5' RUBBLE	100	2.5	1 PC. 2.4'
248	3		2.5' - 4.9' GOOD CONCRETE SOUNDS DULL WHEN HIT, ABUNDANT AIR 1 mm - 5 mm VERTICAL CRACK AT TOP. AGG. MOSTLY SMALL, UP TO 10 cm AVG. 2 cm	100		
247	4				2	
246	5		4.9' - 7.4' GOOD CONCRETE AS ABOVE, EXCEPT FOR VERTICAL HAIRLINE FX. USUALLY AROUND AGG. OCC. THRU AGG. CRACKS HOLD WATER LONGER THAN MASS. T SHAPED STEEL AT 5.5'	84		4.9' - 7.4' 1 PC. 2.0'
245	6				6.9	
244	7		7.4' - 8.9' GOOD CONCRETE ENTRP. AIR 1 mm - 5 mm DIA. SOUNDS DULL WHEN STRUCK.		3	7.4' - 9.9' 1 PC. 2.0'
243	8			87		
242	9					9.9' - 17.6'
	10					

RMO58047 SYS 2 graphics by VISUAL PRODUCTS SECTION - IFL for INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY LABORATORY - WES

DRILLING LOG (Cont Sheet)		ELEVATION TOP OF HOLE		USLS		Hole No. N-53	
PROJECT			INSTALLATION			SHEET 2	
EVALUATION OF EISENHOWER AND SNELL LOCKS			EISENHOWER LOCK			Of 11 SHEETS	
ELEVATION	DEPTH	LEGEND	CLASSIFICATION OF MATERIALS <i>(Descriptive)</i>	% CORE RECOV- ERY	BOX OR SAMPLE NO.	REMARKS <i>(Coring time, water loss, depth of weathering, etc. if significant)</i>	
			8.9' - 15.0' LT. GRAY, GOOD CONCRETE ENTRP. AIR 1mm - 5 mm SOUNDS DULL WHEN STRUCK		10.7	9.9' - 17.6'	
	11					PC.	1.8'
							4.3'
	12				4	REC.	6.1'
						LOSS	2.6'
	13					GAIN	1.0'
	14						
	15		15.0' - 22.7' GOOD CONCRETE AS ABOVE ENTRP. AIR 0.5 mm - 1 cm DIA. 2 mm AVG. 1 G.		14.8		
	16				5		
	17					17.6' - 25.4'	
						2 PC.	
	18					6.5'	
					18.4	1.3'	
	19					REC.	7.8'
						LOSS	2.7'
	20					GAIN	2.6'
	21				6		
	22						

INFO-048 SYS 2 © 1985 by VISUAL PRODUCTS SECTION - IITL for INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY LABORATORY - WES

RWD9-048 SYS 2 GRAPHIC BY VISUAL PRODUCTS SECTION - ILL. for INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY LABORATORY - WES

DRILLING LOG (Cont Sheet)		ELEVATION TOP OF HOLE		251.5 USLS		Hole No. N-53			
PROJECT			INSTALLATION			SHEET 3			
EVALUATION OF EISENHOWER AND SNELL LOCKS			EISENHOWER LOCK			OF 11 SHEETS			
ELEVATION	DEPTH	LEGEND	CLASSIFICATION OF MATERIALS (Description)	% CORE RECOVERY	BOX OR SAMPLE NO.	REMARKS (Drilling time, water loss, depth of weathering, etc., if significant)			
	23		22.7' - 28.5' GOOD CONCRETE, SOUNDS DRUMMY ENTRP. AIR 1mm - 1cm DIA. 2 - 3 mm ABUNDANT		22.7				
	24				7				
	25								
	26						26.3	25.4' - 33.8' 1 PC. 5.7' LOSS 3.5' GAIN 2.7'	
	27								
	28								
	29			MB	28.5' - 38.8' GOOD CONCRETE ABUNDANT ENTRP. AIR 1 - 3 mm. MODERATE AMT. OF 1cm DIA., AIR BUBBS USUALLY ADJACENT TO SIDES OF AGG.		8		
	30							30.4	
	31								
	32							9	
	33								
	34					33.8' - 38.8'			

DRILLING LOG (Cont Sheet)		ELEVATION TOP OF HOLE		USLS		Hole No. N-53	
PROJECT			INSTALLATION			SHEET 4	
EVALUATION OF EISENHOWER AND SNELL LOCKS			EISENHOWER LOCK			OF 11 SHEETS	
ELEVATION	DEPTH	LEGEND	CLASSIFICATION OF MATERIALS (Description)	% CORE RECOVERY	BOX OR SAMPLE NO.	REMARKS (Drilling fluid, water loss, depth of weathering, etc. if applicable)	
		MB			34.6	33.8' - 38.8'	2 PC. 7.6'
35						REC. 10.0'	LOSS 0.0'
36						GAIN 5.0'	
37					10		
38							
39		MB	38.8' - 43.0' GOOD CONCRETE AIR 1mm DIA. THRU OUT OCC. 1cm DIA.		39.4	38.8' - 46.2'	2 PC. 0.6'
40						REC. 4.2'	LOSS 0.0'
41					25		
42							
43		MB	43.0' - 52.6' GOOD CONCRETE ABUNDANT AIR 1mm DIA. - 2.5 cm IRREGULAR SHAPE AVG. 1 - 2 mm SOUNDS DRUMMY		43.7	43.0' - 52.6'	BEATEN OUT OF CORE BARREL BIT STUCK ON TIGHT DON'T USE FOR TESTING. WELL BROKEN.
44		MB					
45					12		
46							

MICROSOFT SYS 2 © 1985 by VISUAL PRODUCTS SECTION - ILL. for INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY LABORATORY - WES

DRILLING LOG (Cont Sheet)		ELEVATION TOP OF HOLE		251.5 USLS		Hole No. N-53	
PROJECT				INSTALLATION		SHEET 5	
EVALUATION OF EISENHOWER AND SNELL LOCKS				EISENHOWER LOCK		OF 11 SHEETS	
ELEVATION	DEPTH	LEGEND	CLASSIFICATION OF MATERIALS (Description)	% CORE RECOVERY	BOX OR SAMPLE NO.	REMARKS (Coring time, water loss, depth of weathering, etc., if significant)	
	47				12	46.2' - 52.5'	
						8 PC. 0.7'	
						0.7'	
						1.0'	
						1.0'	
						1.2'	
						1.4'	
						1.8'	
						0.7'	
	48	MB			48.2	0.4' CHIPS	
						9.5' TOTAL	
						GAIN 3.6'	
	49			175			
	50				13		
	51						
	52		BROKEN 52.0' - 52.5'		52.5		
	53		52.5' - 61.1' GOOD CONCRETE ENTRP. AIR 1mm - 1.5 cm DIA, AVG. 1 - 3 mm DIA. SOUNDS DULL WHEN STRUCK. GOOD AGG. DIST.			52.5' - 61.1'	
						7 PC. 4.5'	
						1.3'	
						0.8'	
						0.4'	
						0.6'	
						0.5'	
	54				14	0.7' BROKEN	
						8.6'	
						DIFFICULT TIME RETRIEVING CORE.	
	55			100			
	56						
	57				57.0		
						BOTTOM OF RUN BROKEN	
	58						

REPRODUCED BY VISUAL PRODUCTS SECTION - ILL. for INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY LABORATORY - WES

DRILLING LOG (Cont Sheet)		ELEVATION TOP OF HOLE		251.5 USLS		Hole No. N-53	
PROJECT				INSTALLATION		SHEET 6	
EVALUATION OF EISENHOWER AND SNELL LOCKS				EISENHOWER LOCK		OF 11 SHEETS	
ELEVATION	DEPTH	LEGEND	CLASSIFICATION OF MATERIALS (Description)	% CORE RECOVERY	BOX OR SAMPLE NO.	REMARKS (Drilling time, water loss, depth of weathering, etc., if significant)	
59					15		
60							
61			VERTICAL BREAK 60.4' - 61.1'		61.1		
62			61.1' - 66.1' GOOD CONCRETE ENTRP. AIR 1 mm - 5 mm DIA., AVG. 2 mm, SLIGHTLY LESS AIR THAN ABOVE. 1 LG. PC. AGG. 5" DIA. AT 63.4' REMAINS: GOOD DIST.			61.1' - 71.1' 7 PC. 0.7' 1.2' 1.3' 1.8'	RUN FELL OUT OF BARREL ON TO GROUND.
63							
64					16		
65				100			
66			66.1' - 71.4' GOOD CONCRETE ENTRP. AIR		66.1		
67			SAME AS ABOVE				
68					17		
69							
70							

RAC9032 BYS 2 graphics by VISUAL PRODUCTS SECTION - IFL for INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY LABORATORY - WES

DRILLING LOG (Cont Sheet)		ELEVATION TOP OF HOLE		USLS		Hole No. N-53	
PROJECT				INSTALLATION		SHEET 7	
EVALUATION OF EISENHOWER AND SNELL LOCKS				EISENHOWER LOCK		OF 11 SHEETS	
ELEVATION	DEPTH	LEGEND	CLASSIFICATION OF MATERIALS (Description)	% CORE RECOVERY	BOX OR SAMPLE NO.	REMARKS (Drilling time, water loss, depth of weathering, etc., if applicable)	
					70.6		
71			BROKEN AT 71.0'				
			71.1' - 76.5' GOOD CONCRETE				71.1' - 81.0'
			ENTRP. AIR 1 mm - 1 cm				2 PC.
			DIA. OCC. 2 cm DIA. AIR				
			AVG. SIZE OF AGG.				
			INCREASED TO 2 - 3 IN.				
			FREQ. LG. PC. AGG.				
			UP TO 6"				
72							
					18		
73							
		MB					
74							
							DRILLER 80.7' - 70.9'
75							
		MB			75.3		
76							
		MB					
77			76.5' - 81.0' POOR CONCRETE	100			4 PC. 2.8'
			POOR BONDING W/ AGG.				2.6'
			POSSIBLE MICRO FRACTURING				3.6'
			THROUGHOUT CEMENT.				0.9'
					19		9.9' TOTAL
78							
		MB					
79							
		MB					
80							
		MB					
81			81.0' - 81.7' MOD. GOOD				
			CONCRETE				81.0' - 91.0'
		?					
		LFT	81.7' - 86.5' POOR CONCRETE.				
			LOOKS OLD, POOR BONDING				
			W/AGG.				
82							
					20		

8009-453 SYS 2 (Revised by VISUAL PRODUCTS SECTION - ILL for INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY LABORATORY - WES)

DRILLING LOG (Cont Sheet)		ELEVATION TOP OF HOLE		USLS		Hole No. N-53	
PROJECT			INSTALLATION		SHEET 8		
EVALUATION OF EISENHOWER AND SNELL LOCKS			EISENHOWER LOCK		OF 11 SHEETS		
ELEVATION	DEPTH	LEGEND	CLASSIFICATION OF MATERIALS (Description)	% CORE RECOVERY	BOX OR SAMPLE NO.	REMARKS (Drilling time, water level, depth of weathering, etc., if applicable)	
83			AGG. SIZE AVG. DEC. TO 2.5 cm SQ. 81.5' - 86.5' SMALL. RED PARTICLES LOOKS LIKE BRICK IN CEMENT. CRACKS THROUGH OUT. LONGEST PC. REC. 1.0'		83.3		
84			ABUNDANT ENTRP. AIR 1mm DIA. AVG.				
85					21		
86			86.5' - 91.0' GOOD CONCRETE AVG. AGG. SIZE INCRE. TO 4.0 cm BETTER BONDING W/ AGG. THAN ABOVE. LESS ENTRP. AIR DIA = 1mm - 1cm AT CRACK AT 86.5'	100			
87					87.3		
88							
89					22		
90							
91			91.0' - 95.9' GOOD CONCRETE ENTRP. AIR 2 mm - 5 mm OCC. IRREG. BUB 1 - 2 cm LONG. GOOD CONSOLIDATION GOOD AGG. DIST.		81.0	91.0' - 101.0'	
92							
93				50	23		
94							

EM505054 SYS 2 graphics by VISUAL PRODUCTS SECTION - ILL for INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY LABORATORY - WES

MODR025 SYS 2 Graphics by VISUAL PRODUCTS SECTION - IIT for INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY LABORATORY - WES

DRILLING LOG (Cont Sheet)		ELEVATION TOP OF HOLE		USLS		Hole No. N-53	
PROJECT			INSTALLATION			SHEET 9	
EVALUATION OF EISENHOWER AND SNELL LOCKS			EISENHOWER LOCK			OF 11 SHEETS	
ELEVATION	DEPTH	LEGEND	CLASSIFICATION OF MATERIALS (Description)	% CORE RECOVERY	BOX OR SAMPLE NO.	REMARKS (Drilling time, water loss, depth of weathering, etc. if significant)	
95							
96			95.9' - 101.1' GOOD CONCRETE ENTRP. AIR 1 mm - 5 mm		95.9		
97							
98					24		
99							
100					100.2		
101			101.1' - 102.0' CEMENT DEGRADED PITTED.			101.0' - 105.4'	
102			102.0' - 104.8' MOD. GOOD CONCRETE. CEMENT DEGRADED PITTED THRU OUT HIGH CONCENTRATION OF SMALLER AGG. ARE SIZE 3 cm LONG.		25	8 PC. 0.7' 1.3' 0.4' 1.5' 0.4' 0.6' 0.3' 0.9'	
103				140		REDO 95.9' - 102.0'	
104					104.8		
105			104.8' - 110.4' MOD. GOOD CONCRETE. SAME AS ABOVE, SOUNDS V. DRUMMY.				
106					26	105.4' - 111.9' 1 PC. 2.8'	

ENG FORM 1636-A PREVIOUS EDITIONS ARE OBSOLETE.  
 MAR 71

PROJECT  
 EISENHOWER '90

HOLE NO.  
 N-53

RMS9058 SYS 2 Graphics by VISUAL PRODUCTS SECTION - ITL for INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY LABORATORY - WES

DRILLING LOG (Cont Sheet)		ELEVATION TOP OF HOLE		251.5 USLS		Hole No. N-53	
PROJECT			INSTALLATION			SHEET 10	
EVALUATION OF EISENHOWER AND SNELL LOCKS			EISENHOWER LOCK			OF 11 SHEETS	
ELEVATION	DEPTH	LEGEND	CLASSIFICATION OF MATERIALS (Description)	% CORE RECOVERY	BOX OR SAMPLE NO.	REMARKS (Drilling time, water loss, depth of weathering, etc., if significant)	
	107					105.4' - 111.7' WENT BACK OVER CORE LEFT IN HOLE AFTER MOD. SPRING	
	108					2 PC. REC. 5.6' 1.6'	
		MB		95	108.6		
	109						
	110				27		
		MB	CONCRETE/ROCK INTERFACE NO BOND				
	111		110.4' - 112.0' MISSING SIDE OF JT.: DOLOMITE V. HARD. BLACK/GRAY V. FINE LAMINATED				
	112				112.0		
		MB	112.0' - 120.4' V. GOOD V. HARD, BLACK/GRAY LAMINATED DOLO. INTRBD. W/SHALE. CLAY LAYER .03' THICK AT 113.4' SHALE. LAYERS AT ALL BREAKS .05' - 0.2' THICK.			112.0' - 120.4' 6 PC. 1.6' 0.05' MS 1.3' 0.05' MS 1.7' 0.05' MS 1.1' 0.2' 0.05' MS 1.1' 0.2' CHIPS	
	113						
		MB					
	114				28	ALSO REC. 1.2 OF LEFT SIDE OF VERTICAL FX. AT 110.4' - 112.0'	
	115						
		MB					
	116						
		MB			116.6		
	117		116.6' - 119.4' MOTTLED DOLO. CAL. BLEBS UP TO 4 cm LONG, 3 mm THICK				
		MB					
	118				29		
		MB					

DRILLING LOG (Cont Sheet)		ELEVATION TOP OF HOLE		251.5 USLS		Hole No. N-53	
PROJECT			INSTALLATION			SHEET 11	
EVALUATION OF EISENHOWER AND SNELL LOCKS			EISENHOWER LOCK			OF 11 SHEETS	
ELEVATION a	DEPTH b	LEGEND c	CLASSIFICATION OF MATERIALS (Description) d	% CORE RECOVERY e	BOX OR SAMPLE NO. f	REMARKS (Identify sample location, etc. if warranted - ... if significant) g	
	119	MB	119.2' - 119.4' SHALE BROKEN				
	120					120.4' - BOTTOM OF HOLE. DID NOT RECOVER LAST 1.0' - BAREL WAS FULL. - BROKE SAMPLE IN HOLE AT SHALE BED/ DOLOMITE INTERFACE - DIFFICULT TIME RETRIVING CORE. FROM THIS HOLE, FROM WED 30 JUNE TIL FINISH 4 JUNE.	

DRILLING LOG		DIVISION	INSTALLATION		SHEET 1 OF 11 SHEETS	
1. PROJECT <b>EVALUATION OF EISENHOWER AND SNELL LOCKS</b>			10. SIZE AND TYPE OF BIT <b>7 3/4" DIAMOND</b>		11. DATUM FOR ELEVATION SHOWN (TBM or MSU) <b>USLS - MSL</b>	
2. LOCATION (Coordinates or Station) <b>MONOLITH: N-57 LOCK STATION 506.00</b>			12. MANUFACTURER'S DESIGNATION OF DRILL <b>FALING 1500</b>		13. TOTAL NO. OF OVER-BURDEN SAMPLES TAKEN DISTURBED: 0 UNDISTURBED: 0	
3. DRILLING AGENCY <b>MOBILE DISTRICT</b>			14. TOTAL NUMBER CORE BOXES <b>30</b>		15. ELEVATION GROUND WATER	
4. HOLE NO. (As shown on drawing title and File Number) <b>N-57</b>			16. DATE HOLE STARTED <b>5 JUNE 90</b>		COMPLETED <b>8 JUNE 90</b>	
5. NAME OF DRILLER <b>CARL MOON</b>			17. ELEVATION TOP OF HOLE <b>251.5'</b>		18. TOTAL CORE RECOVERY FOR BORING <b>X</b>	
6. DIRECTION OF HOLE <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> VERTICAL <input type="checkbox"/> INCLINED _____ DEG. FROM VERT.			19. SIGNATURE OF INSPECTOR <b>M.EILEEN GLYNN</b>			
7. THICKNESS OF OVERBURDEN <b>0</b>			8. DEPTH DRILLED INTO ROCK <b>12.4</b>		9. TOTAL DEPTH OF HOLE <b>125.0</b>	
ELEVATION	DEPTH	LEGEND	CLASSIFICATION OF MATERIALS (Description)	% CORE RECOVERY	BOX OR SAMPLE NO.	REMARKS (Drilling fluid, water loss, depth of weathering, etc. if significant)
251.5			0.0' - 3.0' GOOD NEW CONCRETE, ENTRP. AIR 1mm - 1cm DIA. MOSTLY V. SMALL AIR BUBS. 0.4' - 0.8' MISSING BECAUSE IT WAS BEATEN - BROKEN OUT OF CORE BARREL CATCHER.	100		0.0' - 0.8' 1 PC. 0.4' RUBBLE 0.4'
	1					
	2			100	1	0.8' - 3.0' 1 PC. 1.2'
	3	MB				
	4		3.0' - 4.7' GOOD NEW CONCRETE,	80	4.7	3.0' - 5.4' 1 PC. 1.9'
	5		4.7' - 7.1' GOOD NEW CONCRETE, GOOD CONSOL. WHITE RXN. MTL. ON BREAK 4.7' AIR ENTRP. 1mm - 5mm DIA. AVG. 1mm			5.4' - 7.1' REC. 2 PC. 1.8 4.6
	6	MB			2	
	7	MB				
	8		7.1' - 8.2' GOOD CONCRETE, PC. OF STEEL T-SHAPE AT 7.2' - AIR 1mm - 2mm DIA.		8.2	7.1' - 9.4' HAVING TROUBLE LIFTING SAMPLE 1ST. TRY REC. 0.7' 2 ND. TRY 0.5' QUIT
	9				3	
241.5	10					

M050002 SYS 2 © 1988 BY VESCAL PRODUCTS SECTION - ILL. FOR INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY LABORATORY - IRES

DRILLING LOG (Cont Sheet)		ELEVATION TOP OF HOLE		Hole No. N-57		
PROJECT			INSTALLATION		SHEET 2	
EVALUATION OF EISENHOWER AND SNELL LOCKS			EISENHOWER LOCK		OF 11 SHEETS	
ELEVATION	DEPTH	LEGEND	CLASSIFICATION OF MATERIALS (Description)	% CORE RECOVERY	BOX OR SAMPLE NO.	REMARKS (Drilling time, water loss, depth of weathering, etc. if applicable)
	11	MB	8.2' - 17.3' GOOD CONCRETE, WELL CONSOLIDATED GOOD AGG. DIST. ENTRP. AIR 1 mm - 5 mm DIA. NOT ABUNDANT, OCC. LG. BUB 2 cm LONG.		3	94.0' - 17.3' 4 PC. 2.0' 5.7' 0.1' CHPS 1.1' 0.3' 9.2'
	12	MB				11.8
	13					
	14			114	4	
	15					
	16	MB			15.8	BOTTOM 0.3' WAS BEATEN OUT OF CORE BARREL, DON'T TEST 15.9' - 17.3'
	17	MB				
	18	MB	17.3' - 26.0' GOOD CONCRETE, ENTRP. AIR : MOSTLY SMALL. 1 mm - 2 mm, OCC. 1 cm - 2 cm DIA.		5	17.3' - 26.0' 3 PC. 4.2' 1.4' 3.0'
	19					
231.5	20	MB		100	19.9	
	21					
	22	MB			6	

8002-003 SYS 2 Provided by VISUAL PRODUCTS SECTION - ILL for INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY LABORATORY - IES

DRILLING LOG (Cont Sheet)		ELEVATION TOP OF HOLE 215.5		Hole No. N-57		
PROJECT EVALUATION OF EISENHOWER AND SNELL LOCKS			INSTALLATION EISENHOWER LOCK		SHEET 3 OF 11 SHEETS	
ELEVATION	DEPTH	LEGEND	CLASSIFICATION OF MATERIALS (Qualities)	% CORE RECOVERY	BOX OR SAMPLE NO.	REMARKS (Drilling time, water loss, depth of weathering, etc. if different)
	23	MB	- MB AT V. LG. BOULDER 23.0' - 26.0' LG. ENTRP. AIR MORE FREQ.		6	
	24					
	25	MB			24.8	
	26	MB	26.0' - 35.5' GOOD CONCRETE, GOOD CONSOLIDATION.			26.0 - 35.5' 2 PC. 1.0' 8.5'
	27		- BREAK AT LG. BOULDER POSSIBLE LIFT LINE ? (27.0')		7	
	28					
	29	MB			29.3	
221.5	30		ENTRP. AIR 1 mm - 5 mm OCC. ELONGATED BUBS AT 29.6'	100		
	31					
	32				8	
	33	MB				
	34					

METHODS - SITS 2 - GRADES BY VISUAL PRODUCTS SECTION - ILL. BY INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY LABORATORY - WES

RMS-0085 SYS 4 Graphs by VISUAL PRODUCTS SECTION - ILL for INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY LABORATORY - WES

DRILLING LOG (Cont Sheet)		ELEVATION TOP OF HOLE 251.5		Hole No. N-57			
PROJECT EISENHOWER LOCK			INSTALLATION		SHEET 4 OF 11 SHEETS		
ELEVATION	DEPTH	LEGEND	CLASSIFICATION OF MATERIALS (Description)	% CORE RECOVERY	BOX OR SAMPLE NO.	REMARKS (Drilling time, water loss, depth of weathering, etc. if applicable)	
						34.1	
	35	MB	35.5'-45.5' GOOD CONCRETE. AGG. MOSTLY SMALL 1 cm- 4 cm AVE. 2 cm ENTRP. AIR 1 mm-1 cm AVE. NOT ABUNDANT.			35.5'-45.5' 5 PC. 2.50' 3.00' 2.60' 1.30' 0.60' <hr/> 10.00'	
		MB					
	36						9
	37						
	38	MB					38.0
	39						
211.5'	40			100	10		
	41	MB					
	42	MB			42.3		
	43						
	44						
	45	LIFT?					
	46	MB					
						45.5'-55.0'	

DRILLING LOG (Cont Sheet)		ELEVATION TOP OF HOLE 251.5		Hole No. N-57		
PROJECT EISENHOWER LOCK			INSTALLATION		SHEET 5 OF 11 SHEETS	
ELEVATION	DEPTH	LEGEND	CLASSIFICATION OF MATERIALS (Description)	% CORE RECOV- ERY	BOX OR SAMPLE NO.	REMARKS (Drilling time, water loss, depth of weathering, etc. if applicable)
	47		45.5'-52.8' GOOD CONCRETE. ENTRP. AIR 1mm-1 cm THROUGHOUT.			45.5'-55.0' 2 PC. 4.50' 5.00'
	48				12	
	49					
201.5'	50	LIFT	BREAK AT 50.0' IS PLANAR BUT A LITTLE ROUGH. 50.0'- 52.8' - MINOR DEGRADATION AROUND AGG. NOT SEEN ABOVE OR BELOW.		50.0	
	51	JT. ?		100		
	52				13	
	53	MB	52.8'-55.0' GOOD CONCRETE. ENTRP. AIR 1m-3 mm DIA. THROUGHOUT.			
	54					
	55	LIFT?	54.8'-55.0' BROKEN AND BEATEN OUT OF BARREL. 55.0'-65.0' GOOD CONCRETE. ENTRP. AIR 1mm-1 cm DIA. OCC. 2 cm IRREG. BUB.		54.8	55.0'-65.0' 3 PC. 6.40' 1.90' 1.70'
	56					BOTTOM OF RUN WAS BEATEN W/HAMMER TO LOOSEN. DO NOT TEST 63.5'-65.0'.
	57				14	
	58					

RADSSORS SYS 4 Graphics by VISUAL PRODUCTS SECTION - ITL for INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY LABORATORY - WES

DRILLING LOG (Cont Sheet)		ELEVATION TOP OF HOLE 251.5		Hole No. N-57		
PROJECT EISENHOWER LOCK			INSTALLATION		SHEET 6 OF 11 SHEETS	
ELEVATION	DEPTH	LEGEND	CLASSIFICATION OF MATERIALS (Description)	% CORE RECOV- ERY	BOX OR SAMPLE NO.	REMARKS (Drilling time, water loss, depth of weathering, etc., if significant)
191.5'	59	COLD JT?	58.8'-61.4' LESS ABUNDANT ENTRP. AIR 1mm-2 mm, OCC. 1 cm DIA.	100	58.8	
	60				15	
	61	LIFT				
	62	JT?				
	63	MB			63.3	
	64	MB				
	65	MB	65.0'-75.0' GOOD CONCRETE. ENTRP. AIR 1mm-5 mm DIA. OCC. 1 cm DIA., GOOD CONSOLIDATION.	100	16	65.0'-75.0' 5 PC. 2.80' 2.20' 1.20' 2.00' 1.50' 0.30' CHIPS
	66					
	67					
	68	MB			67.8	
	69					
181.5'	70	LIFT?			17	

RUCS-087 SYS 4 graphics by VISUAL PRODUCTS SECTION - ITL for INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY LABORATORY - WES

DRILLING LOG (Cont Sheet)		ELEVATION TOP OF HOLE 251.5		Hole No. N-57		
PROJECT EISENHOWER LOCK			INSTALLATION		SHEET 7 OF 11 SHEETS	
ELEVATION	DEPTH	LEGEND	CLASSIFICATION OF MATERIALS (Description)	% CORE RECOVERY	BOX OR SAMPLE NO.	REMARKS (Drilling time, water loss, depth of weathering, etc., if applicable)
	71	MB			71.2	
	72			100		
	73	MB			18	
	74					DO NOT TEST 73.2'-75.0'
	75	LIFT?	74.7'-75.0' BROKEN 75.0'-85.0' GOOD CONCRETE. ENTRP. AIR 1mm-5 mm THRU OUT, OCC. 2 cm LONG IRREG. BUB.		75.0	75.0'-85.0' 4.20' 4.20' 1.20' 0.40' <hr/> 10.00'
	76					
	77				19	
	78			100		
	79	MB			79.2	
161.5'	80		TWO PARALLEL VERTICAL CRACKS 80.0'-81.8'.			
	81				20	
	82					

MICROBUB STS 4 Graphite by VISUAL PRODUCTS SECTION - ILL. for INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY LABORATORY - IBS

8403-008 SYS 4 Graphics by VISUAL PRODUCTS SECTION - ILL. for INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY LABORATORY - WES

DRILLING LOG (Cont Sheet)		ELEVATION TOP OF HOLE 251.5		Hole No. N-57		
PROJECT EISENHOWER LOCK			INSTALLATION		SHEET 8 OF 11 SHEETS	
ELEVATION	DEPTH	LEGEND	CLASSIFICATION OF MATERIALS (Description)	% CORE RECOVERY	BOX OR SAMPLE NO.	REMARKS (Drilling time, water level, depth of weathering, etc., if significant)
	83	MB	82.3'-82.7' ROUND GROUTED HOLE. BROWN CEMENT. V. SANDY ONLY ON ONE SIDE.			
	84	MB	CRACK AT 84.0'  STEEL BAR 1.5 cm DIA. ONE SIDE ONLY			
	85	LIFT?	85.0'-95.0' GOOD CONCRETE. GOOD CONSOLIDATION ENTRP. AIR 1mm-3 mm DIA. OCC. 1-2 cm LONG IRREG. BUB.		21	85.0'-95.0' 1.90' 5.90' 1.00' 0.40' CHIP 0.30' CHIP 0.40' 0.10' CHIP
	86					
	87	MB				
	88					
	89					
151.5'	90			100		BOTTOM BEATEN OUT OF CORE BARREL. DO NOT TEST LAST 22' OF RUN.
	91				22	
	92					
	93	MB				
	94					

DRILLING LOG (Cont Sheet)		ELEVATION TOP OF HOLE 251.5		Hole No. N-57		
PROJECT EISENHOWER LOCK			INSTALLATION		SHEET 9 OF 11 SHEETS	
ELEVATION	DEPTH	LEGEND	CLASSIFICATION OF MATERIALS (Description)	% CORE RECOVERY	BOX OR SAMPLE NO.	REMARKS (Drilling time, water loss, depth of weathering, etc., if significant)
		MB				
		MB				
	95	MB	95.0'-103.0' GOOD CONCRETE. GOOD CONSOLIDATION, GOOD AGG. DIST. ENTRP. AIR 1mm-5 mm DIA., OCC. 1 cm DIA.		23	95.0'-105.0' 4 PC. 7.00' 1.80' 0.80' 0.40'
	96					
	97	MB	MINOR DEGRADATION AROUND AGG. 101.5'-103.0'.		97.0	
	98					
	99	MB				
	100				24	
141.5'	101					
	102	MB	BREAK AT LG BOULDER 102.0'		102.0	
	103					
	104		103.0'-105.0' POOR CONCRETE. LG. VOIDS. STRONG.		25	
	105					
	106		105.0'-105.4' POOR CONCRETE. STRONG, BUT LG. VOIDS.			105.0'-115.0' 2 PC. POKER CHIP BROKEN

MDS-080 BY 4 graphs by VISUAL PRODUCTS SECTION - ILL. for INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY LABORATORY - WES

DRILLING LOG (Cont Sheet)		ELEVATION TOP OF HOLE 251.5		Hole No. N-57		
PROJECT EISENHOWER LOCK			INSTALLATION			
			SHEET 10 OF 11 SHEETS			
ELEVATION a	DEPTH b	LEGEND c	CLASSIFICATION OF MATERIALS (Description) d	% CORE RECOVERY e	BOX OR SAMPLE NO. f	REMARKS (Drilling fluid, water loss, depth of weathering, etc., if applicable) g
		MB	105.7'-112.6' GOOD CONCRETE. GOOD CONSOLIDATION ENTRP. AIR 2 mm-5 mm DIA. OCC. 1 cm DIA. AIR LESS ABUNDANT AT 111.0'-112.6'.			105.0'-115.0' 2 PC. 3.70' 4.70' CHIPS 1.60'
	107					
	108					
		MB			26	
	109					
131.1'	110			100		
	111	MB				
					111.3	
	112					
		MB				
	113		112.6'-113.3' GOOD DOLOMITE. HARD. GRAY.		27	
	114		113.3'-115.0' POOR ROCK. DOLOMITE INTERBEDDED W/SHALE. EVERY 0.1' TO 0.4'. MOSTLY BROKEN - SOME POKER CHIP RECOVERY.			
	115		NOT ONE PC. INTACT 113.3'-115.0'.		115.0	
	116		115.0'-115.3' SHALE WEAK. BLACK POKER CHIP 115.3'- 117.1' DOLOMITE V. HARD.			115.0'-125.0' 16 PC. VERTICAL BREAK AT 115.3'-116.2'
	117		117.1'-119.0' DOLOMITE INTERBED W/SHALE BEDS AND STRINGERS.		28	
	118					

REVISION BY 4    DRAWN BY VISUAL PRODUCTS SECTION - ILL.    FOR INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY LABORATORY - WES

RACS-002 SYS 4 graphics by VISUAL PRODUCTS SECTION - ITL for INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY LABORATORY - WES

DRILLING LOG (Cont Sheet)		ELEVATION TOP OF HOLE 251.5		Hole No. N-57			
PROJECT EISENHOWER LOCK			INSTALLATION		SHEET 11 OF 11 SHEETS		
ELEVATION	DEPTH	LEGEND	CLASSIFICATION OF MATERIALS <i>(Description)</i>	% CORE RECOVERY	BOX OR SAMPLE NO.	REMARKS <i>(Drilling time, water loss, depth of weathering, etc. if significant)</i>	
	119	MB	119.0'-125.0' DOLOMITE V. HARD LT. GRAY (DRY) BLACK WET. OCC. SHALE STRINGER + BEDS.	100			
	120	MB					
	121	MB MB			29		
	122	MB MB MB					
	123	MB MB			122.8		
	124	MB MB			30		
	125	MB			125.0	BOTTOM OF HOLE.	
	126						
	127						
	128						
	129						
	130						

<b>DRILLING LOG</b>		DIVISION	INSTALLATION <b>EISENHOWER LOCK</b>	SHEET 1 OF 11 SHEETS
1. PROJECT <b>EVALUATION OF EISENHOWER AND SNELL LOCKS</b>			10. SIZE AND TYPE OF BIT <b>6 INCH DIAMOND</b>	
2. LOCATION (Coordinates or Station) <b>MONOLITH: S-17 LOCK STATION 192.50</b>			11. DATUM FOR ELEVATION SHOWN (TBM or MSU) <b>US LAKE SURVEY (USLS) 251.5'</b>	
3. DRILLING AGENCY <b>MOBILE DISTRICT</b>			12. MANUFACTURER'S DESIGNATION OF DRILL <b>FALLING 1500</b>	
4. HOLE NO. (As shown on drawing title and file number) <b>S-17</b>			13. TOTAL NO. OF OVER-BURDEN SAMPLES TAKEN DISTURBED 0 UNDISTURBED 0	
5. NAME OF DRILLER <b>CARL MOON</b>			14. TOTAL NUMBER CORE BOXES <b>30</b>	
6. DIRECTION OF HOLE <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> VERTICAL <input type="checkbox"/> INCLINED _____ DEG. FROM VERT.			15. ELEVATION GROUND WATER	
7. THICKNESS OF OVERBURDEN <b>0</b>			16. DATE HOLE STARTED <b>14 MAY 90</b> COMPLETED <b>19 MAY 90</b>	
8. DEPTH DRILLED INTO ROCK <b>13.2'</b>			17. ELEVATION TOP OF HOLE <b>251.5</b>	
9. TOTAL DEPTH OF HOLE <b>122.8'</b>			18. TOTAL CORE RECOVERY FOR BORING <b>X</b>	
			19. SIGNATURE OF INSPECTOR <b>M.E. LEE GLYN</b>	

ELEVATION	DEPTH	LEGEND	CLASSIFICATION OF MATERIALS (Description)	% CORE RECOVERY	BOX OR SAMPLE NO.	REMARKS (Drilling time, water loss, depth of weathering, etc., if significant)
251.5	1	MB	0.0' - 2.5' GOOD CONCRETE NB V. WEATHERED SURFACE W/IRON STAINING. + ENTRAIN AIR 1mm DIA. 0 cc. ENTRP. AIR THRU OUT MB HAS ENTRAIN BUB = 1mm DIA. THRU OUT	100	1	DRILL TIME = 20 MIN. HYD. PRES = 300 RUN 1 0.0' - 2.5'
	2	MB	2.5' - 5.0' GOOD CONCRETE AGG. EVEN DIST.			DRILL TIME = 20 MIN. HYD. PRES = 300 RUN 2 2.5' - 5.0'
	3	MB	2.5' - 3.5' LARGER ENTRP. AIR 0.5 cm - 2 cm LONG	100	3.8	
	4	MB	3.5' - 5.0' ENTRP. AIR LESS FREQ. (3-5 mm DIA.)			
	5	MB	5.0' - 7.2' GOOD CONCRETE HARD. AIR ENTRP. (1mm-1cm) MB AT LG. AGG.		2	DRILL TIME = 20 MIN. HYD. PRES = 300 RUN 3 5.0' - 7.2'
245.5	6	MB		100		
	7	MB			7.2	
	8	MB	7.2' - 9.7' GOOD CONCRETE HARD. AIR ENTRP. + ENTRAIN. ALONG MB., BREAK AT BOULDER. + WH. CRUST MTL. ON BRK.	100	3	DRILL TIME = 20 MIN. HYD. PRES = 300 RUN 4 7.2' - 9.7'
	9	MB				
241.5	10		SEE NEXT SHEET (2)			

RMO59474 STY 3.2 GRAPHIC BY VISUAL PRODUCTS SECTION - ILL. for INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY LABORATORY - WES

DRILLING LOG (Cont Sheet)		ELEVATION TOP OF HOLE		251.5 USLS		Hole No. S-17	
PROJECT			INSTALLATION			SHEET 2	
EVALUATION OF EISENHOWER AND SNELL LOCKS			EISENHOWER LOCK			OF 11 SHEETS	
ELEVATION	DEPTH	LEGEND	CLASSIFICATION OF MATERIALS (Description)	X CORE RECOVERY	BOX OR SAMPLE NO.	REMARKS (Drilling time, water loss, depth of weathering, etc., if significant)	
	11		9.7' - 14.7' GOOD CONCRETE ENTRP. AIR = 1 cm DIA. THRU OUT 1 LG. BUB AT 10.7' (2 cm DEEP X 2 cm LONG X 1 cm WIDE)	100	3	HYD. PRES = 300 DRILL ACTION : SMOOTH 1 PC. RECOVERED 5.0' RUN 5 9.7' - 14.7'	
	12	MB	ENTRAIN AIR = 1-3 mm DIA. THRU OUT AGG. GOOD DISTR.			11.7	
	13	MB					
	14	MB			4		
	15		14.7' - 18.7' GOOD CONCRETE ABUNDANT ENTRP. AIR = 1 - 2 cm DIA. BREAK AT AGG NOT ACROSS AGG.			14.7' - 24.3' RUN 6	
	16		ENTRAIN AIR = 1-2 mm DIA.			16.2	
	17						
	18			100			
	19	MB	18.7' - 24.3' GOOD CONCRETE LESS ENTRP. AIR		5		
	20					20.7	
	21						
	22						

RMOS4025 SYS 2 graphics by VISUAL PRODUCTS SECTION - ITL for INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY LABORATORY - WES

<b>DRILLING LOG</b>		DIVISION	INSTALLATION <b>EISENHOWER LOCK</b>		SHEET 3 OF 11 SHEETS	
1. PROJECT <b>EVALUATION OF EISENHOWER AND SNELL LOCKS</b>			10. SIZE AND TYPE OF BIT <b>6 INCH DIAMOND</b>			
2. LOCATION (Coordinates or Station) <b>MONOLITH: S-17 LOCK STATION 192.50</b>			11. DATUM FOR ELEVATION SHOWN (TBM or MSL) <b>US LAKE SURVEY (USLS) 251.5'</b>			
3. DRILLING AGENCY <b>MOBILE DISTRICT</b>			12. MANUFACTURER'S DESIGNATION OF DRILL <b>FALING 1500</b>			
4. HOLE NO. (As shown on drawing title and file number) <b>S-17</b>			13. TOTAL NO. OF OVER-BURDEN SAMPLES TAKEN	DISTURBED <b>0</b>	UNDISTURBED <b>0</b>	
5. NAME OF DRILLER <b>CARL MOON</b>			14. TOTAL NUMBER CORE BOXES <b>30</b>			
6. DIRECTION OF HOLE <input type="checkbox"/> VERTICAL <input type="checkbox"/> INCLINED _____ DEG. FROM VERT.			15. ELEVATION GROUND WATER			
7. THICKNESS OF OVERBURDEN <b>0</b>			16. DATE HOLE	STARTED <b>14 MAY 90</b>	COMPLETED <b>19 MAY 90</b>	
8. DEPTH DRILLED INTO ROCK <b>13.2'</b>			17. ELEVATION TOP OF HOLE <b>251.5</b>			
9. TOTAL DEPTH OF HOLE <b>122.8'</b>			18. TOTAL CORE RECOVERY FOR BORING <b>X</b>			
			19. SIGNATURE OF INSPECTOR <b>M.EILEEN GLYN</b>			
ELEVATION a	DEPTH b	LEGEND c	CLASSIFICATION OF MATERIALS (Description) d	% CORE RECOVERY e	BOX OR SAMPLE NO. f	REMARKS (Drilling time, water loss, depth of weathering, etc. if significant) g
23					6	
24						
25		MB	24.3' - 27.4' GOOD CONCRETE HARD, ENTRAIN AIR 1mm DIA. ENTRP. AIR = 3 mm DIA. - 2 cm LONG LARGE VOID AT 25.7', POSSIBLE COLD JT. AT 25.2' NO COLOR CHANGE JUST A THIN WHITE LINE, COULD BE A HAIRLINE CRACK.		25.1	DRILL TIME = 45 MIN. HYD. PRESS 300 RUN 7 24.3' - 34.3' 1 PC. 3.1'
26				30		
27		MB			7	
28			27.4' - 34.3' ENTRP. AIR 5 mm - 1 cm DIA., ENTRAIN AIR = 1 - 2 mm			
29		MB			29.4	
30						
31					8	
32			CRACK AT 31.5'			

RMS0028 SYS 2 graphics by VISUAL PRODUCTS SECTION - ILL for INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY LABORATORY - WES

DRILLING LOG (Cont Sheet)		ELEVATION TOP OF HOLE		USLS		Hole No. S-17	
PROJECT			INSTALLATION			SHEET 4	
EVALUATION OF EISENHOWER AND SNELL LOCKS			EISENHOWER LOCK			OF 11 SHEETS	
ELEVATION	DEPTH	LEGEND	CLASSIFICATION OF MATERIALS (Description)	% CORE RECOVERY	BOX OR SAMPLE NO.	REMARKS (Drilling time, water loss, depth of weathering, etc., if significant)	
	33				33.1		
	34						
	35		CRUMBLY AT 34.3' - 34.8' CORE INTACT EXCEPT FOR SIDE WEDGE. 34.8' - 37.3' GOOD CONCRETE		9		DRILL TIME 15 MIN. 2 PC. 3.1' 7.0' RUN 8 34.3' - 37.3'
	36			170			
	37				37.3		
	38		37.3' - 40.0' GOOD CONCRETE AIR 1mm - 1cm DIA.				DRILL TIME 50 MIN. 4 PC. 2.8' 2.8' 3.1' 0.4' RUN 9 37.3' - 46.2'
	39						
	40			100			
	41						
	42						

RMO-027 SYS 2 graphics by VISUAL PRODUCTS SECTION - IFL for INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY LABORATORY - WES

DRILLING LOG (Cont Sheet)		ELEVATION TOP OF HOLE		251.5 USLS		Hole No. S-17	
PROJECT				INSTALLATION		SHEET 5	
EVALUATION OF EISENHOWER AND SNELL LOCKS				EISENHOWER LOCK		OF 11 SHEETS	
ELEVATION	DEPTH	LEGEND	CLASSIFICATION OF MATERIALS (Description)	% CORE RECOVERY	BOX OR SAMPLE NO.	REMARKS (Drilling time, water loss, depth of weathering, etc., if significant)	
		MB			42.3		
		MB					
		MB					
43							
44							
45							
		MB			45.8		
46		MB	BREAK ALONG LG. AGG.				
			46.2' - 49.8' GOOD CONCRETE 0.2 - 1.0 cm DIA. AIR ENTRP. BUBS SEEM TO BE LOCATED ADJACENT TO AGG.				DRILL TIME 50 MIN.
47							
48							
49							
		MB					
50			49.8' - 52.7' AIR ENTRP. BUB SEEM TO BE DEEPER * 1cm INTO CORE. W/ 1cm DIA.				
51							
		MB					
52							
		MB					
53			52.7' - 55.2' GOOD CONCRETE LESS ENTRP. AIR EXCEPT ONE LG. BUB AT 54.7', 2.5" LONG 1cm DEEP				
54							

RMO3-028 SYS 2 FORMS BY VISUAL PRODUCTS SECTION - ILL for INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY LABORATORY - WES

DRILLING LOG (Cont Sheet)		ELEVATION TOP OF HOLE		USLS		Hole No. S-17	
PROJECT			INSTALLATION			SHEET 6	
EVALUATION OF EISENHOWER AND SNELL LOCKS			EISENHOWER LOCK			OF 11 SHEETS	
ELEVATION	DEPTH	LEGEND	CLASSIFICATION OF MATERIALS (Description)	X CORE RECOVERY	BOX OR SAMPLE NO.	REMARKS (Drilling time, water loss, depth of weathering, etc. if significant)	
55		MB	55.2' - 55.9', 3 LG BUBS 1.5 cm DIA X 1 cm DEEP				
56		MB	55.9' - 59.8' GOOD CONCRETE AIR ENTRP. 1 cm DIA.		14	DRILL TIME 70 MIN. 3 PC. 3.9' 2.4' 3.5'	
58		MB			58.4		
60		MB	59.8' - 62.2' AIR ENTRP. AVG. 0.5 cm DIA.		15		
62		MB	62.2' - 63.7' LESS ENTRP. AIR (1 mm - 5 mm DIA.)		63.1		
64		MB	63.7' - 65.7' MORE ENTRP. AIR, AVG. 0.5 cm 2 LG. BUBS 1.5 cm LONG		16		
66		MB					

RMS-8128 SYS 2 graphics by VISUAL PRODUCTS SECTION - ILL for INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY LABORATORY - WES

DRILLING LOG (Cont Sheet)		ELEVATION TOP OF HOLE		251.5 USLS		Hole No. S-17	
PROJECT			INSTALLATION			SHEET 7	
EVALUATION OF EISENHOWER AND SNELL LOCKS			EISENHOWER LOCK			OF 11 SHEETS	
ELEVATION	DEPTH	LEGEND	CLASSIFICATION OF MATERIALS (Description)	X CORE RECOV- ERY	BOX OR SAMPLE NO.	REMARKS (Drilling time, water loss, depth of weathering, etc. if significant)	
			65.7' - 69.6' GOOD CONCRETE AIR ENTRP. AVG. 2 mm DIA. THRU OUT. SOME LG. AT 1 cm DIA.				DRILL TIME REC. 5 PC. 3.9' 1.5' 2.8' 0.8' 0.7'
67		MB			67.5		RUN: 65.7' - 75.6'
68							
69		MB	REBAR 68.7'			17	
70							
71		MB	REBAR 71.0'				
		MB	71.1' - 74.0' GOOD CONCRETE AIR ENTRP. AVE 2 - 5 mm DIA.		71.9		
72							
73							
74		MB	REBAR AT 73.9'			18	
		MB	73.9' - 75.6' GOOD CONCRETE LESS AIR ENTRP. EXCEPT 1 LG. BUB AT 75.3' = 1.5 cm LONG				
75		MB					
76		MB	75.8' - PC. OF REBAR		75.6		
							75.6' - 85.6' 2.3' 0.2' CHIPS 1.6' 1.45' 3.5' 0.8'
77						19	
78							

RWD38430 SYS 2 Graphs by VISUAL PRODUCTS SECTION - IFL for INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY LABORATORY - WES

DRILLING LOG (Cont Sheet)		ELEVATION TOP OF HOLE		USLS		Hole No. S-17	
PROJECT			INSTALLATION			SHEET 8	
EVALUATION OF EISENHOWER AND SNELL LOCKS			EISENHOWER LOCK			OF 11 SHEETS	
ELEVATION	DEPTH	LEGEND	CLASSIFICATION OF MATERIALS (Description)	% CORE RECOVERY	BOX OR SAMPLE NO.	REMARKS (Drilling time, water loss, depth of weathering, etc. if applicable)	
			CHIP AT 77.9' 78.2' - 79.7' GOOD CONCRETE			MISSING CHIPS AT 78.1' AND 84.7'	
		⊗	REBAR AT 78.7' RUSTED		19		
			AIR ENTRP. 2 - 3 mm DIA. ABUND. AT 79.2' - 79.7'				
		?	79.7' - 81.15' GOOD CONCRETE PC. OF AGG. (4 IN) AIR ENTRP. W/ RCT MTL. AT BREAK POSSIBLY WEATHERED. REBAR AT 80.1'				
		MB	81.15' - 84.6' GOOD CONCRETE LESS AIR ENTRP. 3 mm DIA.		20		
				98.5			
		⊗	REBAR AT 83.2' CRACK IN AGG. NEAR REBAR		83.2		
			84.7' - 85.6' GOOD CONCRETE INC. IN AIR ENTRP. THROUGH- OUT 1 BUB AT 1 cm DIA.		21	DO NOT USE LAST PC. FOR TESTING (WAS BEATEN OUT OF CORE BARREL)	
			85.6' - 91.6' GOOD CONCRETE AIR ENTRP. 1 cm DIA. 1 cm DEEP -1			DRILL TIME = 70 MIN.	
		MB	87.0' - 91.6' GOOD CONCRETE AIR ENTRP. AVE. 1-3 mm OCC. 1 cm DIA. AIR BUB ADJ. TO AGG.		87.0	85.6' - 95.1'	
				100		4 PC. 6.00' 2.25' 1.10' 0.40' 0.15'	
		MB			22		

RMO94031 SYS 2 Graphics by VISUAL PRODUCTS SECTION - IITL for INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY LABORATORY - WES

DRILLING LOG (Cont Sheet)		ELEVATION TOP OF HOLE		251.5 USLS		Hole No. S-17	
PROJECT			INSTALLATION			SHEET 9	
EVALUATION OF EISENHOWER AND SNELL LOCKS			EISENHOWER LOCK			OF 11 SHEETS	
ELEVATION	DEPTH	LEGEND	CLASSIFICATION OF MATERIALS (Description)	% CORE RECOVERY	BOX OR SAMPLE NO.	REMARKS (Drilling time, water loss, depth of weathering, etc., if significant)	
91		MB			22		
92			91.6' - 94.95' GOOD CONCRETE AIR ENTRP. 91.6' - 92.0' 1 cm DIA.	100	91.6		
93					23		
94		MB	AIR ENTRP 93.6' - 94.5' 1 - 2 cm DIA.				
95			94.95' - 95.1' BROKEN		95.1		
96			95.1' - 99.7' GOOD CONCRETE ENTRP. AIR THROUGH OUT AVG. DIA. 1 cm			95.1' - 105.2'	
97				100	24		
98							
99		MB			99.7		
100			99.7' - 101.8' GOOD CONCRETE OCC. LG. AIR BUBS 1 - 3 cm LONG				
101							
102		MB					

RMDS-032 SYS 2 Graphics by VISUAL PRODUCTS SECTION - IITL for INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY LABORATORY - WES

DRILLING LOG (Cont Sheet)		ELEVATION TOP OF HOLE		Hole No. S-17		
PROJECT EVALUATION OF EISENHOWER AND SNELL LOCKS			251.5 USLS		SHEET 10 OF 11 SHEETS	
ELEVATION	DEPTH	LEGEND	CLASSIFICATION OF MATERIALS (Description)	% CORE RECOVERY	BOX OR SAMPLE NO.	REMARKS (Drilling time, water loss, depth of weathering, etc. if applicable)
			101.8' - 105.1' GOOD CONCRETE ENTRP. AIR 0.5 cm DIA.			
	103	MB				
				100	103.8	
	104	MB				
			CHIPS AT 104.6' - 104.8'			
	105	MB				
			105.2' - 109.6' GOOD CONCRETE SOUNDS DRUMMY, LOOKS MORE POROUS THAN ABOVE HIGH CONCENTRATION OF ENTRP. AIR 3 mm - 2 cm LONG AVG. 3 mm DIA.		26	105.2' - 115.4' 6 PC. 5.5' 0.2' CHIPS 0.7' 1.7' 0.4' 0.3' CHIPS 0.55' 0.5' DRILL TIME 80 MIN.
	106					
	107					
				96.6	108.0	
	108					
	109	BOND				
			109.6' ROCK / CONCRETE CONTACT, GOOD BOND V. STRONG ROCK. DK GRAY DOLOMITE TO 115.4'		27	
	110	Jt				
			JT. CRACK AT CONTACT IN ROCK, PROBABLY MECH.			
	111	MB			111.6	
	112					
	113	MB				
			CHIPS AND DISCS 113.7' - 114.0'			
	114	XX				

RMO-033 SYS 2 Graphics by VISUAL PRODUCTS SECTION - ILL for INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY LABORATORY - WES

DRILLING LOG (Cont Sheet)		ELEVATION TOP OF HOLE		251.5 USLS		Hole No. S-17	
PROJECT			INSTALLATION			SHEET 11	
EVALUATION OF EISENHOWER AND SNELL LOCKS			EISENHOWER LOCK			OF 11 SHEETS	
ELEVATION	DEPTH	LEGEND	CLASSIFICATION OF MATERIALS (Description)	% CORE RECOVERY	BOX OR SAMPLE NO.	REMARKS (Drilling time, water loss, depth of weathering, etc., if significant)	
a	b	c	d	e	f	g	
			ELONGATED HOLES AT 114.2'				
	115		WEATHERED JT. 114.9'		28		
	116		115.4' - 118.2' GOOD HARD, BLACK / GRAY LAMINATED DOLOMITE		116.2		
	117		VERTICAL JT. AT 116.2'				
	118		CLAY / SHALE STRINGER		29		
	119		118.2' - 120.0' GOOD HARD DOLO. MOTTLED DK + LT. GRAY, CALCITE BLEBS UP TO 4 cm LONG	100			
	120		CLAY / SHALE STRINGER				
	120		120.0' - 122.8' GOOD HARD, GRAY DOLOMITE SHALE BEDS UP TO 0.2' THICK AT 120.4'		120.4		
	121		STYOLITE		30		
	122		POSSIBLE JT.				
	123						BOTTOM OF HOLE

RWD50-014 SYS 2 graphics by VISUAL PRODUCTS SECTION - ITL for INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY LABORATORY - WES

<b>DRILLING LOG</b>		DIVISION	INSTALLATION	SHEET 1 OF 12 SHEETS
1. PROJECT <b>EVALUATION OF EISENHOWER AND SNELL LOCKS</b>			10. SIZE AND TYPE OF BIT <b>7-3/4" DIAMOND</b>	
2. LOCATION (Coordinates or Station) <b>275.00'-7.825' FROM LOCK CHAMBER</b>			11. DATUM FOR ELEVATION SHOWN (TBM or MSL) <b>MSL-USGLS</b>	
3. DRILLING AGENCY <b>C O E MOBILE DISTRICT</b>			12. MANUFACTURER'S DESIGNATION OF DRILL <b>DIAMOND</b>	
4. HOLE NO. (As shown on drawing title and file number) <b>S-19</b>			13. TOTAL NO. OF OVER-BURDEN SAMPLES TAKEN DISTURBED <b>0</b> UNDISTURBED <b>0</b>	
5. NAME OF DRILLER <b>CARL MOON</b>			14. TOTAL NUMBER CORE BOXES <b>30</b>	
6. DIRECTION OF HOLE <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> VERTICAL <input type="checkbox"/> INCLINED _____ DEG. FROM VERT.			15. ELEVATION GROUND WATER	
7. THICKNESS OF OVERBURDEN <b>0</b>			16. DATE HOLE STARTED <b>21 MAY 90</b> COMPLETED <b>25 MAY 90</b>	
8. DEPTH DRILLED INTO ROCK <b>129.0'-110.7'-18.3'</b>			17. ELEVATION TOP OF HOLE <b>251.5'</b>	
9. TOTAL DEPTH OF HOLE <b>129.0'</b>			18. TOTAL CORE RECOVERY FOR BORING <b>128.7'</b> <span style="float:right">x</span>	
			19. SIGNATURE OF INSPECTOR <b>M. EILEEN GLYNN</b>	

ELEVATION	DEPTH	LEGEND	CLASSIFICATION OF MATERIALS (Description)	% CORE RECOVERY	BOX OR SAMPLE NO.	REMARKS (Drilling time, water loss, depth of weathering, etc. if applicable)
251.5'			0.0'-2.5' - GOOD CONCRETE. AVE. SIZE AGG. 2.5 cm LONG. AIR ENTRP. 1mm-5 mm DIA. THRU OUT.	100		DRILL TIME ≈ 20 MIN. 1 PC. INTACT 2.5' PRESS ≈ 275 PSI
			1.7'-2.5' - AGG. SIZE AVE. INCREASES TO 3 IN.		1	
250.0'			2.5'-5.0' - GOOD CONCRETE. AIR ENTRP. 3 mm-1 cm LONG, MORE ABUNDANT AT 4.5'-5.0', AVE. AGG 3 IN. DIA.	100		DRILL TIME ≈ 20 MIN. PRESS ≈ 275 PSI 1 PC. 2.5' INTACT
			AVE. AGG. 2 cm DIA. 4.5'-5.0' - SOUNDS DRUMMY			
			5.0'-7.2' - GOOD CONCRETE. AIR ENTRP. 3 mm-2 cm LONG AGG. DIST IS LG. 100-150 cm W/SMALLER 1-2 cm DIA.	100		DRILL TIME ≈ 20 MIN. 1 PC. 2.2'
245.0'			7.2'-4.7' - GOOD CONCRETE. AIR ENTRP. 3 mm-1 cm DIA., AGG. GOOD DIST., ENTRAIN. AIR 1 mm DIA.	100	2	DRILL TIME ≈ 20 MIN. 1 PC. 2.5'
			SEE SHEET 2			

INGS-035 SYS 4 Graphics by VISUAL PRODUCTS SECTION - ILL. for INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY LABORATORY - WES

DRILLING LOG (Cont Sheet)		ELEVATION TOP OF HOLE 251.5 USGLS		Hole No. S-19		
PROJECT EISENHOWER LOCK			INSTALLATION		SHEET 2 OF 12 SHEETS	
ELEVATION	DEPTH	LEGEND	CLASSIFICATION OF MATERIALS (Description)	% CORE RECOVER- ERY	BOX OR SAMPLE NO.	REMARKS (Drilling time, water loss, depth of weathering, etc., if significant)
235.0'	11		9.7'-14.4' GOOD CONCRETE. ENTRP. AIR 2 mm-2 cm DIA, ENTRAIN AIR ≈ 1 mm THROUGHOUT. ABUNDANT LG. ENTRP. AIR AT 12.7'-14.0', AGG. HAS GOOD DIST.			3 PC. 4.70' 3.60' 1.80' DRILL TIME ~ DRILL ACTION: SMOOTH
	12				3	
	13					
	14	MB	MB AT BOULDER			
	15		14.4'-18.0' GOOD CONCRETE. ABUNDANT AIR ENTRP. 2 mm DIA-3 cm LONG, AVE. 5 mm DIA.	100	14.4	
230.0'	16					
	17				4	
	18	MB	MB AT BOULDER			
	19	MB	18.0'-19.8' GOOD CONCRETE. SMALLER AGG. AVE. 3-4 cm LONG, ENTRAIN AIR ≈ 1 mm DIA, ENTRP AIR LESS ABUNDANT ≈ 2 mm DIA.		18.9	
	20		19.8'-21.1' GOOD CONCRETE. ABUNDANT ENTRP. AIR 1-5 mm DIA, AVE. AGG. 2 cm DIA. OCC. LG. AGG. 10 cm			5 PC. 1.30' 5.70' 1.40' 0.80' BROKEN 0.60' 0.20'
	21	MB	MB AT BOULDER		5	
225.0'	22		21.1'-26.8 EXITE SHEET 3)			

RMO-0336 SYS 4 Graphed by VISUAL PRODUCTS SECTION - ITL for INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY LABORATORY - WES

DRILLING LOG (Cont Sheet)		ELEVATION TOP OF HOLE 251.5 USGLS		Hole No. S-19			
PROJECT EISENHOWER LOCK			INSTALLATION		SHEET 3 OF 12 SHEETS		
ELEVATION a	DEPTH b	LEGEND c	CLASSIFICATION OF MATERIALS (Description) d	% CORE RECOVER- ERY e	BOX OR SAMPLE NO. f	REMARKS (Drilling time, water loss, depth of weathering, etc., if significant) g	
220.0'	23	MB	21.1'-26.8' GOOD CONCRETE. ENTRP. AIR 2 mm-1.5 cm DIA. MORE ABUNDANT AT 24.5'- 26.8', AGG. HAS GOOD DISTR.	100	22.8		
	24				6		
	25						
	26						
	27	MB			26.8'-28.8' GOOD CONCRETE. ENTRP. AIR 2 mm-1 cm DIA, AGG. V. SMALL -LG.		26.8
	28	MB					
	29	MB			29.0'-29.6' BROKEN CONCRETE. BEATEN OUT OF CORE BARREL.		7
	30	MB			29.6'-29.8' GOOD CONCRETE. 29.8'-33.5' GOOD CONCRETE. LG. HOLE AT 30.8 (2.5 cm SQ.) ABUNDANT ENTRP. AIR 1 cm AVE. DIA. ENTRAIN AIR 1 mm DIA, POSSIBLE COLD AT 30.8'.		
	31	MB					31.1
	215.0'	32			MB		32.5'-34.2' GOOD CONCRETE. ENTRP. AIR 2 mm-1 cm DIA.
33							
34							

RMOS-037 SYS 4 graphics by VISUAL PRODUCTS SECTION - IITL for INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY LABORATORY - WES

RMO-9038 SYS 4 Graphics by VISUAL PRODUCTS SECTION - IT, for INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY LABORATORY - WES

DRILLING LOG (Cont Sheet)		ELEVATION TOP OF HOLE 251.5 USGLS		Hole No. S-19		
PROJECT EISENHOWER LOCK			INSTALLATION		SHEET 4 OF 12 SHEETS	
ELEVATION	DEPTH	LEGEND	CLASSIFICATION OF MATERIALS (Description)	% CORE RECOV- ERY	BOX OR SAMPLE NO.	REMARKS (Drilling time, water loss, depth of weathering, etc., if significant)
210.0'	35	MB	MB AT BOULDER 34.2'-37.4' GOOD CONCRETE. ABUNDANT ENTRAP. AIR 2 mm- 5 mm AVE. 3 mm	100	8	
					35.4	
205.0'	37	MB	MB AT BOULDER 37.4'-39.8' GOOD CONCRETE. ENTRP. AIR LESS ABUNDANT- 5 mm DIA. MAX.	100	9	40 MIN. DRILL TIME 39.8'-49.3' 6 PC. 3.20' 3.40' 1.40' 0.90' 0.40' CHIPS 0.20'
	38	MB	MB THROUGH AGG. AGG. GOOD DIST			
	39	MB	MB THROUGH AGG.			
		MB	MB THROUGH AGG. 39.2'-39.8' BEATEN OUT OF END OF CORE BARREL		39.8	
	40		39.8-43.0 GOOD CONCRETE ENTRP. AIR 2 mm-5 mm THRU OUT. AGG. GOOD DIST.			
205.0'	42	MB		100	10	
	43	MB	MB AT BOULDER 43.0'-46.4' GOOD CONCRETE. SAME AS ABOVE			
					44.4	
	45				11	
	46					

DRILLING LOG (Cont Sheet)		ELEVATION TOP OF HOLE 251.5 USGLS		Hole No. S-19		
PROJECT EISENHOWER LOCK			INSTALLATION		SHEET 5 OF 12 SHEETS	
ELEVATION a	DEPTH b	LEGEND c	CLASSIFICATION OF MATERIALS (Description) d	% CORE RECOVERY e	BOX OR SAMPLE NO. f	REMARKS (Drilling flow, water loss, depth of weathering, etc. if significant) g
200.0'		MB	BREAK AT BOULDER W/AIR ENTRAIN BUBBLES BROKE			
	47		46.4'-49.4' GOOD CONCRETE. (SAME AS ABOVE)		11	
		MB	BREAK AT BOULDER	100		
	48					
		MB	BREAK AT BOULDER		48.7	
	49	MB	BREAK AT BOULDER			
		MB	49.1'-49.2' BROKEN			
			49.4'-54.4' GOOD CONCRETE. ABUNDANT AIR ENTRP. (2 mm- 1.5 cm DIA.) AVE. 4 mm AIR ABUNDANT AT 49.4'-50.0'			49.4'-54.4' 2 PC. 3.00' 2.00'
	50					
	51				12	
195.0'						
	52			100		
		MB			52.4	
	53					
	54					
			54.4'-62.9' GOOD CONCRETE. ENTRP. AIR 3 mm-1 cm DIA. AT 54.4'-60.1', MORE ABUNDANT AT 60.1'-62.9' GOOD CONSOLIDATION THRU OUT.			54.4'-62.9' 3 PC. 2.90' 2.80' 2.80'
	55				13	
	56					
190.0'						
	57	MB			57.3	
	58					

RM08-036 SYS 4 graphics by VISUAL PRODUCTS SECTION - ILL for INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY LABORATORY - WES

RUD9040 SYS 4 © copies by VISUAL PRODUCTS SECTION - ILL. for INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY LABORATORY - WES

DRILLING LOG (Cont Sheet)		ELEVATION TOP OF HOLE 251.5 USGLS		Hole No. S-19		
PROJECT EISENHOWER LOCK			INSTALLATION		SHEET 6 OF 12 SHEETS	
ELEVATION a	DEPTH b	LEGEND c	CLASSIFICATION OF MATERIALS (Description) d	X CORE RECOV- ERY e	BOX OR SAMPLE NO. f	REMARKS (Drilling time, water loss, depth of weathering, etc., if significant) g
			(SEE SHEET 5)			
	59					
	60	MB		100	14	
	61					
185.0'	62	MB			61.5	
	63		62.9'-71.1' GOOD CONCRETE. GOOD CONSOLIDATION THRU OUT GOOD AGG. DISTR., ENTRP. AIR 2 mm DIA. 1.2 cm long - irreg.		15	62.9'-72.9' DRILLED 10.0' BUT LEFT 1.8' IN THE HOLE. DRILL TIME 45 MIN.
	64	MB				
	65					
	66	MB	66.9'-68.0' ENTRP. AIR MORE ABUNDANT		65.6	
180.0'	67	MB		83		
	68				16	
	69					
	70	MB			69.5	

DRILLING LOG (Cont Sheet)		ELEVATION TOP OF HOLE 251.5 USGLS		Hole No. S-19		
PROJECT EISENHOWER LOCK			INSTALLATION		SHEET 7 OF 12 SHEETS	
ELEVATION a	DEPTH b	LEGEND c	CLASSIFICATION OF MATERIALS (Description) d	% CORE RECOV- ERY e	BOX OR SAMPLE NO. f	REMARKS (Drilling time, water loss, depth of weathering, etc., if significant) g
175.0'	71	MB	(SEE SHEET 6)			
	72		71.1'-78.8' GOOD CONCRETE. GOOD CONSOLIDATION, AIR ENTRP. 2 mm-7 mm DIA. OCC. LG. + IRREG. 2 cm LONG.		17	
165.0'	73					72.9'-79.9'
	74	MB			74.2	5 PC. 3.10' 3.40' 1.40' 0.60' 0.30' + CHIPS
	75					
	76			126	18	
160.0'	77					
	78					
	79	LIFT MB	78.8-79.9 GOOD CONCRETE. A LITTLE SOFTER, MORE POROUS HOLDS WATER LONGER, CEMENT COLOR IS BROWNISH GRAY W/SMALLER AGG., ENTRP. AIR 2 mm-1 cm DIA.		79.0	
	80		79.0'-79.9' BEATEN OUT OF CORE BARREL			79.9'-89.9'
	81		79.9'-82.0' GOOD CONCRETE. SAME AS 79.0'-79.9'. BROWN- GRAY HIGHER CONTENT OF SMALL AGG. 1mm-2.5 mm IN CEMENT LOOKS WEAKER, POROUS POOR CONSOLIDATION.		19	
	82					

DRAWING BY VISUAL PRODUCTS SECTION - ILL. FOR INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY LABORATORY - WES

DRILLING LOG (Cont Sheet)		ELEVATION TOP OF HOLE 251.5 USGLS		Hole No. S-19		
PROJECT EISENHOWER LOCK			INSTALLATION		SHEET 8 OF 12 SHEETS	
ELEVATION a	DEPTH b	LEGEND c	CLASSIFICATION OF MATERIALS (Description) d	% CORE RECOVER- ERY e	BOX OR SAMPLE NO. f	REMARKS (Drilling time, water loss, depth of weathering, etc., if significant) g
			82.0' GOOD CONCRETE. DARK GRAY SEEMS HARDER GOOD CONSOLIDATION, ENTRP. AIR 2 mm-5 mm DIA.			
	83	MB	MB AT BOULDERS		83.1	
	84					
		MB	MB AT BOULDERS			
	85					
		JT	? OR LIFT LINE, COATED W/WHITE MATL.	84	20	
155.0'	86		85.9'-88.6' GOOD CEMENT, COLOR LITTLE BIT LIGHTER THAN ABOVE + MORE POROUS ENTRP. AIR 2 mm-5 mm DIA. CEMENT MATRIX HAS A HIGH CONTENT OF V. SMALL PC. OF AGG.			
	87					
		MB				LEFT 1.6' IN HOLE
	88					
		MB	88.3'-98.1' GOOD CONCRETE. SAME AS ABOVE, SOUNDS DRUMMY, ENTRP. AIR V. SMALL 1 mm-4 mm AVE. 2 mm. SOME IRREGULAR BUBS.		88.3	
	89					
		MB				
	90					89.9'-98.1' 6 PC. 0.40' 5.30' 2.20' 1.50' 0.35' 0.25'
	91				21	
150.0'	92	MB		122	92.0	
	93					
		MB				
	94				22	

RMO2042 SYS 4 Graphics by VISUAL PRODUCTS SECTION - ITL for INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY LABORATORY - WES

DRILLING LOG (Cont Sheet)		ELEVATION TOP OF HOLE 251.5 USGLS		Hole No. S-19		
PROJECT EISENHOWER LOCK			INSTALLATION		SHEET 9 OF 12 SHEETS	
ELEVATION	DEPTH	LEGEND	CLASSIFICATION OF MATERIALS (Description)	% CORE RECOVERY	BOX OR SAMPLE NO.	REMARKS (Drilling time, water loss, depth of weathering, etc., if significant)
			SEE SHEET 8			
145.0'	95					
	96	MB			96.2	
	97					
	98	MB			23	
	99	MB	98.3'-101.6' GOOD CONCRETE. LT. GRAY CEMENT. SAME AS ABOVE. V. HOLEY (ALMOST HONEYCOMB PATTERN). ENTRP. AIR 1 mm-1 cm DIA. ABUNDANT SMALL BUB 1-3 mm.			98.3'-108.2' 6 PC. 3.30' 2.50' 0.90' 1.60' 0.50' 1.10'
	100	MB			100.4	
140.0'	101					
	102	MB	101.6'-108.2' GOOD CONCRETE. SAME AS ABOVE. EXCEPT MORE ENTRP. AIR AT 101.6'-103.8'.	100		
	103				24	
	104					
	105	MB			105.0	
	106					


RUCS-043 SYS 4 graphics by VISUAL PRODUCTS SECTION - ITL for INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY LABORATORY - WES

DRILLING LOG (Cont Sheet)		ELEVATION TOP OF HOLE 251.5 USGLS		Hole No. S-19		
PROJECT EISENHOWER LOCK			INSTALLATION		SHEET 10 OF 12 SHEETS	
ELEVATION a	DEPTH b	LEGEND c	CLASSIFICATION OF MATERIALS (Description) d	% CORE RECOVERY e	BOX OR SAMPLE NO. f	REMARKS (Drilling time, water loss, depth of weathering, etc., if significant) g
135.0'		MB				
	107	MB	VOID AT 106.8' W/8 cm DIA.		25	
	108					
	109		108.2'-110.7' GOOD CONCRETE. LT. GRAY CEMENT AS ABOVE. W/CONSIDERABLY LESS ENTRP. AIR 2 mm-1 cm DIA.			108.2'-115.2' 6 PC. 2.50' 0.90' 0.80' 1.40' 0.20' 1.20'
	110	B			26	
	111		CONCRETE/ROCK CONTACT V. SMOOTH BREAK/JT? NO BOND.	100		
130.0'		MB Z	111.6' CHPS			
	112	MB Z	110.7'-115.2' BLACK GRAY (WET) DOLOMITE INTERBED W/LT. GRAY WEAK CLAY AT 113.8', 114.0'+115'0' 1-3 mm THICK.		112.4	
	113					
	114	MB Z MB Z	DOLOMITE V. HARD, V. DENSE UNIFORM. IN STRUCTURE.		27	
	115	MB	115.2'-117.0' SAME AS ABOVE			115.2'-120.0' 5 PC.
125.0'						

RMOS-044 513 4 graphics by VISUAL PRODUCTS SECTION - ILL for INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY LABORATORY - WES

DRILLING LOG (Cont Sheet)		ELEVATION TOP OF HOLE 251.5 USGLS		Hole No. S-19		
PROJECT EISENHOWER LOCK			INSTALLATION		SHEET 11 OF 12 SHEETS	
ELEVATION	DEPTH	LEGEND	CLASSIFICATION OF MATERIALS (Description)	% CORE RECOVER- ERY	BOX OR SAMPLE NO.	REMARKS (Drilling time, water loss, depth of weathering, etc. if significant)
	117	MB	117.0'-120.0' COLOR CHANGE TO MOTTLED DK. AND LT. DOLOMITE W/NUMEROUS LT. GRAY CLAY THIN LANINAE 1mm THICK.	100	117.0	
	118	MB			28	
	119	MB				
120.0'	120	MB	LG. CALCITE BLEB. 120.0'-125.05' DOLOMITE, BLACK (WET) CALCITE BLEBS THRU OUT, INTERBED W/WEAK BLACK SHALE 4-8 cm THICK. DOLO. V. HARD V. DENSE. STYOLITES COMMON.		120.0	120.0'-129.0' 12 PC. 1.60' 0.30' 0.90' 0.10' 0.10' 0.10' MISSING 1.60' 0.30' 0.50' 0.60' 0.90'
	121	MB				
	122	MB			29	
	123	MB	123.0'-123.1' MISSING.			
	124	MB		98		
115.0'	125	MB	125.05'-129.0' DOLOMITE V. HARD V. DENSE, BLACK WHEN WET, LITTLE TO NO SHALE.		124.7	
	126	MB				
	127	MB			30	
	128	MB				

RMS2045 SYS 4 Graphics by VISUAL PRODUCTS SECTION - ILL for INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY LABORATORY - WES

DRILLING LOG (Cont Sheet)			ELEVATION TOP OF HOLE 251.5 USGLS		Hole No. S-19	
PROJECT EISENHOWER LOCK				INSTALLATION		SHEET 12 OF 12 SHEETS
ELEVATION d	DEPTH b	LEGEND c	CLASSIFICATION OF MATERIALS (Description) d	% CORE RECOVERY e	BOX OR SAMPLE NO. f	REMARKS (Drilling time, water loss, depth of weathering, etc., if significant) g
111.0'	129		SEE PREVIOUS SHEET.			BOTTOM OF HOLE.

84032648 STS 4 Graphics by VISUAL PRODUCTS SECTION - ILL. for INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY LABORATORY - WDC

<b>DRILLING LOG</b>		DIVISION		INSTALLATION <b>EISENHOWER LOCK</b>		SHEET 1 OF 4 SHEETS	
1. PROJECT <b>EVALUATION OF EISENHOWER AND SNELL LOCKS</b>				10. SIZE AND TYPE OF BIT <b>7 3/4" OD</b>			
2. LOCATION (Coordinates or Station) <b>MONOLITH: SS-18 LOCK STATION 226.00</b>				11. DATUM FOR ELEVATION SHOWN (TBM or MSL) <b>MSL - USGL 251.5'</b>			
3. DRILLING AGENCY <b>MOBILE DISTRICT</b>				12. MANUFACTURER'S DESIGNATION OF DRILL <b>FALING 1500</b>			
4. HOLE NO. (As shown on drawing title and this number)		<b>SS-18</b>		13. TOTAL NO. OF OVER-BURDEN SAMPLES TAKEN		DISTURBED <b>0</b>	UNDISTURBED <b>0</b>
5. NAME OF DRILLER <b>CARL MOON</b>				14. TOTAL NUMBER CORE BOXES <b>9</b>			
6. DIRECTION OF HOLE <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> VERTICAL <input type="checkbox"/> INCLINED _____ DEG. FROM VERT.				15. ELEVATION GROUND WATER			
7. THICKNESS OF OVERBURDEN <b>0</b>				16. DATE HOLE		STARTED <b>9 JUNE 90</b>	COMPLETED <b>11 JUNE 90</b>
8. DEPTH DRILLED INTO ROCK <b>0</b>				17. ELEVATION TOP OF HOLE <b>251.5</b>			
9. TOTAL DEPTH OF HOLE <b>35.8'</b>				18. TOTAL CORE RECOVERY FOR BORING <b>35.8</b> x			
				19. SIGNATURE OF INSPECTOR <b>M. EILEEN GLYN</b>			

ELEVATION	DEPTH	LEGEND	CLASSIFICATION OF MATERIALS (Description)	% CORE RECOVERY	BOX OR SAMPLE NO.	REMARKS (Drilling fluid, water loss, depth of weathering, etc., if significant)
		MB	0.0' - 0.7' GOOD CONCRETE	71		0.0' - 0.7' 1 PC. 0.5'
	1		0.7' - 3.0' GOOD CONCRETE LITTLE TO NO ENTRP. AIR / GOOD CONSOLIDATION	115	1	0.7' - 3.0' 1 PC. 2.5'
	2					
	3	MB				
	4		3.0' - 5.3' GOOD CONCRETE. HARD, GOOD CONSOLIDATION, ENTRP. AIR 1mm - 3mm OCC. 7 mm DIA.	100	4.2	3.0' - 5.3' 1 PC. 2.3'
	5					
	6	MB	BROKE ACROSS AGG. 5.3' - 7.9' GOOD CONCRETE. HARD, GOOD CONSOLIDATION ENTRP. AIR 1mm - 2 mm DIA.	100	2	5.3' - 7.9' 1 PC. 2.6'
	7					
	8	MB				
	9		7.9' - 9.7' GOOD CONCRETE. ( SAME AS ABOVE )	45	8.7	7.9' - 10.4' 1 PC. 1.8'
	10	LIFT			3	
		?				

RMO3038 SYS 2 Graphics by VISUAL PRODUCTS SECTION - ILL for INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY LABORATORY - WES

RMS-858 SYS 2 (Revised by VISUAL PRODUCTS SECTION - ILL. for INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY LABORATORY - WES)

DRILLING LOG (Cont Sheet)		ELEVATION TOP OF HOLE 251.5		Hole No. SS-18		
PROJECT EVALUATION OF EISENHOWER AND SNELL LOCKS			INSTALLATION EISENHOWER LOCK		SHEET 2 OF 4 SHEETS	
ELEVATION a	DEPTH b	LEGEND c	CLASSIFICATION OF MATERIALS (Description) d	% CORE RECOV- ERY e	BOX OR SAMPLE NO. f	REMARKS (Drilling time, water loss, depth of weathering, etc., if different) g
	11		9.7' - 19.6' GOOD CONCRETE GOOD CONSOLIDATION / ENTRP. AIR 1mm - 3 mm DIA. NOT ABUNDANT. OCC. 1 cm DIA.			10.4' - 19.7' 2 PC. 5.3' 4.6'
	12	MB			3	
	13					
	14	MB			12.5	
	15	LIFT ?	BREAK IS RELATIVELY PLANER.			
	16		STEEL AT 15.8' 8 cm LONG, 2 WIDE	107	15.0	
	17					
	18	MB				
	19					
	20		19.7' - 25.8' GOOD CONCRETE. GOOD CONSOLIDATION LITTLE ENTRP. AIR		19.7	19.7' - 25.8' 1 PC. 6.2'
	21					
	22				6	

DRILLING LOG (Cont Sheet)		ELEVATION TOP OF HOLE 251.5		Hole No. SS-18		
PROJECT EVALUATION OF EISENHOWER AND SNELL LOCKS			INSTALLATION EISENHOWER LOCK		SHEET 3 OF 4 SHEETS	
ELEVATION a	DEPTH b	LEGEND c	CLASSIFICATION OF MATERIALS (Description) d	% CORE RECOV- ERY e	BOX OR SAMPLE NO. f	REMARKS (Drilling time, water, loss, depth of weathering, etc., if significant) g
23		MB	25.8' - 34.7' GOOD CONCRETE. AS ABOVE.	100	6	
24		MB				
25		MB				
26		MB				
27		MB			27.4	25.8' - 35.8' 1.6' 2.9' 4.3' 0.7' 0.4' 0.1' <u>10.0'</u>
28						BOTTOM OF RUN WAS BEATEN OUT OF CORE BARREL
29						
30				100	8	
31			CRACK ? OR LIFT ? NO EASILY IDENTIFIABLE WEATHERING, NO STAINING.			
32		MB			31.9	
33		MB			9	
34						

INDS-080 SYS 2 Graphics by VISUAL PRODUCTS SECTION - IITL for INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY LABORATORY - WES

DRILLING LOG (Cont Sheet)		ELEVATION TOP OF HOLE 251.5		Hole No. SS-18		
PROJECT EVALUATION OF EISENHOWER AND SNELL LOCKS			INSTALLATION EISENHOWER LOCK		SHEET 4 OF 4 SHEETS	
ELEVATION a	DEPTH b	LEGEND c	CLASSIFICATION OF MATERIALS (Descriptive) d	% CORE RECOVERY e	BOX OR SAMPLE NO. f	REMARKS (Drilling time, water loss, depth of weathering, etc., if significant) g
	34	MB	SEE PREVIOUS SHEET		9	
	35					35.8' BOTTOM
	36					
	37					
	38					
	39					

RMO2-001 SYS 2 graphics by VISUAL PRODUCTS SECTION - JTL for INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY LABORATORY - WES

DRILLING LOG		DIVISION		INSTALLATION		SHEET 1 OF 4 SHEETS	
1. PROJECT EVALUATION OF EISENHOWER AND SNELL LOCKS				10. SIZE AND TYPE OF BIT 7 1/4" DIAMON			
2. LOCATION (Coordinates or Station) MONOLITH: SS-19 LOCK STATION 275.00				11. DATUM FOR ELEVATION SHOWN (TBM or MSL) MSL - USLS			
3. DRILLING AGENCY MOBILE DISTRICT				12. MANUFACTURER'S DESIGNATION OF DRILL FALING 1500			
4. HOLE NO. (As shown on drawing title and file number) SS-19				13. TOTAL NO. OF OVER-BURDEN SAMPLES TAKEN		DISTURBED 0 UNDISTURBED 0	
5. NAME OF DRILLER CARL MOON				14. TOTAL NUMBER CORE BOXES 8			
6. DIRECTION OF HOLE <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> VERTICAL <input type="checkbox"/> INCLINED _____ DEG. FROM VERT.				15. ELEVATION GROUND WATER		18. DATE HOLE STARTED 11 JUNE 90	
7. THICKNESS OF OVERBURDEN 0				17. ELEVATION TOP OF HOLE 251.5		COMPLETED 12 JUNE 90	
8. DEPTH DRILLED INTO ROCK 0				19. TOTAL CORE RECOVERY FOR BORING 35.0 x			
9. TOTAL DEPTH OF HOLE 35.0'				20. SIGNATURE OF INSPECTOR M.EILEEN GLYN			
ELEVATION	DEPTH	LEGEND	CLASSIFICATION OF MATERIALS (Description)	% CORE RECOVERY	BOX OR SAMPLE NO.	REMARKS (Drilling fluid, water loss, depth of weathering, etc., if applicable)	
	0		0.0' - 2.5' GOOD CONCRETE. SOME ENTRP. AIR 1mm - 3 mm DIA. GOOD CONSOLIDATION	100		0.0' - 2.5' 2 PC. 2.2' 0.2'	
	2	MB				BOTTOM BEATEN OUT OF CORE BARREL	
	2.4		2.4' - 4.4' GOOD CONCRETE. SAME AS ABOVE	80	1	2.4' - 5.0' 1 PC. 2.0'	
	4.4	MB					
	4.4		4.4' - 6.9' GOOD CONCRETE. SAME AS ABOVE		4.9		
	6.9	MB					
	6.9		6.9' - 9.4' GOOD CONCRETE. SAME AS ABOVE	120	2	5.0' - 7.5' 2 PC. 1.8' 0.5'	
	9.4	MB					
	7.5			120		7.5' - 9.4'	
	9.4	MB			9.4		
	9.4					9.4' - 19.1'	

RMS-002 SYS 2 Graphics by VISUAL PRODUCTS SECTION - ITR for INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY LABORATORY - WES

INFO-083 SYS 2 graphics by VISUAL PRODUCTS SECTION - ILL for INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY LABORATORY - WES

DRILLING LOG (Cont Sheet)		ELEVATION TOP OF HOLE		Hole No. SS-19		
PROJECT			INSTALLATION		SHEET 2	
EVALUATION OF EISENHOWER AND SNELL LOCKS			EISENHOWER LOCK		OF 4 SHEETS	
ELEVATION	DEPTH	LEGEND	CLASSIFICATION OF MATERIALS (Description)	% CORE RECOVERY	BOX OR SAMPLE NO.	REMARKS (Drilling time, water loss, depth of weathering, etc. if significant)
			9.4' - 19.1' GOOD CONCRETE, ENTRP. AIR 1 mm - 3mm DIA. GOOD CONSOL. + GOOD BONDING W/ AGG.			3 PC. 4.6' 3.7' 1.4' <hr/> 9.7'
	11	MB				
	12				3	
	13					
	14	MB	BREAK AT LG. BOULDER.			
	15		ELONGATED PC. STEEL. 8 cm LONG.	100		
	16	MB			4	
	17					
	18	MB	BREAK AT LG. BOULDER			
	19	MB	BREAK AT LG. BOULDER			
	20		19.1' - 26.1' GOOD CONCRETE. ENTRP. AIR 1 mm - 3 mm DIA. OCC. IRREG. BUBS 1 cc LONG. AIR MORE ABUNDANT THAN ABOVE. GOOD CONSOL.	100		19.1' - 26.0'
	21				5	
	22					

DRILLING LOG (Cont Sheet)		ELEVATION TOP OF HOLE		Hole No. SS-19		
PROJECT			INSTALLATION		SHEET 3	
EVALUATION OF EISENHOWER AND SNELL LOCKS			EISENHOWER LOCK		OF 4 SHEETS	
ELEVATION	DEPTH	LEGEND	CLASSIFICATION OF MATERIALS <i>(Describe)</i>	X CORE RECOVERY	BOX OR SAMPLE NO.	REMARKS <i>(Drilling time, water loss, depth of weathering, etc. if applicable)</i>
23		MB			23.1	
24						
25					6	
26		O	26.1' - 35.0' GOOD CONCRETE. ENTR. AIR 1mm - 5 mm DIA. NOT ABUNDANT. GOOD CONSOLIDATION, V. HARD			26.1' - 35.0' 2 PC. 7.0' 2.0'
27						NO EVIDENCE OF A CRACK 26.1' - 35.0'
28		MB			28.3	
29						
30		MB	BROKE WHEN BROUGHT OUT OF BARREL. PROBABLY A 1FT JT. IF ANYWAY.		7	
31						
32					32.5	
33		MB	BREAK AT LG. BOULDER.		8	
34						

RA020004 SYS 2 Graphics by VISUAL PRODUCTS SECTION - ITL for INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY LABORATORY - WES



Hole No. SN-N56

DRILLING LOG		DIVISION		INSTALLATION		SHEET 1 of 7 SHEETS	
1. PROJECT <b>EVALUATION OF EISENHOWER AND SNELL LOCKS</b>				10. SIZE AND TYPE OF BIT			
2. LOCATION (Coordinates or Station) <b>MONOLITH: SN-N56 LOCK STATION 462.00</b>				11. DATUM FOR ELEVATION SHOWN (TBM or MSL) <b>MSL - USLS 205'</b>			
3. DRILLING AGENCY <b>MOBILE DISTRICT</b>				12. MANUFACTURER'S DESIGNATION OF DRILL <b>FALING 1500</b>			
4. HOLE NO. (As shown on drawing title and file number) <b>SN-N56</b>				13. TOTAL NO. OF OVER-BURDEN SAMPLES TAKEN		13. TOTAL NO. OF OVER-BURDEN SAMPLES TAKEN	
5. NAME OF DRILLER <b>CARL MOON</b>				14. TOTAL NUMBER CORE BOXES		14. TOTAL NUMBER CORE BOXES	
6. DIRECTION OF HOLE <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> VERTICAL <input type="checkbox"/> INCLINED _____ DEC. FROM VERT.				15. ELEVATION GROUND WATER		15. ELEVATION GROUND WATER	
7. THICKNESS OF OVERBURDEN <b>0</b>				16. DATE MOLE		16. DATE MOLE	
8. DEPTH DRILLED INTO ROCK <b>0</b>				17. ELEVATION TOP OF HOLE <b>205'</b>		17. ELEVATION TOP OF HOLE	
9. TOTAL DEPTH OF HOLE <b>73.9'</b>				18. TOTAL CORE RECOVERY FOR BORING <b>73.9</b>		18. TOTAL CORE RECOVERY FOR BORING	
				19. SIGNATURE OF INSPECTOR <b>M.EILEEN GLYNN</b>			
ELEVATION	DEPTH	LEGEND	CLASSIFICATION OF MATERIALS (Description)	% CORE RECOVERY	BOX OR SAMPLE NO.	REMARKS (Drilling time, water loss, depth of weathering, etc. if applicable)	
	0		0.0' - 2.6' GOOD CONCRETE. ENTRP. AIR ABUNDANT 1 mm - 2 mm DIA. OCC. 5 mm - 1 cm DIA. IRREG. PITTED TEXTURE THRU OUT.			PULL 1 0.0' - 2.6' 1 PC. 2.6'	
	2.6	MB	BREAK AT BOULDER		1		
	2.6		2.6' - 4.7' GOOD CONCRETE. ENTRP. AIR 1 mm - 3 mm ABUNDANT. OCC. 5 mm - 2 cm IRREG. LONG BUBS.			PULL 2 2.6' - 5.0' 2 PC. 1.7' 0.4' 2.2' LOSS 0.3'	
	4.7	MB			4.3		
	4.7	MB					
	4.7		4.7' - 9.6' GOOD CONCRETE. ABUNDANT. ENTRP. AIR 1 mm - 2 mm OCC. 4 mm DIA. HARD, SOLID.			PULL 3 5.0' - 7.1' 1 PC. 2.4'	
	7.1	MB			2	REC. 2.4' LOSS 0.0' GAIN 0.0'	
	7.1		PLANAR BREAK.				
	7.1					PULL 4 7.1' - 9.6' 2 PC. 1.5' 0.9'	
	9.6	MB			8.7	REC. 2.4' LOSS 0.1' GAIN 0.0'	
	9.6		BREAK AT LG. BOULDER				
	9.6	MB					

PRODUCTS SYS 2 © 1988 by VISUAL PRODUCTS SECTION - ILL for INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY LABORATORY - WES



RMC-8078 SYS 2 prepared by VISUAL PRODUCTS SECTION - ITL for INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY LABORATORY - WES

DRILLING LOG (Cont Sheet)		ELEVATION TOP OF HOLE		Hole No. SN-N56		
PROJECT			INSTALLATION		SHEET 2	
EVALUATION OF EISENHOWER AND SNELL LOCKS			SNELL LOCK		OF 7 SHEETS	
ELEVATION	DEPTH	LEGEND	CLASSIFICATION OF MATERIALS (Description)	X CORE RECOVERY	BOX OR SAMPLE NO.	REMARKS (Drilling time, water loss, depth of weathering, etc., if significant)
			9.6' - 19.6' GOOD CONCRETE, ABUNDANT ENTRP. AIR 1 mm - 2 mm DIA. OCC. 5 mm DIA. RELATIVELY SMOOTH TEXTURE GOOD CONSOL, HARD.			9.9' - 19.6' 2 PC. 2.6' 5.1' 2.3' REC. 10.0' LOSS 0.0' GAIN 0.0'
	11				3	
	12	? LIFT	- PLANAR BREAK			
	13	MB			12.9	9.6' 2.6' 12.2'
	14					
	15				4	
	16					
	17	? LIFT	- PLANAR BREAK			
	18	MB			17.3	
	19	MB				
	20	MB			5	19.6' - 29.3' 4 PC. 2.6' 3.3' 1.8' REC. 7.7' LOSS 2.0' GAIN 0.0'
	21	MB	19.6' - 27.3' GOOD CONCRETE. HARD, GOOD CONSOL. ABUNDANT SMALL ENTRP. AIR. 1 - 2 mm DIA. OCC. 3 mm DIA. - 1 cm IRREG.			
	22	MB			21.7	

DRILLING LOG (Cont Sheet)		ELEVATION TOP OF HOLE		Hole No. SN-N56		
PROJECT			INSTALLATION		SHEET 3	
EVALUATION OF EISENHOWER AND SNELL LOCKS			SNELL LOCK		OF 7 SHEETS	
ELEVATION	DEPTH	LEGEND	CLASSIFICATION OF MATERIALS (Description)	% CORE RECOVERY	BOX OR SAMPLE NO.	REMARKS (Drilling time, water loss, depth of weathering, etc., if significant)
	23	MB			6	
	24					
	25	LIFT			25.5	
	26	MB	PLANAR BREAK			
	27	MB			7	37.0'
	28		27.3' - 37.0' GOOD CONCRETE, HARD. GOOD CONSOL. REL. SMOOTH TXT. ENTRP. AIR. 1 mm DIA. OCC. 2 - 5 mm DIA.			27.3'
	29					9.7'
	30	MB			29.6	
	31					29.3' - 37.0'
	32	MB				1 PC. 5.1'
	33					4.6'
	34	MB			8	REC. 3.7'
						GAIN 2.0'
						LOSS 0.0'
					33.7	

MODIFIED BY VISUAL PRODUCTS SECTION - ILL. FOR INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY LABORATORY - WES

DRILLING LOG (Cont Sheet)		ELEVATION TOP OF HOLE 205		Hole No. SN-N56		
PROJECT EVALUATION OF EISENHOWER AND SNELL LOCKS			INSTALLATION SNELL LOCK		SHEET 4 OF 7 SHEETS	
ELEVATION a	DEPTH b	LEGEND c	CLASSIFICATION OF MATERIALS (Description) d	% CORE RECOVERY e	BOX OR SAMPLE NO. f	REMARKS (Drilling time, water loss, depth of weathering, etc., if significant) g
35		MB			9	
36						
37		MB				
		MB	37.0' - 44.7' GOOD CONCRETE, GOOD CONSOL., ENTRP. AIR 1 - 3 mm DIA., SOME IRREG, 4 mm - 2.5 cm LONG, REL. SMOOTH TXT.		37.7	37.0' - 45.8' 2 PC. 3.3' 4.4' 0.1' CHIPS 0.02' REC. 8.0' LOSS 0.8' GAIN 0.0'
38						
39					10	
40		MB		8.0		
41				8.8		
42		MB			41.7	
43		MB				
44					11	
45		MB	LARGE VOIDS AT 44.7' - BREAK AT VOIDS - LIFT ?			
46			45.0' - 54.5' (SEE NEXT SHEET)			

R4034078 SYS 2 Graphics by VISUAL PRODUCTS SECTION - ILL for INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY LABORATORY - WES

DRILLING LOG (Cont Sheet)		ELEVATION TOP OF HOLE		Hole No. SN-N56		
PROJECT			INSTALLATION		SHEET 5	
EVALUATION OF EISENHOWER AND SNELL LOCKS			SNELL LOCK		OF 7 SHEETS	
ELEVATION	DEPTH	LEGEND	CLASSIFICATION OF MATERIALS (Description)	X CORE RECOV- ERY	BOX OR SAMPLE NO.	REMARKS (Drilling time, water loss, depth of weathering, etc., if different)
47			45.0' - 54.5' GOOD CONCRETE, GOOD CONSOL, HARD. AIR ENTRP. ABUNDANT 1mm DIA. THRU OUT 2 mm - 1cm FREQ., REL. SMOOTH TXT.			45.8' - 54.5'
48					12	2 PC. 6.4'
49						3.1'
50		50.			50.0	REC. 9.5'
51						LOSS 0.0'
52						GAIN 0.8'
53		MB				
54						
55			54.5' - 64.1' GOOD CONCRETE, HARD, GOOD CONSOL. ENTRP. AIR 1 - 3 mm DIA. PITTED TXT. THRU OUT. SOME 5 mm - 1cm IRREG.			54.5' - 64.1'
56					13	4 PC. 1.2'
57						3.5'
58		MB				3.3'
						1.4'
						REC. 9.4'
						LOSS 0.2'
						GAIN 0.0'

ENGFORM 1836-A PREVIOUS EDITIONS ARE OBSOLETE. MAR 71

MANUFACTURED BY VULCAN PRODUCTS SECTION - ILL. FOR INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY LABORATORY - ILL.

DRILLING LOG (Cont Sheet)		ELEVATION TOP OF HOLE		Hole No. SN-N56		
PROJECT			INSTALLATION		SHEET 6	
EVALUATION OF EISENHOWER AND SNELL LOCKS			SNELL LOCK		OF 7 SHEETS	
ELEVATION	DEPTH	LEGEND	CLASSIFICATION OF MATERIALS (Description)	% CORE RECOVERY	BOX OR SAMPLE NO.	REMARKS (Drilling time, water loss, depth of weathering, etc., if applicable)
		MB			58.7	
59		MB				
60					15	
61						
62						
		MB			62.6	
63		MB				BOTTOM 2.0' BEATEN OUT OF BARREL.
64			63.9' - 73.9' GOOD CONCRETE, ABUNDANT ENTRP. AIR AIR 1mm - 3 mm DIA. FREQ. 4 mm - 1cm IRREG. BUB. PITTED TEXTURE, SOME MINOR DEGRADATION AROUND AGG.		16	64.1' 64.1' - 73.9' 3 PC. 3.2' 5.9' 0.9' 10.0'
65						
66						
67		MB			67.1	
68						
69		MB				
70						

DRILLING LOG (Cont Sheet)		ELEVATION TOP OF HOLE		Hole No. SN-N56		
PROJECT			INSTALLATION		SHEET 7	
EVALUATION OF EISENHOWER AND SNELL LOCKS			SNELL LOCK		OF 7 SHEETS	
ELEVATION	DEPTH	LEGEND	CLASSIFICATION OF MATERIALS (Description)	% CORE RECOV- ERY	BOX OR SAMPLE NO.	REMARKS (Drilling Run, water loss, depth of weathering, etc. if different)
	71	MB			71.6	
	72					
	73	MB			18	
	74					37.9' BOTTOM

RADDEN SITE 2 graphs by VERUE PRODUCTS SECTION - ILL. for INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY LABORATORY - WES

DRILLING LOG	DIVISION	INSTALLATION	SHEET 1 OF 9 SHEETS
1. PROJECT EVALUATION OF EISENHOWER AND SNELL LOCKS		10. SIZE AND TYPE OF BIT	
2. LOCATION (Coordinates or Station) MONOLITH: SN-S15 LOCK STATION 319.00		11. DATUM FOR ELEVATION SHOWN (TBM or MSL) MSL - USLS 205'	
3. DRILLING AGENCY MOBILE DISTRICT		12. MANUFACTURER'S DESIGNATION OF DRILL FALING 1500	
4. HOLE NO. (As shown on drawing title and file number) SN-S15		13. TOTAL NO. OF OVER-BURDEN SAMPLES TAKEN DISTURBED 0 UNDISTURBED 0	
5. NAME OF DRILLER CARL MOON		14. TOTAL NUMBER CORE BOXES 24	
6. DIRECTION OF HOLE <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> VERTICAL <input type="checkbox"/> INCLINED _____ DEG. FROM VERT.		15. ELEVATION GROUND WATER	
7. THICKNESS OF OVERBURDEN 0		16. DATE HOLE STARTED 13 JUNE 90 COMPLETED 18 JUNE 90	
8. DEPTH DRILLED INTO ROCK 7.2		17. ELEVATION TOP OF HOLE 205	
9. TOTAL DEPTH OF HOLE 106.2'		18. TOTAL CORE RECOVERY FOR BORING 104 %	
		19. SIGNATURE OF INSPECTOR M.EILEEN GLYNN	

ELEVATION a	DEPTH b	LEGEND c	CLASSIFICATION OF MATERIALS (Description) d	% CORE RECOVERY e	BOX OR SAMPLE NO. f	REMARKS (Drilling time, water loss, depth of weathering, etc. if significant) g
	1		0.0' - 2.5' GOOD CONCRETE. GOOD CONSOLIDATION ENTRP. AIR 1 mm - 2 mm DIA. OCC. 1 cm DIA.			PULL 1 0.0 - 2.5' REC. 2.5' LOSS 0 1 PC. 2.5'  13 JUNE 1030 HRS
	2			100		
	3		2.5' - 5.0' GOOD CONCRETE. GOOD CONSOLIDATION ENTRP. AIR 1 mm - 3 mm DIA.		1	PULL 2 14 JUNE 90 1600 HRS 2 PC. 2.0' 0.5'
	4					
	5	MB	- LIFT ? 5.0' - 6.4' GOOD CONCRETE.		4.5	REC. 2.5' LOSS 0.0
	6					
	7		6.4' - 7.5' RUBBLE BROKE OUT PC. OF REBAR.		2	1.1 LENGTH OF REBAR. THREW 1.1 AWAY.
	8					
	9		7.5' - 9.9' GOOD CONCRETE, ABUNDANT. AIR ENTRP. 1 mm - 3 mm DIA. GOOD CONSOLIDATION, HARD.	100		PULL 4 7.5' - 9.9'
	10				9.9	

RMO3008 SYS 2 Graphics by VISUAL PRODUCTS SECTION - ILL for INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY LABORATORY - WES

DRILLING LOG (Cont Sheet)		ELEVATION TOP OF HOLE		Hole No. SN-S15		
PROJECT			INSTALLATION		SHEET 2	
EVALUATION OF EISENHOWER AND SNELL LOCKS			SNELL LOCK		OF 9 SHEETS	
ELEVATION	DEPTH	LEGEND	CLASSIFICATION OF MATERIALS (Description)	% CORE RECOVERY	BOX OR SAMPLE NO.	REMARKS (Drilling time, water loss, depth of weathering, etc. if significant)
			9.9' - 19.4' GOOD CONCRETE, ABUNDANT. ENTRP. AIR 1mm - 3 mm DIA. OCC. IRREG. BUB 1-2 cm LONG. COLOR UNIFORM THRU OUT. (GREY)			9.9' - 19.6' 2 PC. 7.1' 2.4' REC. 9.5' LOSS 0.1'
	11					
	12	MB			3	PULL 5
	13					
	14					
	15	MB			14.8	
	16					
	17	MB	BREAK AT LG. BOULDER WHITE RXN. MATL. ON BREAK.		4	
	18	MB	BREAK AT LG. BOULDER WHITE RXN. MATL. ON BREAK.			
	19	MB				
	20		19.3' - 29.2' GOOD CONCRETE, HARD. GOOD CONSOLIDATION, ABUNDANT ENTRP. AIR 1mm - 3 mm DIA. ( LESS ABUNDANT 19.3' - 22.4' )			19.3
	21					19.6' - 29.2' 3 PC. 5.5' 2.6' 1.8' 9.9' PULL 6 REC. 9.9' LOSS 0.0' GAIN 0.3'
	22	MB			5	

14028-007 SYS 2 Graphics by VISUAL PRODUCTS SECTION - ILL. for INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY LABORATORY - WES

RMOS-088 SYS 2 GRAFICA by VISUAL PRODUCTS SECTION - IITL for INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY LABORATORY - WES

DRILLING LOG (Cont Sheet)		ELEVATION TOP OF HOLE		Hole No. SN-S15		
PROJECT			INSTALLATION		SHEET 3	
EVALUATION OF EISENHOWER AND SNELL LOCKS			SNELL LOCK		OF 9 SHEETS	
ELEVATION	DEPTH	LEGEND	CLASSIFICATION OF MATERIALS (Description)	% CORE RECOVERY	BOX OR SAMPLE NO.	REMARKS (Drilling time, water loss, depth of weathering, etc. if applicable)
23					5	
		MB			23.9	
24						
		MB				
25						
26					6	
27						
		MB				
28					28.0	
29						
			29.2' - 38.8'			29.2' - 38.8'
			GOOD CONCRETE,			2 PC. 3.2'
			MINOR DEGRADATION AROUND			6.4'
			AGG. SHALLOW PITTED			9.6'
			TEXTURE THROUGHOUT,			
			ENTRP. AIR 1mm - 3 mm			
			ABUNDANT, OCC. LCM			REC. 9.6'
			IRREG. BUB.			PULL 7
30					7	
31						
32				100		
		MB			32.4	
			BREAK IS PLANAR.			
33						
34						

DRILLING LOG (Cont Sheet)		ELEVATION TOP OF HOLE		Hole No. SN-S15		
PROJECT			INSTALLATION		SHEET 4	
EVALUATION OF EISENHOWER AND SNELL LOCKS			SNELL LOCK		OF 9 SHEETS	
ELEVATION	DEPTH	LEGEND	CLASSIFICATION OF MATERIALS (Description)	% CORE RECOVERY	BOX OR SAMPLE NO.	REMARKS (Drilling fluid, water level, depth of weathering, etc., if applicable)
	35	MB			8	
	36	MB				
	37	MB			36.9	
	38	MB				HOLE
	39	MB	BREAK AT LG. BOULDER 38.8' - 42.8' GOOD CONCRETE, MINOR DEGRADATION AROUND AGG. ENTRP. AIR 1 mm - 3 mm OCC. 5 mm DIA. RELATIVELY SMOOTH TEXTURE.		9	38.8' - 48.3' REC. 1 PC. 8.8' LOSS 0.7' GAIN 0.0'
	40					PULL 8
	41	MB			41.3	
	42					
	43		42.8' - 47.5' GOOD CONCRETE, A LITTLE MORE DEGRAD. AROUND AGG. THAN ABOVE, PITTED TEXTURE. ENTRP. AIR 1 mm - 3 mm		10	
	44	MB	LIFT ? 44.8' - 47.6'			
	45					
	46	MB			45.9	

RUC80000 SYS 2 graphs by VISUAL PRODUCTS SECTION - ILL for INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY LABORATORY - WES

DRILLING LOG (Cont Sheet)		ELEVATION TOP OF HOLE		Hole No. SN-S15		
PROJECT			INSTALLATION		SHEET 5	
EVALUATION OF EISENHOWER AND SNELL LOCKS			SNELL LOCK		OF 9 SHEETS	
ELEVATION	DEPTH	LEGEND	CLASSIFICATION OF MATERIALS (Description)	% CORE RECOVERY	BOX OR SAMPLE NO.	REMARKS (Drilling time, water loss, depth of weathering, etc. if significant)
47			LG. VOIDS AT 47.5' = 2 cm DIA.			
			BREAK AT BOULDER 47.6' - 49.6'			
48			GOOD CONCRETE, MINOR DEGRADATION AROUND AGG. ENTRP. AIR 1 mm - 3 mm DIA.		11	48.3' - 56.6' PULL 9
49						
50			49.6' - 51.1' POOR CONCRETE, LG. VOIDS UPTO 10 cm LONG. CORE NOT INTACT 50.4' - 50.7'		50.4	REC. 8.0' GAIN 0.7' LOSS 1.0'
51			51.1' - 55.6' GOOD CONCRETE, RELATIVELY SMOOTH TEXTURE. ENTRP. AIR. 1 mm - 3 mm DIA.		51.1	2 PC. 2.9' 5.1'
52						
53		MB			12	PROBABLY ONLY RECOVERED 7.5' ?
54						
55			55.0' - 55.6' IRREG ENTRP. AIR AROUND AGG.		55.2	
56			55.6' - 57.8' GOOD CONCRETE, MINOR DEGRADATION AROUND AGG. ENTRP. AIR 1 mm - 3 mm DIA.		13	
57						56.6' - 64.6' 2 PC. 2.2' 5.2' REC. 7.4'
58			LG. VOIDS AT 57.8'			GAIN LOSS PULL 10

RUDS-070 SYS 2 @ 1/8" by VISUAL PRODUCTS SECTION - ITL for INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY LABORATORY - WES

4409-071 SYS 2 © 1964 by VESPA PRODUCTS SECTION - ILL. for INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY LABORATORY - WES

DRILLING LOG (Cont Sheet)		ELEVATION TOP OF HOLE		Hole No. SN-S15		
PROJECT			INSTALLATION		SHEET 6	
EVALUATION OF EISENHOWER AND SNELL LOCKS			SNELL LOCK		of 9 SHEETS	
ELEVATION	DEPTH	LEGEND	CLASSIFICATION OF MATERIALS (Description)	% CORE RECOVERY	BOX OR SAMPLE NO.	REMARKS (Drilling time, water loss, depth of weathering, etc., if different)
	59		57.8' - 63.1' GOOD CONCRETE, MINOR DEGRADATION AROUND AGG. ENTRP. AIR 1 mm - 3 mm DIA.		13	
	60				59.9	
	61	MB	- LIFT ? 60.8' - 63.1' SLIGHTLY SMOOTHER TEXTURE			
	62	MB			14	
	63	MB				
	64		63.1' - 72.1' GOOD CONCRETE, ENTRP. AIR 1 mm - 2 mm OCC. 3 mm - 1 cm DIA. GOOD CONSOLIDATION		64.4	
	65					64.6' - 72.1' PULL 11 3 PC. 4.7' 4.3' 0.8'
	66		63.1' - 64.1' AND 65.8' - 67.8', HIGH CONTENT OF SMALL AGG. 3 mm TO 1 cm LONG.		15	REC. 9.8' LOSS 0.0' GAIN 2.3'
	67					MEASURED DEPTH OF HOLE 72.1' DOES NOT CORRELATE W/ AMT. OF CORE. 72.9', PROBABLY MEASURED PULLS 8' - 9' LONG.
	68				68.1	
	69				16	
	70					

DRILLING LOG (Cont Sheet)		ELEVATION TOP OF HOLE		Hole No. SN-S15		
PROJECT			INSTALLATION		SHEET 7	
EVALUATION OF EISENHOWER AND SNELL LOCKS			SNELL LOCK		OF 9 SHEETS	
ELEVATION	DEPTH	LEGEND	CLASSIFICATION OF MATERIALS (Description)	X CORE RECOVERY	BOX OR SAMPLE NO.	REMARKS (Drilling time, water loss, depth of weathering, etc. if applicable)
71		MB	LG. BOULDER 8 IN. LONG AT 70.5'		16	
72					72.1	
73		MB	72.1' - 81.0' GOOD CONCRETE, HARD. GOOD CONSOL. ENTRP. AIR 1mm - 4 mm OCC. 1 cm - 1.5 cm DIA. TEXTURE REL. SMOOTH.			72.1' - 81.0' PULL 12 MONDAY MORNING 3 PC. 0.9' 5.6' 2.4' REC. 8.9' LOSS 0.0' GAIN 0.0'
74			V. LITTLE. ENTRP. AIR 72.1' - 73.1'		17	BOTTOM WAS BEATEN OUT OF CORE BARREL EXT.
76		MB			76.3	
78		MB	BREAK AT LG. BOULDER		18	
80		MB			80.5	
81			81.0' - 90.7' (SEE NEXT SHEET)		19	PULL 13 81.0' - 90.8' REC. 9.7' LOSS 0.1' GAIN 0.0'
82						

RUC9072 SYS 2 9/8/88 by VISUAL PRODUCTS SECTION - ILL for INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY LABORATORY - WES



DRILLING LOG (Cont Sheet)		ELEVATION TOP OF HOLE		Hole No. SN-S15		
PROJECT			INSTALLATION		SHEET 9	
EVALUATION OF EISENHOWER AND SNELL LOCKS			SNELL LOCK		OF 9 SHEETS	
ELEVATION	DEPTH	LEGEND	CLASSIFICATION OF MATERIALS (Description)	% CORE RECOVERY	BOX OR SAMPLE NO.	REMARKS (Drilling Run, water loss, depth of weathering, etc., if applicable)
95						
96		MB			96.2	
97		MB	BREAK AT LG. BOULDER			
98					23	
99		MB	ROCK/CONCRETE INTERFACE AT 99.1' NO BOND.			
		MB	99.1' - 100.2' V. HARD. GRAY DOLOMITE LOOKS LAMINATED			
100		MB			100.2	BOTTOM OF RUN WAS BEATEN OUT OF CORE BARREL. ( ORIG. ONE PC. )
		MB	100.2' - 103.3' GOOD, V. HARD DOLOMITE CRYSTALLINE, LAMINATED			100.2' - 106.2'
101						PULL 15
						REC. 4.1'
						0.2'
						2.6'
						0.3'
						0.3'
						0.3'
						0.4'
					24	4.1'
						LOSS 2.0'
103		MB				
		MB				
		MB	103.3' - 104.3' SHALEY DOLOMITE WORM-LIKE VEINS OF SOFTER MATL.			
104					104.3	
105						
106						

60078-014 S15 2 prepared by VISUAL PRODUCTS SECTION - ITL for INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY LABORATORY - WES

**APPENDIX C: DESCRIPTIONS OF *SOILSTRUCT***

## **SOIL-STRUCT: Finite Element Computer Program for Soil-Structure Interaction Analysis**

SOILSTRUCT, is a general purpose finite element program for two-dimensional, plane strain analysis of soil-structure interaction and soil-inclusion interaction problems. It calculates displacements and stresses due to incremental construction and/or load application and is capable of modeling nonlinear stress-strain material behavior. The simulation of incremental construction may include embankment construction or backfilling, the placement of layer(s) of a reinforcement material during backfilling or embankment construction, dewatering, excavation, installation of a strut or tie-back anchor excavation support system, removal of the same system and the placement of concrete or other construction materials. The incremental loading simulation may consist of the application of concentrated loads, boundary pressures or loads due to temperature changes in non-soil materials.

The initial version of SOILSTRUCT was developed by Professors G. W. Clough and J. M. Duncan for use in the analysis of Port Allen and Old River U-frame locks, Clough and Duncan (1969). This version of the program reflects modifications made in conjunction with a number of projects at WES to expand the capabilities of the finite elements constitutive models, load vector formulation algorithms, the size of problem which may be analyzed, and the transfer of input, output, restart and plot data files by means of disc storage.

### **FINITE ELEMENTS EMPLOYED**

Three types of finite elements are used to represent the behavior of different materials, (1) a two-dimensional continuum element, (2) an interface element, and (3) a one-dimensional bar element.

A two-dimensional, subparametric, quadrilateral element (QM5) is used to represent the soil and most structural materials. Structural supports, such as the struts or tieback components of an excavation support system, are typically modeled as a spring support using bar elements. However, two-dimensional elements have been used to model these supports. The geometry of this element, developed by Doherty, Wilson, and Taylor (1969), is defined by four external nodes, while the displacement functions include an internal fifth node. To improve flexural response, a constant shear strain, calculated at the location of the internal fifth node, is imposed throughout the element. The QM5 element can be allowed to degrade to a triangular element by letting two adjacent nodes of the quadrilateral coincide.

The Goodman, Taylor, and Breeke (1969) interface element is used to allow for relative movement between different materials, such as between a soil backfill and a support wall. This element is defined by four nodes, with each of the two pairs of nodes having the same coordinates; thus, this type of element has no thickness.

One-dimensional, two node bar or spring elements are used to model the behavior of a variety of structural systems. This includes the modeling of structural supports such as braces or tiebacks or the modeling of reinforcement placed within a soil backfill.

## **MATERIAL STRESS-STRAIN BEHAVIOR**

Several modes of stress-strain behavior are utilized to represent the response of soil, construction materials and the interface region between different materials.

The constitutive relationship used for all two-dimensional elements is Hooke's law. SOILSTRUCT uses an incremental, equivalent linear method of analysis to model nonlinear material behavior. In this type of analysis, the incremental changes in stresses are related to the incremental strains through a linear relationship. This relationship is defined for each structural element by two engineering constants, the Youngs moduli and the Poisson's ratio. For the soil elements either the Youngs moduli and Poisson's ratio, or the Youngs moduli and bulk moduli may be specified.

### **Non-Linear Stress-Strain Response of Soil**

A plane strain, isotropic drained or undrained stress-strain soil model is incorporated within SOILSTRUCT. The program uses a nonlinear, stress-dependent hyperbolic curve to represent the relationship between stress and strains developing during primary loading of the soil (Figure 1a) and a linear stress-strain response during unloading or reloading of the soil (Figure 1b). The unload-reload stress-strain response is applicable when the current stress state is less than that which has been applied previously; otherwise, the primary loading stress-strain is appropriate. Laboratory testing and interpretation procedures for determining the parameters used to define the soil model are described in Duncan, Byrne, Wong, and Mabry (1978). A brief review of the hyperbolic model is given below.

The nonlinear soil response to loading is modeled by performing a series of analyses in which each load is applied incrementally, with the total change in stress computed at the center of each soil element being equal to the sum of the incremental changes in stress over all the load steps. In general, the greater the curvature of the stress-strain relationship or the larger the magnitude of the applied load, the greater

the number of load steps required to accurately model the nonlinear soil response. This may be achieved in two ways using SOILSTRUCT; either the total load is applied using a greater number of incremental loadings, or during the course of each load case analysis the load vector may be applied in series of increments using the substep option.

Application of each loading in the finite element analysis results in a change in stress within each of the soil elements. In addition to the change in stress, there is a corresponding change in stiffness. Since each incremental analysis is performed assuming equivalent linear element response, SOILSTRUCT updates the value of the elastic moduli assigned to each soil element so as to reflect the magnitude of the current stress state within the element. To account for the change in stiffness that occurs during the application of a load increment, each incremental load calculation may be repeated using the iteration option. When the iteration option is invoked, the load vector is reapplied with a revised value for the element stiffness. The value assigned for the stiffness of the soil element reflects the average of the stress state developed at the end of the previous load case, or substep, and that which develops during the current iteration. However, when only one iteration is specified, the modulus values are calculated using the stresses developed at the end of the previous the load increment. Upon completion of the last iteration for each load case or substep, the arrays tabulating the values of the total nodal point displacements and total element stresses are updated with the computed incremental values.

#### Primary Loading - Youngs Moduli

Prior to each analysis a tangent Youngs moduli,  $E_t$ , is assigned to each soil element. The stress-dependent value of  $E_t$  is computed using the relationship

$$E_t = E_i(1 - R_f SL)^2$$

where

$E_i$  = the initial Youngs moduli

$R_f$  = the failure ratio

SL = the stress level

The initial Youngs moduli,  $E_i$ , is equal to

$$E_1 = KP_a \left( \frac{\sigma_3}{P_a} \right)^n$$

**K** = the modulus number  
**n** = the modulus exponent  
**P<sub>a</sub>** = Atmospheric Pressure  
**σ<sub>3</sub>** = minor principal stress

The proportion of mobilized shear strength for each soil element is reflected in the value of the stress level, SL. SL is equal to the current deviator stress,  $(\sigma_1 - \sigma_3)$ , divided by the deviator stress at failure,  $(\sigma_1 - \sigma_3)_f$ , denoted by the subscript f.

$$SL = \frac{(\sigma_1 - \sigma_3)}{(\sigma_1 - \sigma_3)_f}$$

where

**σ<sub>1</sub>** = major principal stress

The value of SL ranges from a value equal to zero, to a value equal to unity. SL equal to zero indicates an isotropic stress state, while SL equal to unity corresponds to the complete mobilization of shear resistance within the soil element.

The version of SOILSTRUCT used in this study allows for two procedures for defining the deviator stress at failure; the original Duncan formulation, Duncan and Chang (1970), and a procedure developed by Peters (1988). In the original Duncan formulation as shown in Figure 2a, the values of the minor principal stress at failure is set equal to the current minor principal stress. The deviator stress at failure is given by

$$(\sigma_1 - \sigma_3) = \frac{2c \cos \phi + 2\sigma_3 \sin \phi}{1 - \sin \phi}$$

where

**c** = cohesion intercept  
**φ** = angle of internal friction

In the Peters formulation shown in Figure 2b, the value for the deviator stress at failure is defined based upon the assumption that the average value of the major and minor principal stresses at failure is equal to the average value of the current major and minor principal stresses.

$$(\sigma_1 - \sigma_3) = 2c \cos \phi + (\sigma_1 + \sigma_3) \sin \phi$$

The difference between these two procedures may be expressed in terms of the resulting vector curves as shown in Figure 2. Vector curves are loci of points describing the state of stress on planes on which failure eventually occurs. The resulting vector curves in the Duncan formulation are to the right; reflecting the assumption that failure is a result of an increase in major principal stress. In contrast, the vector curves to the left in the Peters formulation are attributed to a coincident increase in major principal stress and decrease in the minor principal stress. In general, the Duncan formulation results in larger values of  $(\sigma_1 - \sigma_3)_f$  and therefore smaller values of SL than the Peters formulation. The Peters formulation was developed for undrained loading where  $\sigma'_1 + \sigma'_3$  is the constant consolidation stress determined for the initial stress state.

The failure ratio,  $R_f$ , relates the ultimate deviator stress,  $(\sigma_1 - \sigma_3)_{ult}$ , to the deviator stress at failure,  $(\sigma_1 - \sigma_3)_f$ .

$$(\sigma_1 - \sigma_3)_f = R_f (\sigma_1 - \sigma_3)_{ult}$$

The ultimate deviator stress is the asymptote to the stress-strain hyperbola, as shown in Figure 1a. The value of  $R_f$  is always less than unity and varies from 0.5 to 0.9 for most soils.

#### Unload-Reload Stress-Strain Behavior

During unloading or reloading when the current deviator stress is less than that which has been applied during previous loadings, a stress dependent, linear response is assumed, as shown in Figure 1b. In this case, the value of  $E_{ur}$  is computed using

$$E_{ur} = K_{ur} P_a \left( \frac{\sigma_3}{P_a} \right)^n$$

where

$K_{ur}$  = the unload-reload modulus number

### Poisson's Ratio

The second elastic parameter used to define the material behavior of soil is either the Poisson's ratio,  $\nu$ , or the bulk moduli,  $B$ . This version of SOILSTRUCT allows either parameter to be used. When using Poisson's ratio two values are specified; a constant value which is applicable for all states of stress prior to failure,  $SL < 1$ , and the value of Poisson's ratio applicable when the shear strength of the soil is fully mobilized,  $SL = 1$ .

The hyperbolic model is designed so that as the soil approaches failure the 0.5. The variation in  $\nu$  is accomplished by computing the shear modulus with  $E_t$  and  $\nu_i$  and bulk modulus with  $E_i$  and  $\nu_i$ . This variation in  $\nu$  amounts to

$$\nu = \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{1-b}{1 + \frac{1}{2}b} \right)$$

where

$$b = \left( \frac{E_t}{E_i} \right) \left( \frac{1 - 2\nu_i}{1 + \nu_i} \right)$$

Therefore,  $\nu = \nu_i$  when  $E_t = E_i$  but increases toward 0.5 as  $E_t$  becomes small, near failure.

### Interface Response

Interface elements are used to allow for relative movement between different material regions, such as between a soil backfill and a support wall. These elements

are defined by four nodes, each node having two degrees of freedom and each of the two pairs of nodes share the same coordinates. The interface element, therefore, is of finite length but zero thickness.

The properties of interface elements are defined by an interface normal stiffness,  $k_n$ , and an interface shear stiffness,  $k_s$ . These values of stiffness relate the average relative displacements normal to the interface element,  $\Delta_n$ , and average relative shear displacements,  $\Delta_s$ , to the corresponding normal stress,  $\sigma_n$ , and shear stress,  $\tau$ , by the equations

$$\sigma_n = k_n \Delta_n$$

and

$$\tau = k_s \Delta_s$$

The units of  $k_n$  and  $k_s$  are force per cubic length.

The value of  $k_n$  is set equal to  $1 \times 10^8$  within the program. This value for  $k_n$  ensures that the normal relative displacement of the interface element is insignificant when English units (ft, lbs) or SI units (m, KN) are used. If other units are used, the value of the normal stiffness may need to be changed to a higher value.

Two types of interface shear response are modeled, a bilinear shear stress-displacement relationship shown in Figure 3a, and a hyperbolic shear stress-displacement relationship shown in Figure 3b. In the bilinear model, the value assigned to  $k_s$  is a constant so long as the average shear stress,  $\tau$ , along the interface is less than the shear strength. If the shear strength of the interface element is fully mobilized, which occurs when  $\tau$  is equal to  $\tau_f$ , then  $k_s$  is set equal to zero. When the normal stress,  $\sigma_n$ , is greater than or equal to zero, the value of  $\tau_f$  is given by the relationship

$$\tau_f = c_i + \sigma_n \tan \delta$$

where

$c_i$  = cohesion intercept

$\delta$  = angle of internal friction along the interface

and is shown in Figure 3a. When  $\sigma_n$  is less than zero,  $\tau_f$  is computed using

$$\tau_f = \sigma_n \left( \frac{c_i}{\sigma_t} \right)$$

where

$\sigma_t$  = tensile strength

Direct shear test results on soil-to-concrete interfaces and soil-to-steel interfaces by Potyondy (1961), Clough and Duncan (1969) and Peterson, Kulhawy, Nucci, and Wasil (1976) have shown that the value is proportional to the angle of internal friction of the soil. The value of the constant of proportionality is dependent upon both the type of soil and the type of material comprising the surface of the structure.

The direct shear tests performed by Clough and Duncan (1969) and Peterson, Kulhawy, Nucci, and Wasil (1976) have shown that for some materials, such as sand-to-concrete interfaces, the interface response during shear is nonlinear and dependent upon the normal stress. A nonlinear, stress-dependent hyperbolic curve is used to represent the relationship between shear stress and average relative shear displacement developing during primary loading of the interface (Figure 3a) and a linear shear stress-relative displacement response during unloading or reloading of the interface. The stress-dependent value of  $k_{st}$  is computed using the relationship

$$k_{st} = k_{si} (1 - R_f SL_i)^2$$

where

$k_{si}$  = the initial interface shear stiffness

$R_{fi}$  = the failure ratio  
 $SL_i$  = the stress level

The initial interface shear stiffness,  $k_{si}$ , is equal to

$$k_{si} = K_i \gamma_w \left( \frac{\sigma_n}{P_a} \right)^{n_i}$$

$K_i$  = the interface modulus number  
 $\gamma_w$  = unit weight of water  
 $n_i$  = the interface modulus exponent  
 $\sigma_n$  = normal stress  
 $P_a$  = Atmospheric Pressure

The proportion of mobilized shear strength for each interface element is reflected in the value of the stress level,  $SL_i$ .  $SL_i$  is equal to the current shear stress,  $\tau$ , divided by the shear stress at failure,  $\tau_f$ .

$$SL_i = \frac{\tau}{\tau_f}$$

$\tau_f$  is computed using the equation above.  $SL_i$  ranges in value between zero and one.


The failure ratio,  $R_{fi}$ , relates the ultimate shear stress,  $\tau_{ult}$ , to the shear stress at failure.

$$\tau_f = R_{fi} \tau_{ult}$$


The ultimate shear stress is the asymptote to the shear stress-relative shear displacement hyperbola, as shown in Figure 4b. Direct shear tests on sand-to-concrete interfaces by Peterson, Kulhawy, Nucci, and Wasil (1976) have shown the value of  $R_{fi}$  typically ranges in value from 0.3 to 1.0.

The relationship between the average normal stress along the interface and the

tensile strength is shown in Figure 4b. The value of  $k_n$  is a constant value equal to  $1 \times 10^8$  when  $\sigma_n$  is greater than or equal to  $\sigma_t$ . If  $\sigma_n$  is less than  $\sigma_t$ , then  $k_n$  is set equal to zero, assuring that additional tensile stresses do not accrue upon subsequent loadings. This procedure allows for separation to occur between two adjacent regions of the mesh along interface elements during the course of an incremental analysis.




a. Hyperbolic representation of stress-strain curve for primary loading




b. Linear unloading-reloading stress-strain relationship

Figure 1. Hyperbolic model for stress-strain behavior  
(after Duncan, Byrne, Wong, and Mabry 1978)




a. Duncan formulation,  $\sigma_{3f} = \sigma_3$




b. Peters formulation,  $p = \frac{(\sigma_1 + \sigma_3)_f}{2} = \frac{(\sigma_1 + \sigma_3)}{2}$

Figure 2. Two procedures used to define deviator stress at failure,  $(\sigma_1 - \sigma_3)_f$




a. Bilinear stress-strain model representing interface behavior




b. Hyperbolic representation of the variation of shear stress with relative shear displacement ( $k_{st}$  = tangent interface shear stiffness,  $k_{si}$  = initial interface shear stiffness)

Figure 3. Bilinear and hyperbolic models for interface shear stress-relative shear displacement behavior after Clough and Duncan (1969)



a. Strength criteria



b. Normal stress-normal relative displacement behavior

Figure 4. Interface strength criteria and normal stress-normal relative displacement relationship

## REFERENCES

- Clough, G.W. (1984) "Users Manual for Program SOILSTRUCT", Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg, Virginia.
- Clough, G.W. and Duncan, J.M. (1969) "Finite Element Analyses of Port Allen and Old River Locks", Report No. TE 69-3, College of Engineering, Office of Research Services, University of California, Berkeley, California, September.
- Clough, G.W. and Kuppusamy, T. (1985), "Finite Element Analysis of Lock and Dam 26 Cofferdam", Journal of Geotechnical Engineering Division, American Society of Civil Engineers, Vol. III, No. 4, pp 521-541.
- Clough, G.W. and Tsui, Y. (1977), "Static Analysis of Earth Retaining Structures", Numerical Methods in Geotechnical Engineering, edited by Desai, C.S. and Christian, J.T., McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York, pp 506-527.
- Doherty, W.P., Wilson, E.L., and Taylor, R.L. (1969), "Stress Analysis of Axisymmetric Solids Utilizing Higher-Order Quadrilateral Finite Elements", Report No. SESM 69-3, Structural Engr. Lab., University of California, Berkeley, California.
- Duncan, J.M., Byrne, P., Wong, K.S., and Mabry (1978), "Strength, Stress-Strain and Bulk Modulus Parameters for Finite Element Analyses of Stresses and Movements in Soil Masses", Report No. UCB/GT/78-02, College of Engineering, Office of Research Services, University of California, Berkely, California, April.
- Duncan, J.M. and Chang, C-Y (1970), "Nonlinear Analysis of Stress and Strain in Soils", Journal of the Soil Mechanics and Foundations Division, ASCE, Vol. 96, No. SM5, Proc. Paper 7513, September 1970, pp 1629-1653.
- Duncan, J.M., Seed, R.B., Wong, K.S., and Ozawa, Y. (1984), "FEADAM84: A Computer Program for Finite Element Analysis of Dams", Research Report No. SU/GT/84-03, Geotechnical Engineering, Department of Civil Engineering, Standord University, November.
- Dunlap, P., Duncan, J.M., and Seed, H.B. (1968), "Finite Element Analyses of Slopes in Soil", U.S. Army Engineer Waterways Experiment Station, Vicksburg, Mississippi, Contract Report S-68-6, May.

Goodman, R.E., Taylor, R.L., and Breeke, T.L. (1968), "A Model for the Mechanics of Jointed Rock", Journal of the Soil Mechanics and Foundations Division, ASCE, No. SM3.

Jaky, J. (1948), "Pressure in Silos", Proceedings, 2nd International Conference on Soil Mechanics and Foundation Engineering, Vol. 1, pp 103-107.

Leavell, D.A., Peters, J.F., Edris, E.V., and Holmes T.L. (1989), "Development of Finite-Element Based Design Procedure for Sheet-Pile Walls", Technical Report GL-89-14, U.S. Army Engineer Waterways Experiment Station, Vicksburg, Mississippi.

Mana, A.I. (1978), "Finite Element Analyses of Deep Excavation Behavior in Soft Clay", PhD dissertation submitted to the Department of Civil Engineering and the Committee on Graduate Studies, Stanford University, California.

Mosher, R.L. and Knowles, V.R. (1990), "Finite Element Study of Tieback Wall for Bonneville Navigation Lock", Technical Report ITL-90-4, U.S. Army Engineer Waterways Experiment Station, Vicksburg, Mississippi.

Peters, J.F., Holmes, T.L., and Leavell, D.A. (1986), "Finite Element Analysis of Williamson CBD Sheetpile Cell Floodwall, TASK 1", letter report to Department of the Army COE, Huntington District, Huntington, West Virginia.

Peterson, M.S., Kulhawy, F.H., Nucci, L.R., and Wasil, B.A. (1976), "Stress-Deformation Behavior of Soil-Concrete Interfaces", Contract Report B-49, Department of Civil Engineering, Syracuse University, Syracuse, New York.

Potyondy, J.G. (1961), "Skin Friction Between Various Soils and Construction Materials", Geotechnique, Vol. II, No. 4, December, pp 339-353.

Timoshenko and Woinowsky-Krieger (1959), Theory of Plates and Shells, Second Edition, McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York, p 5.

Zienkiewicz, O.C. (1977), The Finite Element Method, Third Edition, McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York.

**APPENDIX D: REANALYSIS OF TRIAXIAL TESTS**

### Computation of Hyperbolic Parameters

Sample: TP-84-6  
 Depth: 2-4'  
 Type: STD. Compaction  
 Descrip.: Glacial Till, ML

pa = 14.7 psi

Data for Deviatoric Modulus Parameters											
70% Stress Level					95% Stress Level						
s3 psi	(s1-s3) psi	(s1-s3) psi	ea %	ea/(s1-s3)	(s1-s3) psi	ea %	ea/(s1-s3)	s3/pa	1/(s1-s3)ult	Rf	Ei/pa
15	56.9	39.8	1.9	4.774E-04	54.1	3.2	5.915E-04	1.02	8.778E-03	0.4995	219.01
30	110.5	77.4	2.3	2.972E-04	105	4.1	3.905E-04	2.04	5.184E-03	0.5729	382.35
60	206.9	144.8	2.8	1.934E-04	196.6	4.8	2.442E-04	4.08	2.539E-03	0.5253	556.33
										Avg. Rf =	0.5325

**Soil Properties:**

Phi = 38.7 deg  
 c = 300 psf

**Computed Deviatoric Stress at Failure:**

s3	(s1-s3)f
15	58.73
30	108.78
60	208.88

**Compute Least Square Fit of Data:**

logx	logy	(logy)^2	logy/logx	(logy)^2
0.00877392	2.34046674	5.47778455	0.02053508	7.6982E-05
0.30980392	2.58246466	6.6691237	0.80005767	0.09597847
0.61083392	2.74533571	7.53686815	1.67694416	0.37311807

**Summations:**


0.92941176    7.6682671    19.6837764    2.49753691    0.46917352

**Hyperbolic Parameters:**


n = 0.6724728  
 k = 222.71749

**New Curve Values:**

x	y
1.020408	225.763926
2.040816	359.823094
4.081633	573.486922



Test and Computed Stress-Strain Curves



### Computation of Hyperbolic Parameters

Sample: TP-84-6  
 Depth: 2-4'  
 Type: Mod. Compaction  
 Descrip.: Glacial Till, ML

pa = 14.7 psi

s3 psi	70% Stress Level				95% Stress Level			
	(s1-s3)/psi	(s1-s3) psi	ea %	ea/(s1-s3)	(s1-s3) psi	ea %	ea/(s1-s3)	s3/pa
15	95.4	66.8	0.48	7.186E-05	90.6	0.76	8.389E-05	1.02
30	156.8	109.8	0.68	6.193E-05	149	1.03	6.913E-05	2.04
60	246.7	172.7	0.73	4.227E-05	234.4	1.16	4.949E-05	4.08

**Soil Properties:**

Phi = 38.8 deg  
 c = 1740 psf

**Computed Deviatoric Stress at Failure:**

s3	(s1-s3)/
15	100.78
30	151.13
60	251.81

**Compute Least Square Fit of Data:**

logy	(logy) <sup>2</sup>	logylogx	(logx) <sup>2</sup>
0.00877392	3.12311357	9.75383837	0.02740196
0.30980392	3.15190711	9.93451845	0.97647318
0.61083392	3.35533505	11.2582733	2.04955245

**Summations:**

0.92941176 9.63035574 30.9466301 3.05342759 0.46917352

**Hyperbolic Parameters:**


n = 0.38571153  
 k = 1232.03667

**New Curve Values:**

x	Y
1.020408	1241.67472
2.040816	1622.25297
4.081633	2119.47999


1/(s1-s3)ult	Rf	Ei/pa
4.296E-03	0.4098	1327.74
2.056E-03	0.3224	1418.75
1.679E-03	0.4141	2266.39

Avg. Rf = 0.3821





### Test and Computed Stress-Strain Curves



### Computation of Hyperbolic Parameters

Sample: TP-84-6  
 Depth: 8-10'  
 Type: STD. Compaction  
 Descrip.: Glacial Till, SM

pa = 14.7 psi

s3 psi	70% Stress Level				95% Stress Level			
	(s1-s3) psi	(s1-s3) psi	ea %	ea/(s1-s3)	(s1-s3) psi	(s1-s3) psi	ea %	ea/(s1-s3)
15	61.7	43.2	0.62	1.435E-04	58.6	58.6	1.15	1.962E-04
30	110.3	77.2	0.77	9.974E-05	104.8	104.8	1.37	1.307E-04
60	227.2	159	1.79	1.126E-04	215.8	215.8	3.42	1.585E-04

1/(s1-s3)ult	s3/pa	Rf	Ei/pa
9.949E-03	1.02	0.6138	831.25
5.164E-03	2.04	0.5696	1134.21
2.816E-03	4.08	0.6398	1094.19

Avg. Rf = 0.6077

**Soil Properties:**

Phi = 40.4 deg  
 c = 110 psf

**Computed Deviatoric Stress at Failure:**

s3	(s1-s3)
15	58.56
30	113.82
60	224.33

**Compute Least Square Fit of Data:**

logx	logy	(logy) <sup>2</sup>	logy/logx	(logx) <sup>2</sup>
0.00877392	2.91972965	8.52482121	0.02561749	7.6982E-05
0.30980392	3.05469212	9.33114397	0.94635559	0.09597847
0.61083392	3.03909136	9.2360763	1.85638008	0.37311807

**Summations:**


0.92941176    9.01351313    27.0920415    2.82835316    0.46917352

**Hyperbolic Parameters:**


n = 0.19825552  
 k = 877.170548

**New Curve Values:**

x	y
1.020408	880.690923
2.040816	1010.42569
4.081633	1159.2717



### Test and Computed Stress-Strain Curves



Adjusted

Computation of Hyperbolic Parameters

Sample: TP-84-6  
 Depth: 8-10'  
 Type: STD. Compaction  
 Descrip.: Glacial Till, SM

pa = 14.7 psi

s3	70% Stress Level				95% Stress Level			
	(s1-s3) psi	(s1-s3) psi	ea %	ea/(s1-s3)	(s1-s3) psi	ea %	ea/(s1-s3)	s3/pa
15	61.7	43.2	0.62	1.435E-04	58.6	1.15	1.962E-04	1.02
30	110.3	77.2	0.77	9.974E-05	104.8	1.37	1.307E-04	2.04
60	227.2	159	1.79	1.126E-04	215.8	3.42	1.585E-04	4.08

Avg. Rf = 0.6500

1/(s1-s3)ult	Rf	Ei/pa
9.949E-03	0.6138	831.25
5.164E-03	0.5696	1134.21
2.816E-03	0.6398	1094.19

Soil Properties:

Phi = 40.4 deg  
 c = 110 psf

Computed Deviatoric Stress at Failure:

s3	(s1-s3)l
15	58.56
30	113.82
60	224.33

Compute Least Square Fit of Data:

logx	logy	(logy) <sup>2</sup>	logy/logx	(logy) <sup>2</sup>
0.00877392	2.91972965	8.52482121	0.02561749	7.6982E-05
0.30980392	3.05469212	9.33114397	0.94635559	0.09597847
0.61083392	3.03909136	9.2360763	1.85638008	0.37311807

Summations:


0.92941176 9.01351313 27.0920415 2.82835316 0.46917352

Hyperbolic Parameters:

n = 0.8  
 k = 210


New Curve Values:

x	y
1.020408	213.421631
2.040816	371.588642
4.081633	646.973403



Compute Stress-Strain Curves				Sigma 3:	15	(s1-s3)f:	61.7	n=	0.8
					30	110.3	k=	210	
					60	227.2	Rf=	0.65	
Test Data		Computed Curves							
e	x1	x2	x3	x1	x2	x3			
0	0	0	0	0.00	0.00	0.00			
0.2	8	10	12	5.89	10.26	18.04			
0.4	14	18	26	11.08	19.36	34.31			
0.6	20	28	40	15.71	27.47	49.05			
0.8	22	34	50	19.85	34.75	62.48			
1	26	40	62	23.58	41.32	74.76			
1.2	30	48	70	26.96	47.28	86.04			
1.6	36	58	94	32.83	57.69	106.02			
2	42	70	112	37.78	66.46	123.18			
2.4	48	80	130	41.99	73.96	138.08			
2.8	52	86	144	45.62	80.44	151.15			
3.2	54	94	160	48.79	86.10	162.69			
3.6	56	98	170	51.58	91.09	172.96			
4	56	104	182	54.04	95.51	182.16			
4.4	56	108	190	56.25	99.47	190.45			
4.8	56	108	196	58.22	103.02	197.96			
5.2	56	110	202	60.01	106.23	204.79			
5.6		110	206	61.63	109.14	211.04			
6		110	206	63.10	111.80	216.76			
6.4		110	206	64.45	114.24	222.03			
6.8		110	206	65.69	116.48	226.90			
7.2			206	66.84	118.54	231.41			
7.6			206	67.89	120.46	235.60			

Test and Computed Stress-Strain Curves



### Computation of Hyperbolic Parameters

Sample: TP-84-6  
 Depth: 8-10'  
 Type: Mod. Compaction  
 Descrip.: Glacial Till, SM

pa = 14.7 psi

s3 psi	Data for Deviatoric Modulus Parameters			
	(s1-s3) psi	ea %	ea/(s1-s3)	95% Stress Level
15	112.9	0.82	1.038E-04	(s1-s3) psi 107.3
30	161.6	0.7	6.189E-05	ea/(s1-s3) 1.109E-04
60	292.2	0.92	4.499E-05	ea % 1.07
				95% Stress Level 277.6
				ea/(s1-s3) 5.115E-05
				ea % 1.42
				s3/ps 4.08
				1/(s1-s3)ult 0.3603
				RI 0.2168
				RI 0.3413
				RI 0.3603
				Avg. RI = 0.3061

**Soil Properties:**

Phi = 41.7 deg  
 c = 1540 psf

**Computed Deviatoric Stress at Failure:**

s3	(s1-s3)1
15	107.32
30	166.93
60	286.16

**Compute Least Square Fit of Data:**

logx	logy	(logy)^2	logylogx	(logx)^2
0.00877392	2.88796395	8.3403358	0.02533878	7.6982E-05
0.30980392	3.15959219	9.98302281	0.97885405	0.09597847
0.61083392	3.3057719	10.9281278	2.01927759	0.37311807


Summations:  
 0.92941176 9.35332804 29.2514864 3.02347041 0.46917352


**Hyperbolic Parameters:**

n = 0.69396397  
 k = 799.435178

**New Curve Values:**

x	y
1.020408	810.722157
2.040816	1311.52331
4.081633	2121.6805





### Computation of Hyperbolic Parameters

Sample: TP-84.5  
 Depth: 8.5-9.5'  
 Type: STD. Compaction  
 Descr.: Glacial Till, CL

pa = 14.7 psi

s3 psi	Data for Deviatoric Modulus Parameters			
	70% Stress Level		95% Stress Level	
15	(s1-s3)f psi	(s1-s3) psi	ea/(s1-s3)	ea/(s1-s3)
30	44.9	31.4	1.65	5.255E-04
60	89.6	62.7	2.27	3.620E-04
	167.4	117.2	3.95	3.370E-04
			ea %	ea %
			4.28	4.28
			5.42	5.42
			8	8

s3/pa	1/(s1-s3)ult	Rf	Ei/pa
1.02	1.813E-02	0.8141	300.60
2.04	8.726E-03	0.7818	414.87
4.08	4.102E-03	0.6866	388.69
Avg. Rf = 0.7608			

**Soil Properties:**

Phi = 35.2 deg  
 c = 225 psf

**Computed Deviatoric Stress at Failure:**

s3	(s1-s3)f
15	46.86
30	87.68
60	169.34


Compute Least Square Fit of Data:				
logy	(logy) <sup>2</sup>	logylogx	(logx) <sup>2</sup>	
0.00877392	2.47798978	6.14043335	0.02174169	7.6982E-05
0.30980392	2.61791716	6.85349025	0.811041	0.09597847
0.61083392	2.58959906	6.70602329	1.58181493	0.37311807
<b>Summations:</b>				
0.92941176	7.685506	19.6999469	2.41459763	0.46917352


**Hyperbolic Parameters:**

n = 0.185379  
 k = 319.450955

**New Curve Values:**

x	y
1.020408	320.649593
2.040816	364.615673
4.081633	414.610191





### Computation of Hyperbolic Parameters

Sample: TP-84-5  
 Depth: 8.5-9.5'  
 Type: MOD. Compaction  
 Descrip.: Glacial Till, CL

pa = 14.7 psi

s3 psi	70% Stress Level				95% Stress Level			
	(s1-s3)/psi	(s1-s3) psi	ea %	ea/(s1-s3)	(s1-s3) psi	ea %	ea/(s1-s3)	s3/pa
15	91.2	63.8	0.84	1.317E-04	86.6	1.34	1.547E-04	1.02
30	142.7	99.9	0.89	8.909E-05	135.6	1.54	1.136E-04	2.04
60	248.5	174	1.11	6.379E-05	236.1	2.09	8.852E-05	4.08

Avg. R<sup>2</sup> = 0.5284

**Soil Properties:**

Phi = 39.5 deg  
 c = 1300 psf

**Computed Deviatoric Stress at Failure:**

s3	(s1-s3)/
15	90.72
30	143.15
60	248.02

**Compute Least Square Fit of Data:**

logy	(logy) <sup>2</sup>	logylogx	(logx) <sup>2</sup>
0.00877392	2.86467231	8.20634744	0.02513442
0.30980392	3.08784226	9.5347698	0.95662564
0.61083392	3.27899311	10.7517958	2.0029202

**Summations:**


0.92941176    9.23150768    28.4929131    2.98468025    0.46917352

**Hyperbolic Parameters:**

n = 0.68817196  
 k = 731.09002

**New Curve Values:**

x	y
1.020408	741.325304
2.040816	1194.45344
4.081633	1924.5519







SUBJECT: <u>Hyperbolic Parameters</u>	COMPUTED BY:	DATE:	FILE NO.
	CHECKED BY:	DATE:	SHEET NO.


Summary


Test	$R_f$	$n$	$K$	$\phi$	$C$ psf
84-6-2S, ML	0.53	0.67	223	38.7	300
84-6-2M, ML	0.38	0.39	1232	38.8	1740
84-6-8S, SM	0.61	0.20	877	40.4	110
adjusted ?	0.30	0.65	210		
84-6-8M, SM	0.21	0.69	799	41.7	1540
84-5-2C, CL	0.76	0.19	317	35.2	225
84-5-8M, CL	0.53	0.69	731	39.5	1300


**APPENDIX E: RESULTS FOR SOUTH CHAMBER WALL AT EISENHOWER LOCK**





















































CONTOURS OF

NODAL RESULTS

VIEW : -3.55E+04

RANGE : -1.59E+04










Figure E20. Distribution of minor principal stresses and the deformed shape of the wall and surrounding backfill after placement of the anchors

















**APPENDIX F: RESULTS FOR NORTH CHAMBER WALL AT SNELL LOCK**



NUMBER RESULTS

UNIT : -0.021 #02

RANGE : 1.91E+04










Figure F2. Distribution of vertical stresses in the lock wall







































































**APPENDIX G: PETROGRAPHIC EXAMINATION RESULTS**

U. S. Army Engineer  
Waterways Experiment Station  
3909 Halls Ferry Road  
Vicksburg, Mississippi 39180-6199

Eisenhower & Snell Locks  
October 20, 1991  
G. Sam Wong

### Background

1. Cores from both Eisenhower and Snell Locks were taken for evaluation and examination. Portions of two cores from Eisenhower and one from Snell were selected for petrographic examination. When constructed in the mid 50's the two structure have been subjected to similar environmental conditions but severe deterioration was noticed in the concrete of Eisenhower Lock and was investigated by WES and reported by Buck in 1967, "Investigation of Concrete in Eisenhower and Snell Locks, St. Lawrence Seaway", TR No. 6-784. The current investigation also compares the concrete from the two structure.

### Samples

2. Identifying data for the samples are shown below:

Serial No.	Lock Structure	Description
N-53-26-46	Eisenhower	North side of lock, Boring No. 53, Box 26, specimen #46, core run 104.8-108.6 ft, just above bedrock, 3610 psi
S-17-7-14	Eisenhower	South side of lock Boring No. 17, Box 7, specimen #14, core run 25.1-29.4 ft, upper portion of lock, 5980 psi
SN-S-15-1-50	Snell	South side of lock, Boring No. 15, Box 1, core #50, core run 0-4.5 ft, upper portion of lock, 7420 psi

### Test Procedure

3. The as-received pieces of core were examined and subsamples were cut longitudinally and surface ground prior to examination.

- a. Pieces were examined using a setereomicroscope.
- b. Air content was determined using automatic image analysis system. The air voids in the sample were enhanced using a mixture of  $TiO_2$  and grease to fill the voids.

### Results and Discussion

4. Inspection of the three pieces of concrete indicated the following:

- a. All pieces of core were similar in appearance. The maximum aggregate size was 3 in., 1.5 in., and 6 in. for samples N-53-26-46, S-17-7-14, and SN-S-15-1-50 respectively.
- b. All of the broken surfaces appeared to represent fresh fractures. The breaks tended to go around the larger coarse aggregates and through the smaller coarse aggregates. Examination of freshly broken surfaces made during the examination also indicated similar features.

c. The concrete was air-entrained. The air content for the samples examined ranged from 2.3 to 2.8 percent. Figures 1, 2, and 3 shows good distribution of air voids in the paste portion. Figure No. 2 indicated some tendency for air voids to be near the aggregate/paste interface of some coarse aggregate particles. Because of the relative small area of sampling for the air content determination, the low air content of the concrete is not believed to be of any significance. Previous average air contents reported by Buck were near 3.5 percent for the two lock structures.

d. The concrete contains crushed dolomite coarse aggregates and crushed dolomite fine aggregates. Reaction rims were not found in any of the aggregate particles. No other deleterious reactions were observed in any of the pieces of cores examined.

e. Use of phenolphthalein indicator to enhance the paste portion for image analysis indicated no carbonation of the paste as the entire paste portion of the concrete turned a reddish color.

#### Summary

5. Examination of two pieces of cores from Eisenhower Lock and comparison with concrete from Snell Lock indicated that concrete from both structures are similar and free from damaging cement-aggregate reactions and other deleterious reaction. The concrete from the two structures are similar.




Figure No. 1. Sample N-53-26-4a contains approximately 2.3 percent air. Air voids are circled in blue showing good distribution in paste. (X).




Figure No. 2. Sample S-17-1-11 contains approximately 2.6 percent air voids. Some preferential alignment of air voids are noticed along large aggregate particles. 2X.




Figure No. 3. Sample SN-3-13-1-70 contained approximately 2.8 percent air. The air voids are evenly distributed throughout the matrix. The dark spot on the large aggregate is ink used to cover large white crystals in the aggregate fraction of the concrete for image enhancement. It was used during image analysis. 3X.