ENCLOSURE

Revision 1 of the Partial COL Application for Calvert Cliffs Nuclear Power Plant, Unit 3

CALVERT CLIFFS NUCLEAR POWER PLANT UNIT 3 PAGE REMOVAL AND INSERTION INSTRUCTIONS

7

REMOVE	INSERT
Final Safety Analysis	s Report Chapter 2
FSAR Section 2.4.2 text (all), Rev. 0	FSAR Section 2.4.2 text (all), Rev. 1
FSAR Section 2.4.2 tables (all), Rev. 0	FSAR Section 2.4.2 tables (all), Rev. 1
FSAR Section 2.5.4 text (all), Rev. 0	FSAR Section 2.5.4 text (all), Rev. 1
FSAR Section 2.5.4 tables (all), Rev. 0	FSAR Section 2.5.4 tables (all), Rev. 1
FSAR Figure 2.5.4-28, Rev. 0	FSAR Figure 2.5.4-28, Rev. 1
FSAR Figure 2.5.4-29, Rev. 0	FSAR Figure 2.5.4-29, Rev. 1
FSAR Figure 2.5.4-30, Rev. 0	FSAR Figure 2.5.4-30, Rev. 1
FSAR Figure 2.5.4-31, Rev. 0	FSAR Figure 2.5.4-31, Rev. 1
FSAR Figure 2.5.4-32, Rev. 0	FSAR Figure 2.5.4-32, Rev. 1
	FSAR Appendix 2.5-B cover sheet
	FSAR Appendix 2.5-B body
·	FSAR Appendix 2.5-C cover sheet
	FSAR Appendix 2.5-C body
Environmental R	eport—Chapter 7
Environmental Report, Section 7.1 text (all), Rev. 0	Environmental Report Section 7.1 text (all), Rev. 1
Environmental Report, Section 7.1 tables (all), Rev. 0	Environmental Report, Section 7.1 tables (all), Rev. 1
Environmental Report, Section 7.2 text (all), Rev. 0	Environmental Report Section 7.2 text (all), Rev. 1
Environmental Report, Section 7.2 tables (all), Rev. 0	Environmental Report, Section 7.2 tables (all), Rev. 1
Environmental Report, Section 7.3 text (all), Rev. 0	Environmental Report Section 7.3 text (all), Rev. 1
Environmental Report, Section 7.3 tables (all), Rev. 0	Environmental Report, Section 7.2 tables (all), Rev. 1
Environmental Report, Section 7.4 text (all), Rev. 0	Environmental Report Section 7.4 text (all), Rev. 1
Environmental Report, Section 7.4 tables (all), Rev. 0	Environmental Report, Section 7.4 tables (all), Rev. 1

2.4.2 FLOODS

The U.S. EPR DCD includes the following COL Item in Section 2.4.2

A COL applicant that references the U.S. EPR design certification will identify sitespecific information related to flood history, flood design considerations, and effects of local intense precipitation.

This COL item is addressed in the following section.

This section identifies historical flooding at the {Calvert Cliffs Nuclear Power Plant (CCNPP)} site and in the region of the site. It summarizes and identifies individual flood types and combinations of flood producing phenomena in establishing the flood design basis for safety-related plant features. This section also covers the potential effects of local intense precipitation. Although topical information is discussed in Section 2.4.3 through Section 2.4.7 and Section 2.4.9, the types of events considered and the controlling event are reviewed in this section.

{References to elevation values in this section are based on the National Geodetic Vertical Datum of 1929 (NGVD 29), unless stated otherwise.}

2.4.2.1 Flood History

{The CCNPP site is subject to flooding from the Chesapeake Bay, Johns Creek and two small unnamed streams identified on Figure 2.4.1-1 as Branch 1 and Branch 2. There are no stream gauges or flood records for Johns Creek or any of the unnamed branches that collect drainage from undeveloped wooded areas. Flood potential for Johns Creek is discussed in Section 2.4.3 and flooding potential for the unnamed branches is discussed in Section 2.4.2.3. As discussed in Section 2.4.1, stream gauges are located on St. Leonard Creek and the Patuxent River. However, St. Leonard Creek at the confluence with Johns Creek and the Patuxent River at the confluence with St Leonard Creek are both under tidal influence and stream flows do not significantly influence flooding water surface elevations at these locations. Thus, peak stream flow records for St. Leonard Creek and the Patuxent River are not presented in this section. Daily maximum stream flow records are presented and discussed for both water courses in Section 2.4.1.

Tide level data have been recorded on the Chesapeake Bay at Baltimore, Maryland from 1902 to present and at Annapolis, Maryland from 1928 to present. Tide level data have been recorded on the Patuxent River at Solomons Island, Maryland from 1979 to present. The five highest recorded water levels at Baltimore and Annapolis are presented in Table 2.4.5-1 (NOAA, 2004). Each of these high water levels is associated with surges from tropical storm events. The water levels presented in Table 2.4.5-1 have been adjusted for sea level rise and are presented as though they would have been measured with the current sea level datum (epoch 1983-2001) (NOAA, 2004). The high water level data at Solomons Island is not presented as water level data is missing during some high water level events and thus, the maximum recorded water level does not reflect the actual highest water level at the gauge. Since the construction and operation of CCNPP Units 1 and 2 there have been no instances of flooding of the CCNPP Units 1 and 2 grade area surrounding the pump intake area at Elevation 10.0 ft (3.0 m).

As discussed in Section 2.4.7, ice sheets have formed on the Chesapeake Bay on more than one occasion. Despite the formation of ice on the Chesapeake Bay, there have been no instances of ice jams or ice induced flooding at the CCNPP site. As discussed in Section 2.4.7.8 there have been small ice jams that have occurred on tributaries to the Patuxent

River. However, they have had no flooding impact on the CCNPP site. Further details of historic ice sheets and ice effects are discussed in Section 2.4.7.

There are no records of any landslide (submarine or subaerine) or distant tsunami source induced flooding events at the CCNPP site. Historical Tsunami events are discussed in Section 2.4.6.}

2.4.2.2 Flood Design Considerations

{The design basis flood elevation for the CCNPP site is determined by considering a number of different flooding possibilities. The possibilities applicable and investigated for the site include the probable maximum flood (PMF) on streams and rivers, potential dam failures, probable maximum surge and seiche flooding, probable maximum tsunami, and ice effect flooding. Each of these flooding scenarios was investigated in conjunction with other flooding and meteorological events, such as wind generated waves, as required in accordance with guidelines presented in ANSI/ANS 2.8-1992 (ANS, 1992). Detailed discussions on each of these flooding events and how they were estimated are found in Section 2.4.3 through Section 2.4.7.

The estimation of the PMF water level on Johns Creek, located just west of the CCNPP Unit 3 substation/switchyard area is discussed in detail in Section 2.4.3. The maximum PMF water level for Johns Creek is Elevation 65.0 ft (19.8 m). All safety-related facilities for CCNPP Unit 3 are located in the Maryland Western Shore watershed. The low point of the drainage divide between the Maryland Western Shore watershed and the Johns Creek watershed is at Elevation 98.0 ft (29.9 m) and passes through the CCNPP Unit 3 switchyard as shown on Figure 2.4.2-1. Since the maximum PMF water level is 33 ft (10.1 m) below the drainage divide, the Johns Creek PMF does not pose a flooding risk to the CCNPP Unit 3 safety-related facilities.

Section 2.4.4 presents a detailed discussion on potential flood elevations on Johns Creek from dam failures on the Patuxent River. The resulting water level increase in the tidal portions of Johns Creek and St. Leonard Creek would be about 2.0 ft (0.6 m). This water level increase poses no risk to the CCNPP site.

Probable maximum surge and seiche flooding on the Chesapeake Bay as a result of the probable maximum hurricane (PMH) is discussed in Section 2.4.5. The estimated probable maximum storm surge (PMSS) water level is estimated to be at Elevation 19.1 ft (5.8 m). Wave action from coincident winds associated with the storm surge produce a wave run-up height of 20.3 ft (6.2 m) above the PMSS with a maximum water height at Elevation 39.4 ft (12.0 m) along the shore of the CCNPP site. The grade elevation of the Ultimate Heat Sink (UHS) makeup intake structure area is at Elevation 10.0 ft (3.0 m) and the UHS makeup water intake building will be completely submerged as a result of the PMH. The PMSS and coincident wave run-up water level at the CCNPP site produce the highest potential water levels on the Chesapeake Bay and become the design basis flood elevation for the CCNPP Unit 3 UHS makeup intake structure area. The UHS makeup intake structure will be provided with flood protection measures such as water tight doors, roof vents, and piping and conduit penetrations. Flood protection measures are discussed in Section 2.4.10. The CCNPP Unit 3 power block site grade is at nominal Elevation 85.0 ft (25.9 m) and all safety-related facilities other than the UHS makeup intake structure are located above the PMSS and wave run-up water level.

Section 2.4.6 describes the derivation of the probable maximum tsunami (PMT) water level. The maximum water level associated with a PMT at the CCNPP site is 3.8 ft (1.2 m). This is much lower than the flood level due to the PMH and thus, the PMT does not pose a flood risk to the CCNPP site. The maximum water level due to local intense precipitation or the local probable maximum precipitation (PMP) is estimated and discussed in Section 2.4.2.3. The maximum water level in the CCNPP Unit 3 power block area, due to a local PMP, is at Elevation 81.5 ft (24.8 m). This water level becomes the design basis flood elevation for all safety-related facilities in the power block area. All safety-related building entrances in the power block are located above this elevation. The effects of local intense precipitation at the UHS makeup water intake are not estimated since the design basis flood elevation from the PMH will completely submerge this area.}

2.4.2.3 Effects of Local Intense Precipitation

{The design basis for the local intense precipitation is the fall season 1 square mile or point PMP as obtained from the U.S. National Weather Service (NWS) Hydro-meteorological Report Number 52 (NOAA, 1982). Table 2.4.3-1 presents the 1 square mile PMP for various durations at the CCNPP site.

As described in Section 2.4.1, CCNPP Unit 3 is located adjacent to the existing CCNPP Units 1 and 2. The site layout and drainage system are shown in Figure 2.4.2-1. The site grade completely fills in the upper reaches of the two unnamed branches (Branch 1 and Branch 2) shown on Figure 2.4.1-1 such that the streams will now begin just east of the CCNPP Unit 3 plant boundary area. Additionally, the drainage area for these streams, at the headwater, consists of only the CCNPP Unit 3 power block area. Since the power block area is at a much higher elevation than the existing streams, flood flows in these streams will not affect the CCNPP Unit 3 power block area. Thus, local PMP analysis on these two streams was not performed.

As indicated on Figure 2.4.2-1, the containment, fuel and safeguards buildings are located in the center and along the high point of the CCNPP Unit 3 power block area. From the high point, site grading falls at a 1% slope to bio-retention drainage ditches located along the northern and southern edges of the CCNPP Unit 3 area. There are four bio-retention ditches which drain the power block and the Turbine Building areas. Three of them run in the east-west direction; one north of CCNPP Unit 3, (North Ditch), one south of CCNPP Unit 3 and between CCNPP Unit 3 and the area reserved for equipment laydown (Center Ditch) and one south of the equipment laydown area (South Ditch). The fourth ditch (East Ditch) is located along the eastern edge of CCNPP Unit 3 and the equipment laydown area. It collect flows from the other three ditches. The East Ditch is divided in two, to allow passage of the CCNPP Unit 3 security fence. Flows in the South Ditch and the southern half of the East Ditch do not have an impact on the PMP flood levels in CCNPP Unit 3 and are not discussed in this section. The dimensions of the center, north, and east bio-retention ditches are provided in Table 2.4.2-6.

The bio-retention ditches are constructed with base materials that promote infiltration of runoff from low intensity rainfall events. However, for large storms, the infiltration capacity of the base materials would be exceeded and overflow pipes are provided to direct the runoff to the stormwater basin located to the east of the CCNPP Unit 3 power block. For the assessment of the local PMF levels, the overflow pipes and culverts in the drainage system are assumed to be clogged as a result of ice or debris blockage. In that case, PMP storm runoff from the area collected in the North and East Ditches would overflow along the northern and eastern edges (top of berm at Elevation 79 ft (24.1 m)), spilling out to the areas north and east of the CCNPP Unit 3 power block down the bluff to Chesapeake Bay. Channels and diversion walls will be provided on the north side of the site to direct North Ditch overflows to the east and eventually to the Chesapeake Bay. Flows from the Center Ditch will discharge into the East Ditch before overflowing the eastern edge of the East Ditch.

Grading in the vicinity of the safety-related structures slopes away from the individual structures such that PMP ground and roof runoff will sheet flow away from each of these structures towards the collection ditches. Thus, sheet flows are prevented from entering the structures.

The effect of potential ice and debris blockage of storm drains, roof drains, culverts, and outlet pipes has been considered in the site PMP runoff analyses. As mentioned previously, all storm drains, outlet pipes, and culverts are considered blocked for the PMP runoff analysis. Since roof drains are considered blocked, runoff from roofs is assumed to be sheet flow over the edge of the roofs and contributing to the sheet flow runoff from each sub-basin. The runoff model does not consider any detention or storage for roof runoff. All runoff from roofs is included as direct runoff from the sub-basin drainage areas.

Peak water levels in the CCNPP Unit 3 power block area were determined by performing a hydrologic runoff analysis. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) computer program HEC-HMS (USACE, 2006a) was used to develop the hydrologic model and determine peak discharges in the site drainage ditches. Ground cover in the power block consists of primarily two types of surface characteristics, namely: 1) developed impervious area and 2) gravel surface on compacted fills. The drainage areas for the North, Center, and East Ditches are subdivided into 6 sub-basins for the site drainage evaluations. The drainage areas for these sub-basins are shown in Figure 2.4.2-1 and presented in Table 2.4.2-1.

The methodologies suggested by the U.S. National Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) as given in TR-55 Manual (USDA, 1986) were used to estimate the times of concentration (Tc) for the various sub-basins. To account for non-linearity effects during extreme flood condition, the computed Tc was reduced by 25% in accordance with guidance from EM-1110-2-1417 (USACE, 1994). The lag time, estimated as 60% of Tc, (USACE, 2006b) and the local intense precipitation presented in Table 2.4.3-1 were input to the USACE Computer program HEC-HMS (USACE, 2006a). A runoff curve number of 98, representing impervious surfaces (USDA, 1986), is conservatively used for the entire drainage area and also input into the HEC-HMS computer model. The NRCS dimensionless unit hydrograph option for the developments of the HEC-HMS model is given in Figure 2.4.2-2 and resulting peak discharges are presented in Table 2.4.2-2.

The computer program HEC-RAS, also developed by the USACE (USACE, 2005), was used in estimating the peak water levels in the CCNPP Unit 3 power block area. The water level in all ditches is assumed to be at Elevation 79.0 ft (24.1 m), corresponding to a ditch full condition, at the commencement of the PMP storm event. With the ditches full, nearly all of the runoff flowing into the North Ditch is assumed to overflow the North Ditch before entering the East Ditch. This assumption is confirmed with the HEC-RAS results. The runoff from the Center Ditch then flows into the East Ditch along with the East Ditch runoff (sub-basins East 1 and East 2). Cross-sections were developed along the ditches at locations as shown in Figure 2.4.2-3 using the topographic information shown in the figure. The cross section data was input into the HEC-RAS model assuming steady-state flow conditions.

The inflow peaks given in Table 2.4.2-3 were also input into the HEC-RAS model at the locations indicated. The discharges were developed from the HEC-HMS peak discharges in Table 2.4.2-2. Inflows from sub-basins North 2, Center 2, and East 1 were added to the North, Center, and East ditches as evenly distributed flows at each successive cross section as shown in Table 2.4.2-3.

Flow out of the bio-retention ditches during the PMP event was modeled by the use of the lateral weir option in HEC-RAS (USACE, 2005) to determine the overflow discharges from the

CCNPP Unit 3 FSAR	Page 2.4.2-4

North and East ditches. Also, the momentum of the incoming flow to the 90° confluence of the Center and East Ditches was analyzed with the momentum junction option in HEC-RAS. A Manning's "n" value of 0.035 was assumed for the ditches and over bank areas representing riprap lining for the ditches and gravel cover in the over banks (Chow, 1959).

The hydraulics of the East and North ditch junction require that the water level at the downstream (east) end of the North Ditch and the downstream (north) end of the East Ditch have the same starting water level and that the remaining flow in each ditch be close to zero (all flows have exited over the lateral weirs). The starting water level (Elevation 79.7 ft (24.3 m)) and hydraulic condition was determined by trial and error. The water levels at the various cross-sections along the North and Center Ditches during the local PMP are shown in Table 2.4.2-4.

The safety-related structures in the CCNPP Unit 3 power block consist of two UHS cooling towers located in the northwest corner, two UHS cooling towers located in the southeast corner, diesel generator buildings located north and south of the reactor complex and the reactor complex, which consists of the containment building, fuel building, and safeguards buildings. The locations of the buildings are shown on Figure 2.4.2-1. The entrances to each of these structures are located at or close to the grade slab elevation (Elevation 84.6 ft (25.8 m)) for each structure, with the exception of the UHS cooling towers, where the entrances are located 14 ft (4.3 m) above the grade slab elevation. Table 2.4.2-5 gives the entrance elevations at the various safety-related facilities and compares them with the PMP water levels near those facilities. The maximum computed PMP water level in the power block area is Elevation 81.5 ft (24.8 m). However, the maximum PMP water level associated with a safety-related structure is Elevation 81.5 ft (24.8 m) which is 3.1 ft (0.95 m) below the reactor complex grade slab at Elevation 84.6 ft (25.8 m).

Based on the CCNPP Unit 3 power block grading, entrance locations, and peak PMP water levels in the site ditches, all safety-related facility entrances, except for the UHS makeup intake structure, are located above peak PMP ditch water levels and PMP sheet flows are prevented from reaching safety-related entrances.

Flood protection measures are required for the CCNPP Unit 3 UHS makeup water intake structure and its associated electrical building. The grade level at the UHS makeup water intake structure location is at Elevation 10.0 ft (3.0 m). The maximum flood level at the intake location is Elevation 39.4 ft (12.0 m) as a result of the surge, wave heights, and wave run-up associated with the probable maximum hurricane (PMH) as discussed in Section 2.4.5. Thus, the UHS makeup water intake structure and the electrical building associated with the UHS makeup pumps would experience flooding during a PMH and flood protection measures are required for these buildings.

A general arrangement of the UHS makeup water intake area is shown on Figure 9.2.5-1. A plan view of the UHS makeup water intake structure is shown on Figure 9.2.5-2 and a section view is shown on Figure 9.2.5-3. Flood protection for the UHS makeup water intake structure and electrical building will consist of structural measures to withstand the static and dynamic flooding forces as well as water proofing measures to prevent the flooding of the interior of the structures where pump motors and electrical or other equipment associated with the operation of the pumps are located.}

References

{ANS, 1992. Determining Design Basis Flooding at Power Reactor Sites, ANSI/ANS-2.8-1992, American National Standard Institute/American Nuclear Society, July 1992.

Chow, 1959. Open-Channel Hydraulics, V. Chow, 1959.

NOAA, 1982. Application of Probable Maximum Precipitation Estimates – United States East of the 105th Meridian, Hydrometeorological Report Number 52, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, August 1982.

NOAA, 2004. Effects of Hurricane Isabel on Water Levels Data Report, Technical Report NOS CO-OPS 040, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, 2004.

USACE, 1994. Flood-Runoff Analysis, EM 1110-2-1417, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, August 1994.

USACE, 2005. HEC-RAS, River Analysis System, Version 3.1.3, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Hydrologic Engineering Center, May 2005.

USACE, 2006a. HEC-HMS, Hydrologic Modeling System, Version 3.0.1, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Hydrologic Engineering Center, April 2006.

USACE, 2006b. HEC-HMS User's Manual, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Hydrologic Engineering Center, April 2006.

USDA, 1986. Urban Hydrology for Small Watersheds, Technical Release 55, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service, June 1986.

Rev. 1

Sub-Basin	Drainage Area (Acres)	Drainage Area (sq mi)
North 1	10.45	0.0163
North 2	6.83	0.0107
Center 1	14.06	0.0220
Center 2	11.08	0.0173
East 1	6.95	0.0109
East 2	0.89	0.0014
Total	50.26	0.0785

Table 2.4.2-1Sub-Basin Drainage Areas(Page 1 of 1)

Hydrologic Element	Drainage Area (mi ²)	Peak Discharge (cfs)	Runoff Volume . (ac-ft)
Center Ditch	0.022	810.6	21.4
Center Junction	0.041	1,467.8	39.6
Center 1	0 _. 022	810.6	21.4
Center 2	0.017	605.6	16.8
East Junction-1	0.052	1,869.4	50.2
East 1	0.011	401.6	10.6
East 2	0.001	51.6	1.4
North Ditch	0.016	. 600.6	15.9
North Junction	0.027	953.4	26.2
North 1	0.016	600.6	15.9
North 2	0.011	352.8	10.4
Center Ditch	0.022	810.6	21.4
Center Junction	0.041	1,467.8	39.6
Center 1	0.022	810.6	21.4
Center 2	0.017	605.6	16.8

Table 2.4.2-2HEC-HMS Sub-Basin Site PMP Peak Discharges(Page 1 of 1)

CCNPP Unit 3 FSAR

© 2007 UniStar Nuclear Development, LLC. All rights reserved. COPYRIGHT PROTECTED

Rev. 1

Ditch	Reach	Cross Section	Discharge (cfs)
Center Ditch	1	700	810.6
Center Ditch	1	600	911.5
Center Ditch	1	500	1,012.5
Center Ditch	1	400	1,113.4
Center Ditch	1	300	1,214.3
Center Ditch	1	200	1,315.3
Center Ditch	1	100	1,416.2
East Ditch	2	150	51.6
East Ditch	1	1,200	1,467.8
East Ditch	1	1,100	1,504.3
East Ditch	1	1,000	1,540.8
East Ditch	1	900	1,577.3
East Ditch	1	800	1,613.8
East Ditch	1	700	1,650.3
East Ditch	1	600	1,686.8
East Ditch	1	500	1,723.4
East Ditch	1	400	1,759.9
East Ditch	1	300	1,796.4
East Ditch	1	200	1,832.9
East Ditch	1	100	1,869.4
North Ditch	1	600	600.6
North Ditch	1	500	671.2
North Ditch	1	400	741.7
North Ditch	1	300	812.3
North Ditch	1	200	882.8
North Ditch	1	100	953.4

Table 2.4.2-3HEC-RAS PMP Peak Discharges(Page 1 of 1)

Rev. 1

Table 2.4.2-4 PMP Maximum Water Levels

(Page 1 of 1)

Ditch	Station	Discharg e (cfs)	Minimum Channel Elevation (ft)	Maximum Water Level (ft)	Channel Velocity (ft/s)	Froude Number
	600	600.6	76.0	79.8	3.1	0.3
	500	486.9	76.0	79.8	2.6	0.3
	400	388.7	76.0	79.7	2.1	0.2
North	300	301.5	76.0	79.7	1.6	0.2
	200	219.9	76.0	79.7	1.2	0.1
	100	139.9	76.0	79.7	0.8	0.1
	0	0.9	76.0	79.7	0.0	0.0
	1200	1,467.8	74.0	80.1	5.5	0.5
	1100	1,297.2	74.0	80.0	5.0	0.4
	1000	1,092.8	74.0	79.9	4.3	0.4
	900	921.5	74.0	79.8	3.7	0.3
	800	773.7	74.0	79.8	3.2	0.3
	700	641.7	74.0	79.7	2.7	0.2
East	600	519.6	74.0	79.7	2.2	0.9
	500	404.8	74.0	79.7	1.7	0.1
	400	290.1	74.0	79.7	1.2	0.1
	300	176.4	74.0	79.7	0.7	0.1
	200	61.9	74.0	79.7	0.3	0.0
	100	1.9	74.0	79.7	0.0	0.0
	0	1.9	74.0	79.7	0.0	0.0
	700	810.6	76.0	81.6	1.9	0.2
	600	911.5	76.0	81.5	2.2	0.2
	500	1,012.5	76.0	81.5	2.5	0.2
Conter	400	1,113.4	76.0	81.4	2.8	0.2
Centel	300	1,214.3	76.0	81.3	3.2	0.3
	200	1,315.3	76.0	81.2	3.6	0.3
	100	1,416.2	76.0	81.0	4.2	0.4
	0	1,416.2	76.0	80.9	3.4	0.3

Safety-Related Facility	Entrance Elevation (ft)	Associated Cross Section	Ditch	PMP Peak Water Elevation (ft)	Freeboard (ft)
Northwestern UHSs	98.6 ft	600	North	79.8	18.8
Southeastern UHSs	98.6 ft	300	Center	81.3	17.3
North Diesel Generator	85.1 ft	500	North	79.8	5.3
South Diesel Generator	85.1 ft	500	Center	81.5	3.6
Peactor Complex*	846#	400	North	79.7	4.9
Reactor Complex	04.0 11	400	Center	81.4	3.2

Table 2.4.2-5 Safety-Related Facility Entrance Elevation Summary

(Page 1 of 1)

* Includes containment, fuel and safeguards buildings

CCNPP Unit 3 FSAR

© 2007 UniStar Nuclear Development, LLC. All rights reserved. COPYRIGHT PROTECTED

Rev. 1

Table 2.4.2-6Bio-Retention Ditch Dimensions(Page 1 of 1)

		Top of Ditch Elevation (ft, NGVD 29)			
Ditch	Invert Elevation (ft, NGVD 29)	Left Bank	Right Bank	Side Slopes	Bottom Width (ft)
Center	76.0	79.0	80.4	3:1	47.0
North	76.0	79.0	79.0	3:1	37.0
East	74.0	79.0	79.0	3:1	25.0

CCNPP Unit 3 FSAR

© 2007 UniStar Nuclear Development, LLC. All rights reserved. COPYRIGHT PROTECTED

Rev. 1

2.5.4 STABILITY OF SUBSURFACE MATERIALS AND FOUNDATIONS

The U.S. EPR DCD includes the following COL Item for Section 2.5.4:

A COL Applicant that references the U.S. EPR design certification will present sitespecific information about the properties and stability of all soils and rocks that may affect the nuclear power plant facilities, under both static and dynamic conditions including the vibratory ground motions associated with the Safe Shutdown Earthquake (SSE)

This COL item is addressed in the following sections.

This subsection addresses subsurface materials and foundation conditions for the {Calvert Cliffs Nuclear Power Plant (CCNPP) Unit 3 site.} It was prepared based on the guidance in relevant sections of NRC Regulatory Guide 1.206, Combined License Applications for Nuclear Power Plants (LWR Edition) (NRC, 2007).

{The information presented in this subsection is based on results of a subsurface investigation program implemented at the CCNPP Unit 3 site, and evaluation of the collected data, unless indicated otherwise. The data are contained in Geotechnical Subsurface Investigation Data Report (Schnabel, 2007a) (Schnabel, 2007b). The data is also presented as Appendix 2.5-A and Appendix 2.5-B.

The CCNPP Units 1 and 2 Updated Final Safety Analysis Report (UFSAR) (BGE, 1982) contains a summary of the geotechnical information collected previously for the construction of CCNPP Units 1 and 2. The planned CCNPP Unit 3 is approximately 2,000 ft south of the existing units. CCNPP Units 1 and 2 UFSAR (BGE, 1982) contains mostly general information that is quantitatively limited in its extent and depth of exploration relative to the investigation performed for the CCNPP Unit 3. Therefore, the comparison information was limited to those cases when comparable information obtained from the CNNPP Unit 3 subsurface investigation (Schnabel, 2007a) was available in the CCNPP Units 1 and 2 UFSAR (BGE, 1982).

References to elevation values in this subsection are based on the National Geodetic Vertical Datum of 1929 (NGVD29), unless stated otherwise.}

2.5.4.1 Geologic Features

{Section 2.5.1.1 addresses the regional geologic settings, including regional physiography and geomorphology, regional geologic history, regional stratigraphy, regional tectonic and non-tectonic conditions, and geologic hazards, as well as maps, cross-sections, and references. Section 2.5.1.2 addresses the geologic conditions specific to the site, including site structural geology, site physiography and geomorphology, site geologic history, site stratigraphy and lithology, site structural geology, seismic conditions, and site geologic hazard evaluation, accompanied by figures, maps, and references. Pre-loading influences on soil deposits, including estimates of consolidation, pre-consolidation pressures, and methods used for their estimation are addressed in Section 2.5.4.2. Related maps and stratigraphic profiles are also addressed in Section 2.5.4.2.

In summary, the site is located in the Atlantic Coastal Plain physiographic province. The soils were formed by ancient rivers carrying large quantities of solids from the northern and western regions into the Atlantic Ocean. These deposits were placed under both freshwater (fluvial) and saltwater (marine) environments, and are about 2,500 feet thick at the site (BGE, 1982). The upper soils are Quaternary, Holocene- and/or Pleistocene-Age deposits formed as beaches or terraces. The lower soils are Miocene-, Eocene-, Paleocene-, and Cretaceous-Age deposits.

The Miocene and Eocene soils belong to the Chesapeake and Nanjemoy groups. The Holocene, Pleistocene, Miocene, and Eocene soils were the subject of a detailed subsurface exploration for the COL investigation, as described below.

2.5.4.2 **Properties of Subsurface Materials**

This subsection addresses the properties of subsurface materials. It is divided into several parts, as follows.

- Sections 2.5.4.2.1.1 through 2.5.4.2.1.3 describe the subsurface conditions and properties of soils
- Section 2.5.4.2.1.4 describes the chemical properties of soils
- Section 2.5.4.2.1.5 addresses materials below a depth of 400 ft
- Section 2.5.4.2.1.6 provides a summary of the field investigation program
- Section 2.5.4.2.1.7 provides a summary of the laboratory testing program

2.5.4.2.1 Description of Subsurface Materials

The site geology is comprised of deep Coastal Plain sediments underlain by bedrock, which is about 2,500 ft below the ground surface for CCNPP Units 1 and 2 UFSAR (BGE, 1982). The site soils consist of marine and fluvial deposits. The upper approximately 400 ft of the site soils were the subject of the CCNPP Unit 3 subsurface investigation. These soils can be divided into the following stratigraphic units.

- Stratum I: Terrace Sand
- Stratum IIa: Chesapeake Clay/Silt
- Stratum IIb: Chesapeake Cemented Sand
- Stratum IIc: Chesapeake Clay/Silt
- Stratum III: Nanjemoy Sand

Information on deeper soils (below 400 ft) was obtained from the available literature, and it will be discussed later in this subsection. Identification of Strata I through III was based on their physical and engineering characteristics. The characterization of the soils was based on a suite of tests performed on these soils, consisting of standard penetration tests (SPT) in soil borings including hammer energy measurements, cone penetration test (CPT) soundings, test pits, geophysical suspension P-S velocity logging, field electrical resistivity testing, and observation wells, as well as extensive laboratory testing. The extent of the field tests is summarized in Table 2.5.4-1. Locations of these tests are shown in Figure 2.5.4-1 through Figure 2.5.4-3. Subsurface profiles inferred from these tests are shown in Figure 2.5.4-5 through Figure 2.5.4-9, with a subsurface profile legend provided in Figure 2.5.4-4.

The natural topography at the CCNPP site, at the time of the subsurface exploration, was gently rolling. Site-wide, however, the relief could vary by as much as 100 ft. In the area where CCNPP Unit 3 is planned, ground surface elevations at the time of the exploration ranged from approximately elevation 50 ft to elevation 120 ft, with an average of about elevation 88 ft. The planned elevation (rough grade) in the powerblock area ranges from about elevation 75 ft to elevation 85 ft, with the centerline of Unit 3 at elevation 84.7 ft, or approximately elevation 85 ft. The Powerblock includes the Reactor Building, Fuel Building, Safeguard Building, Emergency Power Generating Building, Nuclear Auxiliary Building, Access Building, Radioactive Waste Building, Turbine Building, and Ultimate Heat Sink.

The subsurface conditions were established from the information contained in the Geotechnical Subsurface Investigation Data Report (Schnabel, 2007a). The subsurface profiles illustrate these conditions. The maximum depth explored was about 400 ft beneath the ground surface at boring locations B-301 and B-401. The maximum depth explored by CPT soundings was 142 ft beneath the ground surface at location C-407 (CPT soundings encountered repeated refusal and, therefore, could not be consistently extended to greater depths). Field tests (borings, CPTs, etc.) identified as 300-series, e.g., B-301 or C-301, are located in Unit 3 area. Tests identified as 400-series, e.g., B-401 or C-401, are located in an area adjacent to CCNPP Unit 3, hereafter referred to as Construction Laydown Area 1 (CLA1). Field tests identified as 700 series, e.g., B-701 or C-701, are located outside of these two areas, and include the proposed cooling tower, switchyard, and intake/discharge piping locations. Bedrock is too deep (about 2,500 ft below ground) to be of interest for earthwork and foundation design and construction. Therefore, rock properties will not be addressed in similar detail as the overlying soils. The major strata identified from the boring logs, as shown on the subsurface profiles (Strata I, II, and III), are described in detail in the next subsections.

2.5.4.2.1.1 Stratum I – Terrace Sand

The Terrace Sand stratum consists primarily of light-brown to brown sand with varying amounts of silt, clay, and/or gravel, sometimes with silt or clay interbeds. This stratum was fully penetrated by boreholes installed within CCNPP Unit 3 Powerblock area and the adjoining CLA1 area (the 300 and 400 series borings) and by a majority of boreholes drilled outside of these two areas (the 700 series borings). This stratum is not present in low lying areas.

The thickness of Stratum I soils was estimated from the boring logs. In CCNPP Unit 3 area, its thickness with respect to the existing ground surface varies from about 2 ft to 51 ft, with an average thickness of about 21 ft. The average bottom for Stratum I soils is about elevation 66 ft in CCNPP Unit 3 area. The average thickness and bottom elevation for Stratum I soils for the combined CCNPP Unit 3 and CLA1 areas is about 27 ft and elevation 65 ft, respectively. Additional information on thickness and termination elevation for this stratum at locations other than Unit 3, including site-wide, is presented in Tables 2.5.4-2 and 2.5.4-3. Based on site-wide information, the termination elevation for Stratum I was estimated at about elevation 61 ft. An elevation of 60 ft was adopted for simplicity.

It should be noted that at isolated locations, sandy soils with an appearance similar to Stratum I soils were encountered. These soils are suspected of being man-made fill. They were present at the ground surface, above Stratum I soils, and were encountered in 17 borings (B-309, B-336, B-340, B-341, B-406, B-409, B-412, B-415, B-419, B-420, B-438/A, B-439, B-440, B-701, B-710, B-713, and B-768). Mainly, they were found in areas which had previously been developed at the site, such as Camp Conoy, roadways, and ball field areas. Their thickness ranged from approximately 0.5 ft to 17 ft, with an average thickness of about 7 ft.

Soil samples were collected from the borings via SPT and tube samples. Samples were collected more frequently in the upper portion of the borings than in the lower portion, e.g., typically 6 samples were obtained in the upper 15 ft. Thereafter, samples were obtained at 5 ft intervals. SPT N-values were measured during the sampling and recorded on the boring logs. In CCNPP Unit 3 area, the SPT N-values in Stratum I soils ranged from 0 blows/ft (weight of hammer [WOH] or weight of rod [WOR]) to 70 blows/ft, with an average measured N-value of 10 blows/ft. Additional SPT information on this layer at locations other than Unit 3, including site-wide, is presented in Table 2.5.4-4. The measured N-values are within a relatively uniform

range of about 3 to 13 blows/ft, with occasional higher values between about elevation 70 ft and elevation 90 ft.

The WOH and WOR values were very infrequent in Stratum I soils. A total of 5 WOH and WOR conditions were encountered in borings at CCNPP Unit 3 location, and a total of 5 were observed in all other borings. At the CCNP Unit 3 location, three of these conditions were in boring B-309 in materials designated as "fill," which will be removed during construction. The fourth episode was in boring B-314 at the ground surface which will also be removed during construction. The fifth value was in boring B-322 at about elevation 70 ft, at the location of the Essential Service Water System (ESWS) Cooling Tower. The cause of this low SPT value is likely due to sampling disturbance. A review of the boring logs and stratigraphic profiles for the same soils at other locations do not indicate this to be the predominant situation. Rather, the low SPT value is an isolated, infrequent situation, most likely caused by factors other than the natural condition of Stratum I soils. Nonetheless, these soils will be removed during excavation for the ESWS Cooling Tower to at least elevation 60 ft. In conclusion, at the CCNP Unit 3 location, the 5 WHO and WOR results are inconsequential to the stability of Stratum I soils.

Five drill rigs were used for the COL subsurface exploration. SPT hammer energies were measured for each of the five drilling rigs utilized. Energy measurements were made in 5 borings (B-401, B-403, B-404, B-409, and B-744). Because the SPT N-value used in correlations with engineering properties is the value corresponding to 60 percent hammer efficiency, the measured SPT N-values were adjusted based on the energy measurements, in accordance with American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM) D6066 (ASTM, 2004f)). The average energy transfer ratio (ETR) obtained from hammer energy measurements for each drilling rig was applied to the measured SPT N-values. The average ETR ranged from 78 percent to 87 percent, or an N-value adjustment factor ranging from 1.30 to 1.45. A summary of the measured ETR values for each drill rig is shown in Table 2.5.4-5. The measured SPT N-values from each boring were adjusted using the appropriate ETR value shown in Table 2.5.4-5 for the drill rig utilized. The adjusted average field-measured N-value for Stratum I soils is 16 blows/ft. A value of 15 blows/ft was conservatively adopted for engineering purposes, as shown in Table 2.5.4-6. Based on corrected SPT N-values, Stratum I soils are considered medium dense on average.

CPT soundings were performed in Stratum I soils. The cone tip resistance, q_c , in these soils ranged from about 2 to 570 tons per square ft (tsf), with an average of about 120 tsf. The CPT tip resistance profile versus elevation is shown in Figure 2.5.4-11. The results indicate the q_c values in Stratum I soils to be typically limited to about 200 tsf, with values peaking much higher between elevation 80 ft to elevation 90 ft. The CPT results also indicate the presence of clay zones within this stratum, at about elevation 115 ft, elevation 100 ft, and elevation 90 ft. Estimated relative density from CPT data ranges from about 30 to near 100 percent, with an average of about 65 percent.

Laboratory index tests and testing for determination of engineering properties were performed on selected samples from Stratum I soils. Laboratory test quantities are summarized in Table 2.5.4-7. Sample selection for testing was primarily based on the observed soil uniformity from the field classification, or conversely, the variation in material description based on logging in the field, in order to obtain a quantitative measure of the uniformity, or the variation, respectively. The following index tests were performed on Stratum I soils, with results as noted.

	<u>No. of Tests</u>	<u>Min. Value</u>	<u>Max. Value</u>	<u>Average Value</u>
Water Content (%)	31	3	44	15
Liquid Limit (LL)(%)	31	Non-Plastic (NP)	75	NP
Plastic Limit (PL)(%)	31	NP	23	NP
Plasticity Index (PI)	31	NP	52	NP
Fines Content (%)	85	3	71	19
Unit Weight (pcf)	3	115	124	120

The test results are summarized in Table 2.5.4-8. The water content and Atterberg limits are presented versus elevation in Figure 2.5.4-12. They are also shown on a plasticity chart in Figure 2.5.4-13. For engineering purposes, Stratum I soils were characterized, on average, as non-plastic with an average fines content (materials passing No. 200 Sieve) of 20 percent. Grain size analyses indicated that these soils are primarily fine or fine-medium sands. The Unified Soil Classification System (USCS) designations were poorly-graded sand/silty sand, silty sand, well-graded sand, clayey sand, clay of high plasticity, silt, clay, and silt with high plasticity, with the predominant classifications of SP-SM and SM. The often plastic and fine-grained soil classifications are from the interbeds within this stratum. Based on the laboratory results, an average unit weight of 120 pounds per cubic foot (pcf) was adopted for these soils.

The shear strength of Stratum I soils was evaluated based on laboratory testing and correlations with SPT N-values and CPT results. Initially, an angle of shearing resistance (or friction angle), ϕ' , for the granular Terrace Sand was estimated from an empirical correlation with SPT N-values (Bowles, 1996). Using the SPT N-value adjusted for hammer efficiency, a ϕ' of about 34 degrees was obtained for N=15 blows/ft and for medium-grained sand. A value of $\phi'=33$ degrees was considered appropriate. Friction angle values were also obtained from the CPT results, estimated using the method recommended in EPRI Report EL-6800 (EPRI, 1990). They are presented versus elevation in Figure 2.5.4-14. The values shown in Figure 2.5.4-14 range from about 29 to 49 degrees, with an average value of about 40 degrees. One direct shear test was performed on a sample of Stratum I soils designated as clay by USCS, resulting in $\phi'=29.2$ degrees and c'=0.3 tsf. The laboratory strength results are given in Table 2.5.4-9. From the above interpretations, a summary of average ϕ' values for Stratum I soils is compiled as follows.

<u>SPT</u>	CPT	<u>Direct Shear</u>
33	40	29*

* c'=0.3 tsf not shown

 ϕ' (degrees)

Based on the above, ϕ '=32 degrees and c'=0 is conservatively adopted for Stratum I soils.

Consolidation properties and stress history of Stratum I soils were evaluated via laboratory testing and evaluation of the CPT data. A summary of the laboratory consolidation test results is presented in Table 2.5.4-10. The results are also shown versus elevation in Figure 2.5.4-15. Results indicate that, on average, these soils are preconsolidated to 5 tsf, with an overconsolidation ratio (OCR) of at least 4. OCR derived from CPT data are shown in Figure 2.5.4-16. The CPT-interpreted results are scattered over a large range, from OCR=0.6 to

OCR=10, with no unique trend. At best, an average OCR may be discerned from the CPT data, or an approximate average OCR of 4 to 5. Summary OCR values from CPT data are shown in Table 2.5.4-10. An average OCR=4 and preconsolidation pressure (Pp') of 4 tsf were adopted for Stratum I soils based on available data.

Static (or high strain) elastic modulus, E, for coarse-grained soils can be evaluated using the following relationship (Davie, 1998).

where,

Eq. 2.5.4-1

where N=SPT N-value in blows/ft. Substituting the previously established N-value for Stratum I soils (SPT N-value=15), an elastic modulus of 270 tsf was estimated for these soils. Also, elastic modulus can be estimated based on shear wave velocity for sandy soils (Senapathy, 2001), as follows.

E = 2 G (1 + µ)		Eq. 2.5.4-2
$G_{.0001\%} = \gamma/g (Vs)^2$		Eq. 2.5.4-3
$G_{0001\%} / G_{375\%} = 10$	(for sands)	Ea. 2.5.4-4

In Eqs. 2.5.4-2 through 2.5.4-4, $G_{0001\%}$ =small strain shear modulus (i.e., strain in the range of 10⁻⁴ percent), $G_{375\%}$ =large strain (static) shear modulus (i.e., strains in the range of 0.25 percent to 0.5 percent), µ=Poisson's ratio, γ =total soil density, g=acceleration of gravity, and Vs=shear wave velocity.

Using Vs=790 ft/sec obtained from the measurements at the site (refer to Section 2.5.4.4 for discussions on this topic), γ =120 pcf, and taking µ=0.3 for sand, a static (or high strain) modulus of elasticity of 302 tsf is estimated from Eq. 2.5.4-2. Using an average of the estimated values from SPT and shear wave velocity, an elastic modulus of 286 tsf is estimated. A value of 280 tsf was adopted for Stratum I soils. Values of E are shown in Table 2.5.4-11.

The static shear modulus, G, is related to the static modulus of elasticity by the following relationship:

G = E / [2 (1+ µ)]

Eq. 2.5.4-5

Using μ =0.3 for sandy soils, a shear modulus of 108 tsf was estimated for these soils based on E=280 tsf. A value of 116 tsf was estimated using Eq. 2.5.4-3. A value of 110 tsf was conservatively adopted for Stratum I soils. Values of G are shown in Table 2.5.4-11.

The coefficient of subgrade reaction for 1-ft wide or 1-ft square footings, k_1 , was obtained from "Evaluation of Coefficient of Subgrade Reaction" (Terzaghi, 1955). Based on material characterization for Stratum I soils, $k_1 = 75$ tons per cubic ft (tcf) was estimated and adopted.

Active, passive, and at-rest static earth pressure coefficients, K_a, K_p, and K₀, respectively, were estimated assuming frictionless vertical walls and horizontal backfill using Rankine's Theory and based of the following relationships (Lambe, 1969):

$K_{a} = \tan^{2}(45 - \phi'/2)$	Eq. 2.5.4-6
$K_p = \tan^2(45 + \phi'/2)$	Eq. 2.5.4-7
$K_0 = 1 - \sin(\phi')$	Eq. 2.5.4-8

CCNPP Unit 3 FSAR

Rev. 1

Substituting previously adopted ϕ '=32 degrees for Stratum I soils, the following earth pressure coefficients were estimated; K_a=0.3, K_p=3.3, K₀=0.47. Values adopted for engineering purposes are K_a=0.3, K_p=3.3, and K₀=0.5.

The sliding coefficient is tangent δ , where δ is the friction angle between the soil and the material it is bearing against, in this case concrete. Based on "Foundations & Earth Structures" (NFEC, 1986), tangent δ =0.4 was adopted for Stratum I soils.

All of the material properties adopted for engineering purposes for Stratum I soils, as well as other relevant information, are summarized in Table 2.5.4-12.

2.5.4.2.1.2 Stratum II – Chesapeake Soils

The Chesapeake soils are the dominant materials in the upper 400 ft of the site, with a combined thickness of about 270 ft. They were subdivided into three layers, based on visual appearance and material properties, namely

- Stratum IIa Chesapeake Clay/Silt
- Stratum IIb Chesapeake Cemented Sand
- Stratum IIc Chesapeake Clay/Silt

Each of these strata is described below.

Stratum IIa - Chesapeake Clay/Silt

The Chesapeake Clay/Silt stratum was encountered beneath the Terrace Sand in all boreholes, except in low lying areas where Stratum I soils had been eroded. Stratum IIa typically consists of light to dark gray clay and/or silt, although it is predominately clay, with varying amounts of sand.

The thickness of Stratum IIa soils was estimated from the boring logs. In CCNPP Unit 3 area, its thickness varies from about 4 ft to 35 ft, with an average thickness of about 20 ft. Additional information on thickness of this stratum at locations other than CCNPP Unit 3, including site-wide, is presented in Table 2.5.4-2.

The stratum thickness was based on estimating the termination elevations encountered for the layer at boring locations. In CCNPP Unit 3 area, the termination elevations of Stratum IIa soils were estimated to range from about elevation 56 ft to elevation 38 ft, with an average termination elevation 47 ft. In combined CCNPP Unit 3 and CLA1 areas, the termination elevations were from elevation 56 ft to elevation 27 ft, with an average elevation 46 ft. An elevation 45 ft was adopted for simplicity. Additional termination information on this layer at locations other than CCNPP Unit 3, including site-wide, is presented in Table 2.5.4-3. Only data from borings that fully penetrated the layer were considered for determination of termination elevations.

Soil samples were collected from the borings via SPT and tube sampling. SPT N-values were measured during the sampling and recorded on the boring logs. In the CCNPP Unit 3 area, the SPT N-values ranged from 1 blow/ft to 46 blows/ft, with an average uncorrected N-value of 9 blows/ft. Additional SPT information on this layer at locations other than CCNPP Unit 3, including site-wide, is presented in Table 2.5.4-4. The measured N-values versus elevation are presented in Figure 2.5.4-10. This figure indicates the SPT N-values to be within a relatively narrow range, indicating uniformity in both depth and laterally, although some increase in SPT N-value with depth is evident in Figure 2.5.4-10.

The measured SPT N-values from each boring were adjusted using the appropriate ETR value shown in Table 2.5.4-5 for the drill rig utilized. The adjusted average field-measured N-value for Stratum IIa soils is 13 blows/ft. A value of 10 blows/ft was conservatively adopted for engineering purposes, as shown in Table 2.5.4-6. Based on adjusted SPT N-values, Stratum IIa soils are considered stiff on average.

CPT soundings were performed in Stratum IIa soils. The cone tip resistance values ranged from about 10 to 200 tsf, with an average value of about 50. A profile of q_c versus elevation is shown in Figure 2.5.4-11. The results also indicate a mild increase in tip resistance with depth.

Index tests and testing for determination of engineering properties were performed on selected samples from Stratum IIa soils. Sample selection for testing was primarily based on the observed soil uniformity from the field classification, or conversely, the variation in material description based on logging in the field, in order to obtain a quantitative measure of the uniformity, or the variation, respectively. The following index tests were performed on Stratum IIa soils, with results as noted.

	No. of Tests	<u>Min. Value</u>	<u>Max. Value</u>	<u>Average</u> <u>Value</u>
Water Content (WC) (%)	67	11	88	32
Liquid Limit (LL) (%)	67	Non-Plastic (NP)	86	57
Plastic Limit (PL) (%)	67	NP	22	22
Plasticity Index (PI)	67	NP	64	35
Fines Content (%)	72	29	99	77
Unit Weight (pcf)	40	103	124	116

The test results are summarized in Table 2.5.4-8. The water content and Atterberg limits are presented versus elevation in Figure 2.5.4-12. They are also shown on the plasticity chart in Figure 2.5.4-13. For engineering purposes, Stratum IIa soils were characterized, on average, as medium-high plasticity clays, with an average PI=35. Their predominant USCS designation was clay of high plasticity and silt of high plasticity (CH and MH), however, sometimes with silty sand, silty sand to clayey sand, and organic clay. The organic designation was based on laboratory (liquid limit) tests. As visual indications to presence of organic soils were not noted during the field sampling, follow up laboratory organic contents tests were performed. Results of 8 tests indicated organic contents in the range of 0.1 percent to 1.6 percent, with an average of 0.9 percent. With less than 1 percent organic matter on average, and observations during sampling, these soils are not considered organic. Also from the laboratory test results, an average unit weight of 115 pcf was adopted for these soils.

The shear strength of Stratum IIa soils was evaluated based on laboratory testing, and using correlations with SPT N-values and the CPT results. The results are summarized in Table 2.5.4-13.

The undrained shear strength, su, was estimated from empirical correlations with SPT N-value (Lowe, 1975), using

 $s_u = N/16$ (in tsf)

Eq. 2.5.4-9

© 2007 UniStar Nuclear Development, LLC. All rights reserved. COPYRIGHT PROTECTED where N=SPT N-value in blows/ft. Substituting the previously established N-value for Stratum IIa soils (SPT N-value=10), s_u =0.63 tsf is estimated for these soils. Undrained shear strength was also estimated using the CPT data, following a CPT-su correlation from Robertson (Robertson, 1988, as follows.

$$s_u = (q_t - \sigma_v) / N_{kt}$$

Eq. 2.5.4-10

where, qt is the cone tip resistance, σv is the total overburden stress, and Nkt is cone factor that varies between 10 and 20. A cone factor Nkt=15 was used as an average value for the analysis of the CPT data. The shear strength values obtained from the CPT data indicate an average su=1.6 tsf. Results of 43 laboratory unconsolidated undrained (UU) triaxial and unconfined compression (UC) tests on selected samples indicate an average su=1.1 tsf. The laboratory shear strength test results are shown versus elevation in Figure 2.5.4-17. The CPT-derived values are shown versus elevation in Figure 2.5.4-18. Based on these results, an undrained shear strength of 1.0 tsf was conservatively adopted for Stratum IIa soil.

The angle of shearing resistance of these soils was evaluated from laboratory test results. The results are shown in Table 2.5.4-9. Eleven direct shear tests were performed on samples of Stratum IIa soils, mostly designated as CL and CH by the USCS soil classification system, resulting in an average $\phi'=25$ degrees and c'=0.5 tsf. Strength parameters from 6 isotropically consolidated triaxial (CIU-bar) tests, indicated average (effective) $\phi'=27$ degrees and c'=0.4 tsf and average (total) $\phi=14$ degrees and c=0.7 tsf. From the above, the following is a summary of average ϕ' and ϕ values for Stratum IIa soils based on various data and interpretation.

	<u>Direct Shear</u>	<u>CIU-bar</u>	
∳' (degrees)	25	27	
c' (tsf)	0.5	0.4	
<pre></pre>		14	
c (tsf)		0.7	

The direct shear and CIU-bar results are comparable. Based on the above, ϕ '=26 degrees and c'=0.4 tsf is adopted for Stratum IIa soils.

Consolidation properties and stress history of Stratum IIa soils were assessed via laboratory testing and evaluation of the CPT data. A summary of the laboratory consolidation test results is presented in Table 2.5.4-10. The results are also plotted versus elevation and shown in Figure 2.5.4-15. Results indicate that, on average, these soils are preconsolidated to about 9 tsf, with an OCR of at least 5. OCR data derived from CPT results are shown in Figure 2.5.4-16. The CPT-interpreted results are scattered over a large range, from OCR=0.6 to OCR=10, with no unique trend. At best, an average OCR may be discerned from the CPT data, or an approximate OCR of 5 to 6. Summary of OCR values from CPT data is shown in Table 2.5.4-10. An OCR=4 and a preconsolidation pressure of 6 tsf were conservatively adopted for Stratum IIa soils.

Static modulus of elasticity for fine-grained soils was evaluated using the following relationship (Davie, 1988).

E = 600 su

Eq. 2.5.4-11

CCNPP Unit 3 FSAR

© 2007 UniStar Nuclear Development, LLC. All rights reserved. COPYRIGHT PROTECTED

This relationship was modified for the CCNPP site soils based on their plasticity, as follows.

$$E = 450 s_u$$
 Eq. 2.5.4-12

Substituting the previously established s_u for Stratum IIa soils (i.,e., s_u =1 tsf), an elastic modulus of 450 tsf is estimated. Other relationships for static modulus of elasticity are also available for fine-grained soils (Ref. 2.5.4-8), as follows.

G _{.0001%} / G _{.375%} = 21	I/√PI (for clays)	Eq. 2.5.4-13
G _{.375%} / s _u = 200	(for clays)	Eq. 2.5.4-14

It is noted that Eq. 2.5.4-14 (Senapathy, 2001) was derived based on Eqs. 2.5.4-2 and 2.5.4-11 using a Poisson's ratio of 0.5, and therefore this equation has similarities with Eq. 2.5.4-12. Using Vs=1,100 ft/sec obtained from the measurements at the site (refer to subsection 2.5.4.4 for discussions on this topic), γ =115 pcf, PI=35, and using µ=0.45 for clay, static (or high strain) modulus of elasticity of 1,766 tsf is estimated from Eqs. 2.5.4-2, 2.5.4-3, and 2.5.4-13. Using s_u=1.0 tsf, an elastic modulus of 580 tsf is estimated from Eqs. 2.5.4-2 and 2.5.4-14. Of the preceding estimates, the value based on PI appears high whereas the other two estimates are comparable, therefore, the PI-based value was omitted in selecting an average elastic modulus for Stratum IIa soils. Using an average of the estimated values from undrained strength and shear wave velocity correlated with s_u, an elastic modulus of 515 tsf is estimated (average of 450 and 580 tsf). A value of 510 tsf was conservatively adopted for Stratum IIa soils. The values are shown in Table 2.5.4-11.

The static shear modulus, G, was estimated using Eq. 2.5.4-5. Using μ =0.45 for clay soils, a shear modulus of 176 tsf is estimated based on the corresponding E value. Values of 609 and 200 tsf were estimated using Eqs. 2.5.4-13 and 2.5.4.-14. The highest value was ignored for conservatism. An average of the two other values, 180 tsf, was conservatively adopted for Stratum IIa soils. The values are shown in Table 2.5.4-11.

The coefficient of subgrade reaction for 1-ft wide or 1-ft square footings, k_1 , was obtained from Terzaghi (Terzaghi, 1995). Based on material characterization for Stratum IIa soils, k_1 =75 tcf was estimated and adopted.

Active, passive, and at rest static earth pressure coefficients, K_a , K_p , and K_0 , respectively, were estimated using Eqs. 2.5.4-6, 2.5.4-7, and 2.5.4-8. Substituting the previously adopted ϕ '=26 degrees for Stratum IIa soils, the following earth pressures coefficients are estimated; K_a =0.4, K_p =2.6, and K_0 =0.6. Given the overconsolidated nature of the soils, and considering the adopted OCR value, the K_0 value was increased by 33 percent based on experience. The adopted values for engineering purposes are K_a =0.4, K_p =2.6, and K_0 =0.8.

The sliding coefficient (tangent δ) of 0.35 was adopted for Stratum IIa soils in contact with concrete (NFEC, 1986).

All of the material properties adopted for engineering purposes for Stratum IIa soils, as well as other useful information, are summarized in Table 2.5.4-12.

Stratum IIb - Chesapeake Cemented Sand

The Chesapeake Cemented Sand stratum was encountered beneath Stratum IIa in all the boreholes. This stratum includes interbedded layers of light to dark gray silty/clayey sands, sandy silts, and low to high plasticity clays, with varying amounts of shell fragments and with varying degrees of cementation. The predominant soils, however, are sandy.

CCNPP Unit 3 FSAR

© 2007 UniStar Nuclear Development, LLC. All rights reserved. COPYRIGHT PROTECTED The thickness of Stratum IIb soils was estimated from the boring logs. In the CCNPP Unit 3 area, its thickness varies from about 57 ft to 73 ft, with an average thickness of about 66 ft. Additional information on the thickness of this layer at locations other than CCNPP Unit 3, including site-wide, is presented in Table 2.5.4-2.

In CCNPP Unit 3 area, the termination elevations of Stratum IIb soils were estimated to range from about elevation 3 ft to elevation -31 ft, with an average termination elevation -19 ft. In combined CCNPP Unit 3 and CLA1 areas, the termination elevations were in the same range as in CCNPP Unit 3, however, with an average elevation -17 ft. An elevation of -15 ft was adopted for simplicity. Additional information on termination elevations for this layer at locations other than CCNPP Unit 3, including site-wide, is presented in Table 2.5.4-3. Only data from borings that fully penetrated the layer were considered for determination of termination elevations.

Soil samples were collected from the borings via SPT and tube samples. In the CCNPP Unit 3 area, the SPT N-values ranged from 4 blows/ft to greater than 100 blows/ft, with an average Nvalue of 45 blows/ft. Site-wide, an average SPT N-value of 41 blows/ft was estimated. SPT values exceeding 100 blows/ft were common in these soils, resulting in sampler refusal. Based on SPT N-values and penetration resistances observed, on average, Stratum IIb soils are considered very dense. The measured SPT N-values from each boring were adjusted using the appropriate ETR value shown in Table 2.5.4-5 for the drill rig utilized. The adjusted average field-measured N-value for Stratum IIb soils is 48 blows/ft when the adjusted values are "capped" at 100 blows/ft. When the adjusted values are not capped at 100 blows/ft, an average N-value of 56 blows/ft is obtained. For conservatism, a value of 45 blows/ft was adopted for engineering purposes, as shown in Table 2.5.4-6. Additional SPT information on this layer at locations other than Unit 3, including site-wide, is presented in Table 2.5.4-4. The measured Nvalues versus elevation are presented in Figure 2.5.4-10. They indicate large variations in SPT N-value over the entire thickness of this stratum, due to varying degrees of cementation. Higher cementation in the top half and relatively lower cementation in the lower half is suggested by the SPT N-values. Laterally, the variation in cementation is rather uniform across both CCNPP Unit 3 powerblock and CLA1 areas.

CPT soundings were attempted in Stratum IIb soils. However, the soils could only be partly penetrated. All CPT soundings experienced refusal when encountering the highly cemented portions of these soils. The CPT soundings could only be advanced after predrilling through the highly cemented zones, and sometimes the predrilling had to be repeated due to the intermittent presence of hard zones at the same sounding. Values of q_c from the soundings ranged from about 40 to over 600 tsf. The average q_c value may range from 200 to 300 tsf. The results corroborate with the SPT N-values where the highest N-values were measured in zones that CPT soundings encountered refusal or could not penetrate these soils, approximately between elevation 20 and elevation 40 ft. The q_c profile is shown in Figure 2.5.4-11.

Low SPT N-values and q_c values are very infrequent in this stratum, given the influence of cementation. The low values are very likely the result of sampling disturbance, or in one case (at C-406, elevation ~30 ft, q_c ~10 tsf) the low tip resistance is due to the relatively low overburden pressure at that location. They could also be influenced by groundwater, given that the "confined" groundwater level is roughly near the top of this stratum (refer to Section 2.5.4.6 for groundwater information). The cementation in Stratum IIb soils varies, including zones that are highly cemented and others with little cementation. The degree of cementation was subjectively evaluated during the field exploration by observing the degree of shell fragmentation present and testing the soils with diluted hydrochloric acid, as noted on the boring logs. The cementation is affected by the presence of shells in these soils. The influence of iron oxide may also be a factor, although no specific test was performed on the samples for

CCNPP Unit 3 FSAR

Page 2.5.4-11

© 2007 UniStar Nuclear Development, LLC. All rights reserved. COPYRIGHT PROTECTED

verification of iron contents. These soils, however, have been studied in the past by others, as follows.

Based on a study of soils near Calvert Cliffs (Rosen, 1986), dolomite or calcite, which is present in the local soils, is identified as the cementing agent. The absence of dolomite or calcite in certain parts may be due to low pH groundwater. Abundant iron cement is also reported in some areas near Calvert Cliffs, with significant accumulation of shells that had dissolved. The degree of cementation is affected by the level of dolomitization in the sandy soils, a process that began in the Chesapeake Groups soils once they were covered by the clayey soils above.

The abundant shells in some zones within this stratum renders these zones very porous. In a few borings, loss of drilling fluid was noted, e.g., in borings B-302, B-406, B-414, B-426, B-703, and B-710. These porous zones were encountered either near the upper or the lower part of the stratum. Fluid loss was estimated to be in the range of 300 to 600 gallons at each of the 400-series borings. The loss was judged to be due to the nested accumulation of coarse materials, particularly shell fragments at these locations. The fluid loss in boring B-309, and in the upper portion of boring B-710, was in suspected fill materials.

Index tests and testing for the determination of engineering properties were performed on selected samples from Stratum IIb soils. Sample selection for testing was primarily based on the observed soil uniformity from the field classification, or conversely, the variation in material description based on logging in the field, in order to obtain a quantitative measure of the uniformity, or the variation, respectively. The following index tests were performed on Stratum IIb soils, with results as noted.

	<u>No. of</u> <u>Tests</u>	<u>Min. Value</u>	<u>Max. Value</u>	<u>Average</u> <u>Value</u>
Water Content (WC)(%)	67	26	88	34
Liquid Limit (LL)(%)	67	Non-Plastic (NP)	78	46
Plastic Limit (PL)(%)	67	NP	52	24
Plasticity Index (PI)	67	NP	43	22
Fines Content (%)	115	3	71	24
Unit Weight (pcf)	16	115	124	118

The test results are summarized in Table 2.5.4-8. The water content and Atterberg limits are presented versus elevation in Figure 2.5.4-12. They are also shown on the plasticity chart in Figure 2.5.4-13. Grain size analyses indicated that Stratum IIb soils are primarily medium-fine sands. The USCS designations were silty sand, poorly-graded sand to silty sand, clayey sand, silt, silt of high plasticity, clay of high plasticity, clay, and organic clay. The predominant classifications, however, were silty sand, clayey sand, and poorly-graded sand to silty sand (SM, SC, and SP-SM). Three samples were classified as organic clay or organic silt, although evidence of high organic content was not present during the field exploration. The organic designation was based on laboratory (liquid limit) testing. Follow up organic content testing on one sample indicated an organic content of 3.2 percent. Despite the presence of organic matter in this sample, Stratum IIb soils are not considered organic soils since organic materials are virtually absent in these soils. The plastic and fine-grained soil classifications are generally from the clayey/silty interbeds within this stratum. For engineering analysis purposes, and given the

predominance of granular proportions, Stratum IIb soils were characterized, on average, as sands with low plasticity, and with an average fines content of 20 percent. Based on laboratory test results, an average unit weight of 120 pcf was also adopted for engineering purposes.

The shear strength of Stratum IIb soils was evaluated based upon laboratory testing and correlations with SPT N-values and CPT results. Initially, the angle of shearing resistance of the soils was estimated from an empirical correlation with SPT N-values (Bowles, 1996). Using the SPT N-value adjusted for hammer efficiency, a ϕ ' of about 50 degrees is obtained for N = 45 blows/ft for sands. A value of ϕ '=40 degrees was conservatively considered. Friction angle values were also obtained from the CPT results, despite limited success penetrating these soils in entirety with the CPT. Estimates of friction angle using the method recommended in EPRI EL-6800 (EPRI, 1990) are presented versus elevation in Figure 2.5.4-14. The estimated values range from 28 degrees to 49 degrees, with an average value of 39 degrees. Three direct shear tests were performed on samples of Stratum IIb soils designated as organic silt and clayey sand by the USCS classification, resulting in average ϕ '=31 degrees and c'=0.4 tsf. The laboratory strength results are given in Table 2.5.4-9. Strength parameters from three CIU-bar tests classified as organic clay, poorly-graded sand to silty sand, and silty sand, indicated average (effective) ϕ '=31 degrees and c'=0.5 tsf and average (total) ϕ =16 degrees and c=1.7 tsf. From the above results, the following is a summary of strength parameters for Stratum IIb soils based on various data and interpretation.

	<u>SPT</u>	<u>CPT</u>	<u>Direct Shear</u>	<u>CIU-bar</u>	
∳' (degrees)	40	39	31	31	
c' (tsf)	0	0	0.4	0.5	
¢ (degrees)				16	
c (tsf)				1.7	

The direct shear and CIU-bar results are comparable, as are values interpreted from the SPT and CPT data. Based on the above, ϕ '=34 degrees and c'=0 is adopted for Stratum IIb soils.

Consolidation properties and stress history of Stratum IIb soils were evaluated via laboratory testing and evaluation of the CPT data. A summary of the laboratory consolidation test results is presented in Table 2.5.4-10. The laboratory results are also plotted versus elevation and shown in Figure 2.5.4-15. Results indicate that, on average, these soils are preconsolidated to 9 tsf, with an OCR of at least 5. OCR data were derived from the CPT results and are shown in Figure 2.5.4-16. The results are scattered over a large range, from OCR=0.8 to OCR=10, with no unique trend. At best, an average OCR may be discerned from the CPT data in Figure 2.5.4-16, or an approximate OCR of 7. A summary of OCR values from CPT data is shown in Table 2.5.4-10. An OCR=3 and a preconsolidation pressure of 8 tsf were conservatively adopted for Stratum IIb soils.

The elastic modulus, E, of Stratum IIb soils was evaluated using the relationship in Davie (Davie, 1988), and Eq. 2.5.4-1. Using the previously established N-value of 45 blows/ft, an elastic modulus of 810 tsf is estimated for these soils. Also, an elastic modulus was estimated based on shear wave velocity for sandy soils (Senapathy, 2001), and Eqs. 2.5.4-2 through 2.5.4-4. Using an average Vs=1530 ft/sec obtained from the measurements at the site (refer to Section 2.5.4.4 for discussions on this topic), γ =120 pcf, and assuming μ =0.3 for sand, a modulus of elasticity of 1,134 tsf is estimated from Eq. 2.5.4-2. Using an average of the two

estimates from SPT and shear wave velocity, an elastic modulus of 972 tsf is estimated. A value of 970 tsf was adopted for Stratum IIb soils. The values are shown in Table 2.5.4-11.

The static shear modulus, G, was estimated using Eq. 2.5.4-5. Using a Poisson's ratio of 0.3 for sandy soils, a shear modulus of 373 tsf is estimated for these soils. A value of 436 tsf was estimated using Eq. 2.5.4-3. Using an average of the two estimates, a value of 400 tsf was adopted for Stratum IIb soils. The values are shown in Table 2.5.4-11.

The coefficient of subgrade reaction for 1-ft wide or 1-ft square footings, k_1 , was obtained from Terzaghi (Terzaghi, 1955). Based on material characterization for Stratum IIb soils, $k_1 = 300$ tcf was estimated and adopted.

Active, passive, and at rest static earth pressure coefficients, K_a , K_p , and K_0 , respectively, were estimated assuming frictionless vertical walls and horizontal backfill using Rankine's Theory (Lambe, 1969), Eqs. 2.5.4-6 through 2.5.4-8, and the adopted ϕ '=34 degrees for Stratum IIb soils. The estimated earth pressure coefficients are K_a =0.28, K_p =3.5, and K_0 =0.44. Values adopted for engineering purposes are K_a =0.3, K_p =3.5, and K_0 =0.5.

The sliding coefficient, tangent δ , for Stratum IIb soils in contact with concrete was estimated based on data in "Foundations and Earth Structures" (NFEC, 1986). Tangent δ =0.45 was adopted for Stratum IIb soils.

All of the material properties adopted for engineering purposes for Stratum IIb soils, as well as other useful information, are summarized in Table 2.5.4-12.

Stratum IIc - Chesapeake Clay/Silt

Underlying the cemented soils, another Chesapeake Clay/Silt stratum was encountered, although distinctly different from the one above the cemented soils. This stratum was encountered in all borings that were sufficiently deep to encounter these soils within the CCNPP Unit 3 powerblock and CLA1 areas. Although primarily gray to greenish gray clay/silt soils, they contain interbedded layers of sandy silt, silty sand, and cemented sands with varying amounts of shell fragments. The greenish tone is the result of glauconite in these soils. Glauconite is a silicate mineral of greenish color with relatively high iron content (about 20 percent). Galuconite oxidizes on contact with air, producing a dark color tone. It is normally found as sand-size, dark green nodules. It can precipitate directly from marine waters or develop as a result of decaying of organic matter in animal shells or bottom-dwellers.

The thickness of Stratum IIc soils was estimated from the boring logs. Only two borings, B-301 and B-401, were sufficiently deep to completely penetrate this stratum. Based on borings B-301 and B-401, the thickness of this stratum is estimated as 190 ft, as shown in Table 2.5.4-2.

The stratum thickness was based on estimating the termination elevations encountered for the layer at the boring locations. In Unit 3 area, the termination elevation of Stratum IIc soils was estimated at elevation -208 ft, whereas in CLA1 area it was estimated at elevation -211 ft, or an average elevation -209 ft, as shown in Table 2.5.4-3. An elevation of -200 ft was adopted for simplicity.

Soil samples were obtained from the borings via SPT and tube samples. SPT N-values were measured during the sampling and recorded on the boring logs. In the CCNPP Unit 3 area, the SPT N-values ranged from 12 to greater than 100 blows/ft, with an average N-value of 23 blows/ft. In the adjacent CLA1 area, the SPT N-values ranged from 10 to 39 blows/ft, with an average N-value of 20 blows/ft. The combined average SPT N-value is 21 blows/ft. Based on SPT N-values, Stratum IIc soils are considered very stiff on average. Additional SPT information on this layer is presented in Table 2.5.4-4. The measured N-values versus

elevation are presented in Figure 2.5.4-10. They indicate a relatively uniform trend in SPT N-value with depth in the upper half and an increasing trend in the lower half of the profile. It also indicates lateral uniformity in SPT N-values across the CCNPP Unit 3 and CLA1 areas to be within a narrow range, as also evident from the average values in the two areas. Evidences of intermittent cementation, or otherwise hardened zones, are also indicated by increasing SPT N-values at intermittent elevations, e.g., near elevation -40, elevation -110, and elevation -170 ft.

The SPT N-values were adjusted for hammer energy; the adjusted average field-measured N-value for Stratum IIc soils is 29 blows/ft. A value of 25 blows/ft was conservatively adopted for engineering purposes, as shown in Table 2.5.4-6.

CPT soundings were attempted in Stratum IIc soils, following several attempts to penetrate these soils due to persistent refusal in overlying soils. A profile of q_c versus elevation is shown in Figure 2.5.4-11. The results suggest relative uniformity in q_c values with depth and lateral extent, as well as evidence of cemented (or hardened zones) near elevation -40 ft which was similarly reflected in the SPT N-value profile in Figure 2.5.4-10. The q_c values range from about 50 to 100 tsf, with an average of about 75 tsf.

Index tests and testing for determination of engineering properties were performed on selected samples from Stratum IIc soils. Sample selection for testing was primarily based on the observed soil uniformity from the field classification, or conversely, the variation in material description based on logging in the field, in order to obtain a quantitative measure of the uniformity, or the variation, respectively. The following index tests were performed on Stratum IIc soils, with results as noted.

	<u>No. of Tests</u>	<u>Min. Value</u>	<u>Max. Value</u>	<u>Average Value</u>
Water Content (WC) (%)	88	26	123	54
Liquid Limit (LL) (%)	88	39	218	94
Plastic Limit (PL) (%)	88	30	100	50
Plasticity Index (PI)	88	9	118	44
Fines Content (%)	82	18	100	54
Unit Weight (pcf)	19	86	117	107

The test results are summarized in Table 2.5.4-8. The water content and Atterberg limits are presented versus elevation in Figure 2.5.4-12. They are also shown on the plasticity chart in Figure 2.5.4-13. For engineering analysis purposes, Stratum IIc soils were characterized, on average, as high plasticity clay and silt, with an average PI=45. Their predominant USCS designation was clay of high plasticity and silt of high plasticity (CH and MH), however, sometimes with silty sand, clay, and organic clay classifications indicated. Based on field observations during sampling, the organic designation based on laboratory (Liquid Limit) testing is not representative of these soils, and therefore, they are not considered organic soils. The organic designation (based on Liquid Limit tests) may be impacted by the glauconite content in the soils. Based on laboratory testing, an average unit weight of 110 pcf was also adopted for Stratum IIc soils for engineering purposes.

The shear strength of Stratum IIc soils was evaluated based on laboratory testing, and using correlations with SPT N-values and the CPT results. The results are summarized in Table 2.5.4-13.

The undrained shear strength, s_u , was estimated from Eq. 2.5.4-9 based on SPT N-values. Substituting the previously established N-value for Stratum IIc soils (SPT N-value=25), s_u =1.6 tsf is estimated for these soils. Undrained shear strength was also estimated using the CPT data, following a CPT- s_u correlation from Robertson (Robertson, 1988), using a cone factor N_{kt} =15. The shear strength values obtained from the CPT data are shown versus elevation in Figure 2.5.4-18, indicating an average s_u =4.7 tsf as summarized in Table 2.5.4-13. A number of laboratory unconsolidated undrained (UU) triaxial and unconfined compression (UC) tests were performed on selected undisturbed samples. Laboratory test results on 10 samples resulted in an average s_u =2.2 tsf. The laboratory shear strength test results are shown versus elevation in Figure 2.5.4-17. Based on these results, an average undrained shear strength of 2.0 tsf was conservatively adopted for Stratum IIc soils.

The angle of shearing resistance of these soils was evaluated from laboratory test results. The results are shown in Table 2.5.4-9. Four direct shear tests were performed on samples of Stratum IIc soils, designated as clay, clay of high plasticity, and clayey sand by the USCS soil classification system, resulting in an average $\phi'=25$ degrees and c'=1.6 tsf. Strength parameters from one CIU-bar test, indicated effective stress $\phi'=29.1$ degrees, c'=1.0 tsf, and total stress $\phi=15.4$ degrees, and c=1.5 tsf. From the above, the following is a summary of average ϕ' values for the Stratum IIc soils based on various data and interpretation.

	Direct Shear	<u>CIU-bar</u>
φ' (degrees)	25	29.1
c' (tsf)	1.6	1.0
¢ (degrees)		15.4
c (tsf)		1.5

Based on the above, ϕ '=27 degrees and c'=1.0 tsf is adopted for Stratum IIc soils.

Consolidation properties and stress history of Stratum IIc soils were evaluated via laboratory testing and evaluation of the CPT data. A summary of the laboratory consolidation test results is presented in Table 2.5.4-10. The laboratory results are also plotted versus elevation and shown in Figure 2.5.4-15. Results indicate that, on average, these soils are preconsolidated to about 15 tsf, with an OCR of at least 3. OCR data derived from CPT results are shown in Figure 2.5.4-16. The CPT-derived results are scattered over a large range, from about OCR=1.2 to OCR=10, with no unique trend, although most values are in the range of about 5 to 10. An average OCR from the CPT data would be approximately 9. A summary of OCR values from CPT data is shown in Table 2.5.4-10. An OCR=3 and preconsolidation pressure of 14 tsf were conservatively adopted for Stratum IIc soils. It is noted that this preconsolidation pressure is equivalent to about 200 to 300 ft of preloading by sediments that once covered these soils during prehistoric times. This is consistent with a study on the depositional history of Miocene-age soils in Maryland (Rosen, 1986) that estimated the burial depth of these soils in Western Maryland, e.g., Calvert County, at "much less" than 590 ft, which would be equivalent to about 200 to 300 ft one-half of the referenced burial depth.

CCNPP Unit 3 FSAR

Static modulus of elasticity for Stratum IIc was evaluated using Eq. 2.5.4-12. For the adopted $s_u=2$ tsf, an elastic modulus of 900 tsf is estimated. Also, elastic modulus was estimated based on shear wave velocity from Eqs. 2.5.4-13 and 2.5.4-14. Using an average Vs=1,250 ft/sec obtained from the measurements at the site (refer to Section 2.5.4.4 for discussions on this topic), unit weight of 110 pcf, and assuming Poisson's ratio 0.45 for clayey soils, a modulus of elasticity of 2,477 tsf is estimated from Eq. 2.5.4-13. Using $s_u=2.0$ tsf, an elastic modulus of 1,160 tsf is estimated from Eq. 2.5.4-14. Of the preceding estimates, the value based on PI appears high. Therefore, the PI-based value is conservatively omitted when estimating an average elastic modulus for Stratum IIc soils. Using an average of the estimated values from undrained strength and shear wave velocity, an elastic modulus of 1,030 tsf is estimated and adopted for Stratum IIc soils, as shown in Table 2.5.4-11.

The static shear modulus, G, was estimated using Eq. 2.5.4-5. Using μ =0.45 for clay soils, a shear modulus of 355 tsf is estimated for these soils. Values of 853 and 400 tsf were estimated using Eqs. 2.5.4-13 and 2.5.4.-14. The higher value was ignored for conservatism. An average of the two other values, 370 tsf, was conservatively adopted for Stratum IIc soils, as shown in Table 2.5.4-11.

The coefficient of subgrade reaction for 1-ft wide or 1-ft square footings, k_1 , was obtained from Tezaghi (Terzaghi, 1955). Based on material characterization for Stratum IIc soils, k_1 =150 tcf was estimated and adopted.

Active, passive, and at rest static earth pressure coefficients, K_a , K_p , and K_0 , respectively, were estimated assuming frictionless vertical walls and horizontal backfill using Rankine's Theory, Eqs. 2.5.4-6 through 2.5.4-8, and the adopted ϕ '=27 degrees for Stratum IIc soils, the following earth pressures coefficients are estimated; K_a =0.4, K_p =2.6, and K_0 =0.55. Given the overconsolidated nature of the soils, the K_0 value was increased. The adopted values for engineering purposes are K_a =0.4, K=2.6, and K_0 =0.7.

The sliding coefficient, tangent δ , of 0.40 was adopted for Stratum IIc soils in contact with concrete (NFEC, 1986).

All of the material properties adopted for engineering purposes for Stratum IIc soils, as well as other useful information, are summarized in Table 2.5.4-12.

2.5.4.2.1.3 Stratum III – Naniemoy Sand

Underlying the Chesapeake Clay/Silt stratum are the Nanjemoy soils (Stratum III). Stratum III was encountered in deep borings B-301 and B-401. This stratum consists primarily of dark, greenish-gray glauconitic sand, however, it contains interbedded layers of silt, clay, and cemented sands with varying amounts of shell fragments and varying degrees of cementation. The glauconite in these soils could vary from less than 10 percent to as much as 50 percent.

The thickness of Stratum III soils cannot be estimated from the information obtained from the CCNPP Unit 3 subsurface investigation (boring logs B-301 and B-401), as these borings did not penetrate these soils in their entirety, although they penetrated them by about 100 ft. The Nanjemoy soils are about 200 ft thick at the site (Hansen, 1996), consisting of primarily sandy soils in the upper 100 ft and clayey soils in the lower 100 ft. On this basis, the termination (bottom) of the upper sandy portion can be estimated at about elevation -315 ft and the termination of the lower clayey portion can be estimated at about elevation -415 ft. Information from borings B-301 and B-401 sufficiently characterizes the upper half of this geologic unit, as these borings were terminated at elevation -308 ft and elevation -329 ft, respectively.

Soil samples were collected from the borings via SPT sampling. Only one tube sample was collected in these soils, however, despite several attempts, given the depth and penetration difficulties involved. SPT N-values were measured during the sampling and recorded on the boring logs. In the CCNPP Unit 3 area, the SPT N-values ranged from 34 blows/ft to greater than 100 blows/ft, with an average N-value of 64 blows/ft. In the adjacent CLA1 area, the SPT N-values ranged from 28 blows/ft to greater than 100 blows/ft, with an average N-value of 64 blows/ft. In the adjacent CLA1 area, the SPT N-values ranged from 28 blows/ft to greater than 100 blows/ft, with an average N-value of 56 blows/ft. The combined average SPT N-value is 61 blows/ft. Based on SPT N-values, Stratum III soils are considered very dense on average. The SPT information is presented in Table 2.5.4-4. The measured N-values versus elevation are presented in Figure 2.5.4-10. They indicate a generally increasing trend in SPT N-value with depth, although SPT N-values begin to decline near the bottom of the explored depth, a possible indication of nearing the underlying clay soils. Limited SPT values are available from this stratum to judge its lateral uniformity, however, most available data appear to fall in a relatively narrow range, except for intermittent "peak" values. CPT sounding could not reach these soils due to refusal in overlying soils.

The SPT N-values were adjusted for hammer energy; the adjusted average field-measured N-value for Stratum III soils is 72 blows/ft. A value of 70 blows/ft was conservatively adopted for engineering purposes, as shown in Table 2.5.4-6.

Index tests were performed on several samples from Stratum III soils. Sample selection for testing was primarily based on the observed soil uniformity from the field classification, or conversely, the variation in material description based on logging in the field, in order to obtain a quantitative measure of the uniformity, or the variation, respectively. Due to the limited quantity of available samples, the testing was limited. The following index tests were performed on selected samples of Stratum III soils, with the results as noted.

<u>No. of</u> <u>Tests</u>	<u>Min.</u> Value	<u>Max. Value</u>	<u>Average Value</u>
7	23	37	30
7	47	76	59
7	32	40	32
7	15	36	27
10	12	29	19
	<u>No. of</u> <u>Tests</u> 7 7 7 7 7 10	No. of Tests Min. Value 7 23 7 47 7 32 7 15 10 12	No. of TestsMin. ValueMax. Value72337747767324071536101229

The test results are summarized in Table 2.5.4-8. The water content and Atterberg limits are presented versus elevation in Figure 2.5.4-12. They are also shown on the plasticity chart in Figure 2.5.4-13. For engineering analysis purposes, Stratum III soils were characterized, on average, as sand of high plasticity, with an average PI=30. Their predominant USCS designations were clayey sand and silty sand (SC and SM), although clay of high plasticity and silt of high plasticity were also indicated. Testing for unit weight was not performed since only disturbed SPT samples could be obtained from this stratum; however, based on correlation with SPT N-values (Bowles, 1996), an average unit weight of 120 pcf was adopted for these soils.

The shear strength of Stratum III soils was evaluated using correlations with SPT N-values, assuming predominately granular behavior. For an average SPT N-value=70 blows/ft, an

average ϕ '=50 degrees is estimated (Bowles, 1996). A ϕ '=40 degrees was conservatively adopted.

Given the relatively high plasticity in these soils (LL=60 and PI=30 on average), their behavior could also be characterized using undrained parameters. Although no laboratory strength tests were performed on these soils, their undrained shear strength, s_u , may be estimated from Eq. 2.5.4-9. For an average N-value=70 blows/ft, s_u =4.4 tsf is estimated for these soils. An undrained shear strength of 4.0 tsf may conservatively be assigned to Stratum III soils as summarized in Table 2.5.4-13.

Given the high SPT N-value, and associated strength, Stratum III soils are considered highly preconsolidated. Although no consolidation or CPT tests were performed in these soils, their preconsolidation pressure is judged to be at least as high as the overlying soils (a preconsolidation pressure of 14 tsf was assigned to the overlying Stratum IIc soils). The high degree of preconsolidation is evident by the indices that were measured, e.g., a profile of the water content versus elevation in Figure 2.5.4-12 clearly demonstrates the water contents to be consistently near the Plastic Limit, a strong indication of high preconsolidation in these soils.

Static modulus of elasticity for Stratum III soils was evaluated using Eq. 2.5.4-1. For the adopted SPT N-value=70 blows/ft, an elastic modulus of 1,260 tsf is estimated. Similarly, Eqs. 2.5.4-12 through 2.5.4-14 were utilized, along with corresponding parameters previously noted, and elastic modulus values of 1,800, 1,879, and 2,080 tsf were estimated, as noted in Table 2.5.4-11. A value of 1,750 tsf is estimated and adopted for Stratum III soils.

The static shear modulus, G, was estimated using Eq. 2.5.4-5. Using μ =0.3 for sandy soils, a shear modulus of 700 tsf is estimated and adopted for these soils, as shown in Table 2.5.4-11.

Foundations are not anticipated in Stratum III soils, therefore, estimating their coefficient of subgrade reaction, earth pressure, and sliding coefficient is unnecessary.

All of the material properties adopted for engineering purposes for Stratum III, as wells as other information, are summarized in Table 2.5.4-12.

2.5.4.2.1.4 Chemical Properties of Soils

Chemical laboratory tests were performed on selected soil and groundwater samples. The groundwater test results, and soil portions tested as part of the groundwater characterization, are addressed in Section 2.4.13. A brief summary of available information is evaluated and provided below.

Chemical Testing for CCNPP Units 1 and 2

Chemical test results on soils are available in a report that was prepared as part of the design of an additional Diesel Generator Building (Bechtel, 1992) at the project site. Three samples from each investigated stratum were tested, for pH, sulfate, and chloride. A summary of the results is presented in Table 2.5.4-14.

Chemical Testing on CCNPP Unit 3 Samples

Field electrical resistivity tests were performed along four arrays, at locations shown in Figures 2.5.4-1 and 2.5.4-2. The results are presented in Appendix 2.5-A, and summarized in Table 2.5.4-15. The results are approximately correlated with depth based on the array spacing, as shown in Table 2.5.4-15.

Field Electrical Resistivity Testing for COL Investigation

Field electrical resistivity tests were performed along four arrays, at locations shown in Figures 2.5.4-1 and 2.5.4-2. The results are presented in Appendix 2.5-A, and summarized in Table 2.5.4-15. The results are approximately correlated with depth based on the array spacing, as shown in Table 2.5.4-15.

Evaluation of Chemical Data

Guidelines for interpretation of chemical test results are provided in Table 2.5.4-16, based on the following consensus standards, API Recommended Practice 651 (API, 2007), Reinforced Soil Structures (FWHA, 1990), Standard Specification for Portland Cement (ASTM C150), Manual of Concrete Practice (ACI, 1994), and Standard Specification for Blended Hydraulic Cement (ASTM, C595). From the average values of available results shown in Tables 2.5.4-14 and 2.5.4-15, and guidelines in Table 2.5.4-16, the following conclusions were developed.

Attack on Steel (Corrosiveness): The resistivity test results indicate that all soils are "little corrosive," except for Stratum IIc Chesapeake Clay/Silt that may be "little to mildly corrosive." Based on the chloride contents being typically below 10 ppm, all soils are essentially noncorrosive. The pH results, however, indicate that all soils are "corrosive to very corrosive," except for Stratum IIc Chesapeake Clay/Silt that may be "mildly corrosive." It is noted that few chemical test results are available from Stratum IIc; however, that should be of no special importance because no Category I structure (or piping) is anticipated within these soils. The pH data dominate the corrosive characterization of the soils. Nevertheless, all natural soils at the site will be considered corrosive to metals, requiring protection if placed within these soils. Protection of steel against corrosion may include cathodic protection, or other measures, which will be determined during the detailed design phase of the project. It should be noted that additional pH testing on groundwater samples obtained from the observation wells (refer to Section 2.4.13) indicate pH values of average 5.5, 6.8, and 7.1 for wells screened in Stratum I, Stratum IIa, and Stratum IIb soils, respectively. Except for values obtained in groundwater associated with Stratum I soils indicating "corrosive" conditions, remaining pH data from other strata only indicate "mildly corrosive" conditions.

Attack on Concrete (Aggressiveness): The sulfate test results in all tested soils indicate a "severe" potential for attack on concrete, except for Stratum IIc Chesapeake Clay/Silt that may cause a "moderate" attack. As noted above, few chemical test results are available for Stratum IIc; however, that should be of no special importance because no Category I structure (or piping) is anticipated within these soils. Nevertheless, all natural soils at the site will be considered aggressive to concrete, requiring protection if placed within these soils. Protection of concrete from sulfate attack will be addressed during the detailed design phase of the project. The incorporation of sacrificial concrete thickness, whose compatibility may be verified by bench scale laboratory testing, is one of the measures that will be considered during the detailed design phase of the project.

2.5.4.2.1.5 Subsurface Materials Below 400 Feet

As indicated earlier, the field exploration for the CCNPP Unit 3 extended to a maximum depth of about 400 ft below ground. Coastal Plain sediments, however, are known to extend below this depth, to a depth of approximately 2,500 ft, or to top of bedrock (BGE, 1982). The subsurface conditions below 400 ft were addressed through reference to existing literature and work that had been done by others, primarily for the purpose of seismic site characterization. The subsurface conditions below 400 ft are addressed in Sections 2.5.4.7 and 2.5.2.5.

2.5.4.2.1.6 Field Investigation Program

The planning of the field investigation referred to the guidance provided in NRC Regulatory Guide 1.132, "Site Investigations for Foundations of Nuclear Power Plants" (NRC, 2003). References to the industry standards used for field tests completed for the CCNPP Unit 3 subsurface investigation are shown in Table 2.5.4-1. The details and results of the field investigation are provided in Geotechnical Subsurface Investigation Data Report (Schnabel, 2007a) and included as Appendix 2.5-A. The work was performed under the Bechtel QA program with work procedures developed specifically for the CCNPP Unit 3 subsurface investigation, including a subsurface investigation plan developed by Bechtel The locations of borings in Figures 2.5.4-1 and 2.5.4-2, although in agreement with the guidance in Regulatory Guide 1.132 (NRC, 2003a) at the time of developing the subsurface investigation plan, do not agree with the guidance of Regulatory Guide 1.132 (NRC, 2003a), for the current CCNPP Unit 3 layout since the layout has evolved over time and the locations of some of the structures have shifted. This has resulted in borings or CPT soundings being outside the outline of some structures. Although differing soil conditions are not expected, due to the observed lateral stratigraphic uniformity at the site, a complementary investigation will be performed as part of the detailed design of the project, with reference to guidance in Regulatory Guide 1.132 (NRC, 2003a) to verify subsurface uniformity at these locations. If this additional investigation yields nonconservative results that impact the conclusions of this section, an update to the COL application will be made.

2.5.4.2.1.7 Laboratory Testing Program

The laboratory investigations of soils and rock was performed with in accordance with the guidance outlined in Regulatory Guide 1.138, Laboratory Investigations of Soils for Engineering Analysis and Design of Nuclear Power Plants (NRC, 2003b). Deviations are identified, alternatives and/or basis for deviation are provided.

A summary, as well as detailed results, of all laboratory tests performed as part of the subsurface investigation is provided in Geotechnical Subsurface Investigation Data Report (Schnabel, 2007a)(Schnabel, 2007b), included as Appendix 2.5-A and Appendix 2.5-B.

The laboratory work was performed under the Bechtel QA program with work procedures developed specifically for the CCNPP Unit 3 subsurface investigation.

Soil samples were shipped under chain-of-custody protection from the on-site storage to the testing laboratories. ASTM D4220 (ASTM, 2000a) provides guidance on standard practices for preserving and transporting soil samples. This guidance was referenced in preparing technical specifications for the CCNPP Unit 3 subsurface investigation, addressing sample preservation and transportation, as well as other subsurface investigation and geotechnical requirements.

Laboratory testing consisted of testing soils and groundwater samples obtained from the investigation program. Testing of groundwater samples is addressed is Section 2.4.13. Laboratory testing of soil samples consisted of index and engineering property tests on selected SPT, undisturbed, and bulk samples. The SPT and undisturbed samples were recovered from the borings and the bulk samples were obtained from the test pits. Soil laboratory tests included the following: water content, grain size (sieve and hydrometer), Atterberg limits, organic content, chemical analysis (pH, chloride, and sulfate), unit weight, specific gravity, moisture-density, consolidation, unconfined compression (UC), unconsolidated-undrained triaxial compression (UU), consolidated-undrained triaxial compression (CIU-bar), direct shear (DS), and resonant column torsional shear (RCTS) testing.

Regulatory Guide 1.138 (NRC, 2003b) provides guidance for laboratory testing procedures for certain specific tests, including related references. Some of these references are not in common practice in the U.S. or are out-of-date. Laboratory testing of samples for the CCNPP Unit 3 subsurface investigation used commonly accepted, and updated practices such as more recent ASTM and EPA standards which are equivalent to the testing procedures referenced in the Regulatory Guide. Laboratory testing of samples for the CCNPP Unit 3 subsurface investigation did not rely upon non-U.S. or out-of-date versions of practices or standards provided in the Regulatory Guide. References to the industry standards used for this laboratory investigation, standards delineated in Regulatory Guide 1.138 (NRC, 2003b), and quantity of test are shown in Table 2.5.4-7.

All laboratories have completed their testing, with the results contained in Geotechnical Subsurface Investigation Data Report and associated Addendum No. 3 (Schnabel, 2007a) (Schnabel, 2007b), included as Appendix 2.5-A and Appendix 2.5-B.

The soil and rock laboratory tests listed in Regulatory Guide 1.138 (NRC,2003b) are common tests performed in most well-equipped soil and rock testing laboratories, and they are covered by ASTM standards. Additional test that are not covered in regulatory guidance were also performed for the CCNPP Unit 3 subsurface investigation (e.g., CBR tests to assess suitability of subgrade or fill materials for pavement, and RCTS tests, which were used in lieu of the resonant column test alone to obtain shear modulus and damping ratio values for a wide range of strains). Appendix 2.5-B describes the test procedures used to perform RCTS testing. Results of Cation Exchange Capacity tests are addressed with the groundwater chemistry data in Section 2.4.13.

2.5.4.2.1.8 Investigations

Previous Subsurface Investigations

Based on limited information available from the CCNPP Units 1 and 2 UFSAR (BGE, 1982), the original subsurface investigations for the CCNPP Units 1 and 2 performed in 1967 consisted of a total of 10 exploratory borings, ranging in depth from 146 to 332 ft, with soil samples obtained at various intervals for soil identification and testing. Seven piezometers were also installed for groundwater observation and monitoring. The 1967 investigation included other field investigations (two seismic survey lines using Microtremor) and laboratory testing (moisture content, density, particle size, permeability, cation exchange, and x-ray diffraction). Supplemental investigations in support of detailed design were performed in July 1967 (5 borings), August 1967 (23 borings), December 1968 (18 borings), and 1969 (5 borings). Additional investigations were performed in 1980/1981 (borings, CPT soundings, and observation wells) in order to site a "generic Category I structure," and in 1992 additional investigations (borings, dilatometer soundings, crosshole seismic survey, field resistivity) were performed for an additional Diesel Generator Building. Various laboratory testing was also performed on selected portions of the recovered soils.

Geological descriptions in CCNPP Units 1 and 2 UFSAR (BGE, 1982) indicate the surficial deposits to be Pleistocene Age soils extending from the ground surface to about elevation 70 ft. These soils were estimated to extend to an average elevation 60 ft based on the CCNPP subsurface investigation. CCNPP Units 1 and 2 UFSAR (BGE, 1982) indicates that Chesapeake Group soils were encountered in the 1967 investigation between elevation 70 ft and elevation -200 ft. These soils were estimated to extend to extend to approximately elevation -200 ft based on the COL investigation. CCNPP Units 1 and 2 UFSAR (BGE, 1982) indicates that Eocene deposits lie below elevation -200 ft and consist of glauconitic sands. Comparable observations were made on these, and the overlying deposits, from the CCNPP subsurface
investigation borings. CCNPP Units 1 and 2 UFSAR (BGE, 1982) remarked that "good correlation of subsurface stratigraphy was obtained between the borings." This remark is corroborated by the results obtained from the CCNPP subsurface investigation.

It is noted that the CCNPP Unit subsurface investigation involved a significantly larger quantity of testing than performed for the original CCNPP Units 1 and 2. Given the reasonably parallel geologic conditions between CCNPP Units 1 and 2 and the CCNPP Unit 3 site, and the greater intensity in exploration and testing at the CCNPP Unit 3 site which should result in enhanced characterization of the subsurface conditions, findings from previous investigations are not discussed further, unless a differing condition is reported from the previous investigations.

CCNPP Unit 3 Subsurface Investigation

The subsurface investigation program was performed with in accordance with the guidance outlined in Regulatory Guide 1.132 (NRC, 2003a). Deviations are identified at point of use, alternatives and/or basis for deviation are provided. The fieldwork was performed under the contractors QA program and work procedures developed specifically for the CCNPP Unit 3 subsurface investigation.

Regulatory Guide 1.132 (NRC, 2003a) provides guidance on spacing and depth of borings, sampling procedures, in-situ testing, geophysical investigations, etc. This guidance was used in preparing a technical specification, addressing the basis for the CCNPP Unit 3 subsurface investigation. The quantity of borings and CPTs for Category I structures was based on a minimum of one boring per structure and the one boring per 10,000-square ft criterion. The maximum depths of the borings for Category I structures were based on a foundation to overburden stress ratio criterion of 10 percent. The sampling intervals typically exceeded the guidance document by shortening the sample spacing in the upper 15 ft and maintaining 5-ft sampling intervals at depths greater than 50 ft, except for the case of 400-ft borings. Continuous sampling was also performed, and will be described later.

Regulatory Guide 1.132 (NRC, 2003a) provides guidance in selecting the boring depth, d_{max}, based on a foundation to overburden stress ratio of 10 percent. Using this criterion, a boring depth of approximately 350 ft was determined for the most heavily loaded structures supported on the Common Basemat. Regulatory Guide 1.132 (NRC, 2003a), also indicates that at least one-fourth of the principal borings should penetrate to a depth equal to dmax. Given the previously available knowledge of subsurface conditions as documented in the CCNPP Units 1 and 2 UFSAR (BGE, 1982) indicating stable, geologically old deposits at the site which would not adversely impact foundation stability, it was determined that one boring should be extended to about 400 ft, 4 borings extended to about 200 ft, and 4 borings extended to about 150 ft for the Common Basemat. (The consistency across the site of the Miocene-age Chesapeake Group clays and silts that exist below about 100 ft depth and the underlying Nanjemov Formation sands that start at around 300 ft depth is aptly demonstrated by the similarity of the shear wave velocity profiles obtained in boreholes almost 1,000 ft apart (Figure 2.5.4-22)). Also included were 3 CPT soundings. Borings associated with the Common Basemat extended at least 33 ft below the foundation level. Additional boring are to be taken to meet the Regulatory Guide 1.132 guidance during detailed design.

As noted in subsection 2.5.4.2.1.6, the current quantity and locations of tests, shown in Figures 2.5.4-1 and 2.5.4-2, do not necessarily coincide with the footprint of structures, for the current CCNPP Unit 3 layout has evolved since the investigation, as well as the need during the field work to relocate the tests to locations that avoided wetlands, reduced cutting trees, and were accessible to the drilling equipment. Although a differing subsurface condition is not anticipated

due to the observed soil uniformity at the site, a complementary investigation will be performed during the detailed design stage to verify subsurface uniformity at these locations.

A team consisting of a geologist, a geotechnical engineer, and a member of the project management performed a site reconnaissance prior to start of the field investigation. The focus of this task was to observe the site and access conditions, locations of borings and wells, and identify potential test relocation areas. Information on site geology and geotechnical conditions, used as a basis for developing the soils investigation plan for the CCNPP subsurface investigation was obtained from the information contained in the CCNPP Units 1 and 2 UFSAR (BGE, 1982).

Regulatory Guide 1.132, (NRC, 2003a) provides that boreholes with depths greater than about 100 ft (30.5 m) should be surveyed for deviation. In lieu of surveying for deviation in boreholes greater than 100 ft (30.5 m), deviation surveys, were used in the 10 suspension P-S velocity logging boreholes to depths ranging from about 200 to 400 ft. The results indicated minimum, maximum, and average deviation of 0.6, 1.6, and 1.0 percent, respectively. The information collected the necessary data for proper characterization of the CCNPP Unit 3 subsurface materials."

Regulatory Guide 1.132, (NRC, 2003a) provides guidance for color photographs of all cores to be taken soon after removal from the borehole to document the condition of the soils at the time of drilling. For soil samples, undisturbed samples are sealed in steel tubes, and cannot be photographed. SPT samples are disturbed, and by definition they do not resemble the condition of the material in-situ. Sample photography is a practice typically limited to rock core samples, not soils, therefore, it was not used. X-ray imaging, however, was performed on tube samples selected for RCTS testing.

The CCNPP Unit 3 subsurface field exploration was performed from April through August 2006. This work consisted of an extensive investigation to define the subsurface conditions at the project area. The exploration locations are shown in Figures 2.5.4-1 through 2.5.4-3. The scope of work and investigation methods were determined to be as follows:

- Surveying to establish the horizontal and vertical locations of exploration points.
- Evaluating the potential presence of underground utilities at exploration points.
- Drilling 145 test borings with SPT sampling and collecting in excess of 200 undisturbed samples (using Shelby push tubes, Osterberg sampler, and Pitcher sampler) to a maximum depth of 403 ft, including 4 borings with continuous SPT samples (B-305, B-409, B-324, and B-417), with the first two borings being 150 ft deep each and the last two borings being 100 ft deep each. Note that "continuous sampling" was defined as one SPT sample for every 2.5-ft interval with one ft distance between each SPT sample.
- Installing and developing 40 groundwater observation wells to a maximum depth of 122 ft, including Slug testing in each well.
- Excavating 20 test pits to a maximum depth of 10 ft and collecting bulk soil samples.
- Performing 63 CPT soundings, including off-set soundings that required pre-drilling to overcome CPT refusal, to a maximum depth of 142 ft, as well as seismic CPT and pore pressure dissipation measurements.
- Conducting 2-dimensional field electrical resistivity testing along four arrays.
- Performing borehole geophysical logging, consisting of suspension P-S velocity logging, natural gamma, long- and short-term resistivity, spontaneous potential, 3-arm caliper, and directional survey in 10 boreholes.

- Conducting SPT hammer-rod combination energy measurements on 5 drilling rigs.
- Performing laboratory testing of soils, consisting of natural water content, unit weight, specific gravity, sieve and hydrometer analysis, Atterberg limits, organic content, moisturedensity, CBR, unconfined compression, consolidated and unconsolidated undrained triaxial compression, direct shear, consolidation, chemical analysis (pH, sulfate, and chloride), and RCTS testing. RCTS testing is further discussed in Section 2.5.4.7.3.
- Performing laboratory testing on groundwater samples obtained from the observation wells, consisting of pH, conductivity, dissolved oxygen, alkalinity, ammonia nitrogen, bromide, chloride, dissolved solids, fluoride, nitrate as N, nitrite as N, sulfate, and sulfide, including cation exchange testing on soils in the well screen area. These results are discussed in Section 2.4.13.

The location of each exploration point was investigated for the presence of underground utilities prior to commencing exploration at that location. Locations of several exploration points had to be adjusted due to proximity to utilities, inaccessibility due to terrain conditions, or proximity to wetlands. Access had to be created to most exploration locations, via clearing roads and creating temporary roads, due to heavy brush and forestation. These areas were restored subsequent to completion of the field investigation.

An on-site storage facility for soil samples was established before the exploration program commenced. Each sample was logged into an inventory system. Samples removed from the facility were noted in the inventory logbook. A chain-of-custody form was also completed for all samples removed from the facility. Material storage handling was in accordance with ASTM D4220 (ASTM, 2000a).

Complete results of the investigation are in Appendix 2.5-A and Appendix 2.5-B. Laboratory test results are discussed and summarized in Section 2.5.4.2 and Appendix 2.5-C. Geophysical test results are discussed and summarized in Section 2.5.4.4. Further details pertaining to field activities related to borings, CPTs, Slug tests, geophysical surveys, and other activities are summarized below.

Test Boring and Sampling

Soils were sampled using the SPT sampler in accordance with ASTM D1586 (ASTM, 1999). The soils were sampled at continuous intervals (one sample every 2.5-ft) to 15 ft depth. Subsequent SPT sampling was performed at regular 5 ft intervals. At boring B-401, with a total depth of 401.5 ft, SPT sampling was performed at about 10 ft intervals below a depth of 300 ft. The recovered soil samples were visually described and classified by the engineer or geologist in accordance with ASTM D2488 (ASTM, 2006d)). A representative portion of the soil sample was placed in a glass jar with a moisture-preserving lid. The sample jars were labeled, placed in boxes, and transported to the on-site storage facility. Table 2.5.4-17 provides a summary of all test borings performed. The boring locations are shown in Figures 2.5.4-1 and 2.5.4-2. The boring logs are included in Appendix 2.5-A. At boring completion, the boreholes were tremie-grouted using cement-bentonite grout.

Undisturbed samples were obtained in accordance with ASTM D1587 (ASTM, 2000c) using the push Shelby tubes, Osterberg sampler, and rotary Pitcher sampler. Upon sample retrieval, the disturbed portions at both ends of the tube were removed, both ends were trimmed square to establish an effective seal, and pocket penetrometer (PP) tests were performed on the trimmed lower end of the samples. Both ends of the sample were then sealed with hot wax, covered with plastic caps, and sealed once again using electrician tape and wax. The tubes were labeled and transported to the on-site storage area. Table 2.5.4-18 provides a summary of

undisturbed sampling performed during the subsurface investigation. Undisturbed samples are also identified on the boring logs included in Appendix 2.5-A.

Energy measurements were made on the hammer-rod system on each of the five drilling rigs used in the subsurface investigation. A Pile Driving Analyzer (PDA) was used to acquire and process the data. A summary of measured energies is provided in Table 2.5.4-5. Energy measurements were made at sampling intervals of 15 ft, with the total number of measurements made per boring ranging from 6 (at boring B-744) to 26 (at boring B-401), depending on boring depth. Energy transfer to the gage locations was estimated using the Case Method, in accordance with ASTM D4633 (ASTM, 2005a). The resultant energy transfer efficiency measurements ranged from 78 to 87 percent, with an average energy transfer efficiency of 83 percent. Detailed results are presented in Appendix 2.5-A.

Cone Penetration Testing

CPT soundings were performed using an electronic seismic piezocone compression model, with a 15 cm² tip area and a 225 cm² friction sleeve area. CPT soundings were performed in accordance with ASTM D5778 (ASTM, 2000e)), except that tolerances for wear of the cone tip were in accordance with report SGF 1:93E, Recommended Standard for Cone Penetration Tests, (SGS, 1993) which are comparable to ASTM. It is noted that for the 10-cm² base cone, the ASTM D5778 (ASTM, 2000e) specified dimensions for "base diameter," "cone height," and "extension" are minimum 34.7 mm, 24 mm, and 2 mm, respectively, compared to the report SGF 1:93E (SGS, 1993) recommended tolerances of minimum 34.8 mm, 24 mm, and 2 mm, for the same cone. The 2-mm SGF Report (SGS, 1993) value accounts for a constant 5-mm porous filter. Pore pressures were measured in the soundings. The equipment was mounted on a track-operated rig dedicated only to the CPT work. Cone tip resistance, sleeve friction, and dynamic pore pressure were recorded every 5 cm (approximately every 2 in) as the cone was advanced into the ground. Seismic shear wave velocity tests were also performed using a geophone mounted in the cone, a digital oscilloscope, and a beam, which was struck on the ground surface with a sledge hammer. Pore pressure dissipation data were also obtained, with the data recorded at 5-sec intervals.

A total of 63 CPT soundings were performed, including additional off-set soundings due to persistent refusal in dense/hard or cemented soils. At selected sounding locations, the soils causing refusal were pre-augered so that deeper CPT penetration could be obtained at the sounding location. Pre-augering was performed at six locations, but often several times at the same sounding. The sounding depths ranged from about 12 ft to 142 ft.. Seismic CPT was performed at eight sounding locations. Pore pressure dissipation tests were performed in 20 soundings, at 26 different depths. Table 2.5.4-19 provides a summary of CPT locations and details. The locations are shown in Figures 2.5.4-1 and 2.5.4-2. The CPT logs, shear wave velocity, and pore pressure dissipation results are contained in Appendix 2.5-A.

Observation Wells and Slug Testing

A total of 40 observation wells were installed to a maximum depth of 122 ft during the CCNPP Unit 3 subsurface investigation under the full-time supervision of geotechnical engineers or geologists. Wells were installed either in SPT boreholes or at an off-set location, in accordance with ASTM D5092 (ASTM, 2004a). Wells installed in SPT boreholes were grouted to the bottom of the well, and the portion above was reamed to a diameter of at least 6 in. using rotary methods and biodegradable drilling fluid. Off-set wells were installed using either 6¼-in. ID hollow-stem augers or 6-in. diameter holes using the rotary method and biodegradable drilling fluid. Each well was developed by pumping and/or flushing with clean water. Table 2.5.4-20 provides a summary of the observation well locations and details. The locations are shown in Figures 2.5.4-1 and 2.5.4-2. Complete observation well details are provided in Section 2.4.12.

Slug testing, for the purposes of measuring the in-situ hydraulic conductivity of the soils, was performed in all 40 wells. The tests were conducted using the falling head method, in accordance with Section 8 of ASTM D4044 (ASTM, 2002b). Slug testing included establishing the static water level, lowering a solid cylinder (slug) into the well to cause an increase in water level in the well, and monitoring the time rate for the well water to return to the pre-test static level. Electronic transducers and data loggers were used to measure the water levels and times during the test. Table 2.5.4-21 provides a summary of the hydraulic conductivity values. Details on testing are provided in Section 2.4.12.

Appendix 2.5-A contains the details of well installation records, boring logs for observation wells, and the hydraulic conductivity test results.

<u>Test Pits</u>

A total of 20 test pits were excavated to a maximum depth of 10 ft each using a mechanical excavator. Bulk samples were collected at selected soil horizons in some of the test pits for laboratory testing. Table 2.5.4-22 provides a summary of the test pit locations. The locations are shown in Figure 2.5.4-3. Appendix 2.5-A contains the test pit records.

Field Electrical Resistivity Testing

A total of four field electrical resistivity (ER) tests were performed to obtain apparent resistivity values for the site soils. Table 2.5.4-23 provides a summary of the ER test locations. ER testing was conducted using an Advanced Geosciences, Inc., Sting resistivity meter, a Wenner four-electrode array, and "a" spacings of 1.5 ft, 3 ft, 5 ft, 7.5 ft, 10 ft, 15 ft, 20 ft, 30 ft, 40 ft, 50 ft, 100 ft, 200 ft, and 300 ft in accordance with ASTM G57 (ASTM, 2001a) and IEEE 81 (IEEE, 1983), except as noted below. The arrays were centered on each of the staked locations R-1 and R-2, R-3, and R-4, and are shown in Figures 2.5.4-1 and 2.5.4-2. The electrodes were located using a 300-ft measuring tape along the appropriate bearings using a Brunton compass.

ASTM G57 (ASTM, 2001a) states that electrodes not be driven more than 5% of the electrode separation, which is about 0.9 in. for the smallest "a" spacing of 1.5 ft used. Electrodes, however, were driven about 2.25 in. (or about 12%) at locations where leaves and vegetation were present on the ground, to ensure adequate contact with the soils. ASTM G57 (ASTM, 2001a) states that a decade box be used to check the accuracy of the resistance meter. This verification, however, was conducted using a resistor supplied by the equipment manufacturer in compliance with the manufacturer's recommendations. ASTM G57 (ASTM, 2001a) states that measurement alignments be chosen along uniform topography. Given the topography at the site, however, the array alignments along R-1 and R-2 (shown in Figure 2.5.4-1) contained topographic variation. Finally, IEEE 81 (IEEE, 1983) states that electrodes not be driven into the ground more than 10% of the "a" spacing. As discussed above, at some locations electrodes were driven about 2.25 in. (or about 12%) into the ground. Despite the noted deviations, the collected resistivity values are considered valid and suitable for use.

The raw field data are considered "apparent" resistivity values. The data were modeled in an attempt to remove the geometric and sampling influences and develop vertical profiles that estimate "true" subsurface resistivity values. The values, shown in Table 2.5.4-15, provide a summary of the field resistivity results, as well as "true" resistivity values with depth. For developing vertical profiles, depth values were taken as 1/3 of the a-spacing in the Geotechnical Subsurface Investigation Data Report (Schnabel, 2007a). The raw data are provided in Appendix 2.5-A.

OON DD	11 10 0	
	1 10011 12	
CONFE	UHIL O	FOAD

Suspension P-S Velocity Logging Survey

Borehole geophysical logging was performed in a total of 10 boreholes. The geophysical survey consisted of natural gamma, long- and short-normal resistivity, spontaneous potential, three-arm caliper, direction survey, and suspension P-S velocity logging. Geotechnical engineers or geologists provided full-time field inspection of borehole geophysical logging activities. Detailed results are provided in Appendix 2.5-A. The P-S logging results are discussed in detail in Section 2.5.4.4.

Subsurface and Excavation Profiles

Subsurface profiles depicting the inferred subsurface stratigraphy are presented in Figures 2.5.4-5 through 2.5.4-9. Profiles depicting excavation geometries and locations of Category I structures, as well as the relationship between their foundations with the subsurface materials, are addressed in Section 2.5.4.5.

2.5.4.3 Foundation Interfaces

{Foundation interfaces are discussed as an integral part of 2.5.4.5 and 2.5.4.10}

{The logs of test pits that were dug are included in the subsurface investigation report (Schnabel, 2007a). Based on the information obtained during the review of information from the CCNPP Units 1 and 2 UFSAR (BGE, 1982) and the observations of the soil samples being taken for the CCNPP Unit 3 subsurface investigation, it was determined that exploratory trenches were not necessary in order to characterize the soils at the CCNPP Unit 3 site.}

2.5.4.4 Geophysical Surveys

{This Section provides a summary of the geophysical survey undertaken for CCNPP Unit 3. Section 2.5.4.4.1 summarizes previous geophysical surveys performed at the CCNPP Units 1 and 2 area. Section 2.5.4.4.2 summarizes those completed during the CCNPP Unit 3 subsurface investigation.

2.5.4.4.1 Previous Geophysical Survey for CCNPP Units 1 and 2

Various geophysical techniques were employed during the original site investigation for CCNPP Units 1 and 2 in 1967. These investigations are addressed in detail in the UFSAR (BGE, 1982). A brief summary of the investigations, reproduced from this reference, is as follows.

2.5.4.4.1.1 Seismic Refraction Survey

Refraction surveys were performed along two lines, 2,000 ft and 2,100 ft in length, for the purpose of obtaining compressional wave velocity data. The data indicated compressional wave velocities in the upper (approximately 40 ft) Pleistocene soils of about 2,200 ft/sec and in the lower (thickness undefined in the UFSAR) Miocene soils of about 5,500 ft/sec to 5,900 ft/sec. Data for deeper deposits, including bedrock, were obtained from measurements at a location several miles south of the site. The results are provided in a summary table, reproduced and shown in Table 2.5.4-24.

2.5.4.4.1.2 Uphole Seismic Velocity Survey

An uphole seismic survey was performed in the plant area for the purpose of correlating the results with those from the seismic refraction survey. The uphole survey was performed in a borehole (DM-4), about 148 ft deep. The results indicated a compressional wave velocity of 2,000 ft/sec in the upper approximately 40 ft and 5,500 ft/sec below, to the maximum depth of about 148 ft. The results are reproduced and shown in Figure 2.5.4-19.

CCNPP Unit 3 FSAR

© 2007 UniStar Nuclear Development, LLC. All rights reserved. COPYRIGHT PROTECTED

2.5.4.4.1.3 Shear Wave Velocity Measurements

Shear wave propagation was evaluated from surface waves using a Sprengnether velocity meter. The measurements indicated that the shear wave velocity of the Miocene soils is about 1,600 ft/sec. Measurements for other deposits are not reported.

2.5.4.4.1.4 Micromotion Measurements

Micromotion measurements were made at three locations at the site using Microtremor equipment. The results indicated a predominant period of background vibration of about 0.5 sec to 0.75 sec. These measurements were reported to be consistent with results for reasonably dense soils. Based on these observations it was concluded that no special problems could arise in designing the facility at the site.

2.5.4.4.1.5 Laboratory Shockscope Tests

Several samples of the site soils were tested in the laboratory using the Shockscope to obtain compressional wave velocity measurements for correlation with the field measurements. The test results indicated compressional wave velocity measurements ranging from 1,000 ft/sec to 3,200 ft/sec for confining pressures of 0 to 6,000 psf, respectively. The results are reproduced herein and shown in Table 2.5.4-25.

2.5.4.4.1.6 Velocity Profile for CCNPP Units 1 and 2

Based on results of the refraction survey, uphole survey, shear wave velocity measurements, micromotion data, and laboratory shockscope, as well as measurements made in 1943 that extended to greater depth, including bedrock, at locations several miles south of the site, a compressional and shear wave velocity model was prepared for the site, using estimated Poisson's ratios. The results are reproduced herein and shown in Figure 2.5.4-20.

2.5.4.4.2 Geophysical Survey for CCNPP Unit 3

Suspension P-S velocity logging and down-hole seismic CPT tests were performed at 10 boreholes and 8 soundings, respectively, during the CCNPP subsurface investigation. The results are discussed below.

2.5.4.4.2.1 Suspension P-S Velocity Logging

Suspension P-S velocity logging was performed in borings B-301, B-304, B-307, B-318, B-323, B-401, B-404, B-407, B-418, and B-423. The boreholes were uncased and filled with drilling fluid. Boreholes B-301 and B-401 were approximately 400 ft deep each, while the remaining boreholes were approximately 200 ft deep each. The OYO/Robertson Model 3403 unit and the OYO Model 170 suspension logging recorder and probe were used to obtain the measurements. Details of the equipment are described in Ohya (Ohya, 1986). The velocity measurement techniques used for the project are described in Electric Power Research Institute (EPRI) Report TR-102293, Guidelines for Determining Design Basis Ground Motions, (EPRI, 1993). The results are provided as tables and graphs in Appendix 2.5-A.

At this time, an ASTM standard is not available for the suspension P-S velocity logging method, therefore, a brief description follows. Suspension P-S velocity logging uses a 23-ft (7-m) probe containing a source near the bottom, and two geophone receivers spaced 3.3 ft (1 m) apart, suspended by a cable. The probe is lowered into the borehole to a specified depth where the source generates a pressure wave in the borehole fluid (drilling mud). The pressure wave is converted to seismic waves (P-wave and S-wave) at the borehole wall. At each receiver location, the P- and S-waves are converted to pressure waves in the fluid and received by the geophones mounted in the probe, which in turn send the data to a recorder on the surface. At

each measurement depth, two opposite horizontal records and one vertical record are obtained. This procedure is typically repeated every 1.65 ft (0.5 m) or 3.3 ft (1 m) as the probe is moved from the bottom of the borehole toward the ground. The elapsed time between arrivals of the waves at the geophone receivers is used to determine the average velocity of a 3.3-ft (1-m) high column of soil around the borehole. For quality assurance, analysis is also performed on source-to-receiver data.

Compressional wave velocity (Vp) and shear wave velocity (Vs) results obtained during the CCNPP Unit 3 subsurface investigation are summarized in Figures 2.5.4-21 and 2.5.4-22 and are discussed herein. Ignoring the measurements above elevation 85 ft (approximate planned finished grade), Vp measurements in Stratum I Terrace Sand ranged from about 850 ft/sec to 5,560 ft/sec, with an increasing trend with depth. Vp measurements in Stratum IIa Chesapeake Clay/Silt ranged from about 3,120 ft/sec to 5,750 ft/sec, with typically decreasing trend with depth. Vp measurements in Stratum IIb Chesapeake Cemented Sand ranged from about 2,350 ft/sec to 8,130 ft/sec, with initially increasing trend with depth, however, with fairly uniform values after a few feet of penetration, except at intermittent cemented zones with peak Vp values. Vp measurements in Stratum IIc Chesapeake Clay/Silt ranged from about 4,800 ft/sec to 5,600 ft/sec, with relatively uniform values throughout the entire thickness, except for occasional minor peaks at intermittent depths. Vp measurements in Stratum III Nanjemov Sand ranged from about 5,420 ft/sec to 7,330 ft/sec, with relatively uniform values, except for occasional minor peaks at intermittent depths. Results are relatively consistent with those reported from CCNPP Units 1 and 2 (Table 2.5.4-24 and Figure 2.5.4-19) for similar soils. It is noted that Vp values below about elevation 80 ft are typically at or above 5,000 ft/sec; these measurements reflect the saturated condition of the soils below the referenced elevation.

Ignoring the measurements above elevation 85 ft, Vs measurements in Stratum I Terrace Sand ranged from about 400 ft/sec to 1,150 ft/sec, with a relatively uniform trend with depth. Vs measurements in Stratum IIa Chesapeake Clay/Silt ranged from about 590 ft/sec to 1,430 ft/sec, with typically increasing trend with depth. Vs measurements in Stratum IIb Chesapeake Cemented Sand ranged from about 560 ft/sec to 3,970 ft/sec, with significant variation with depth owing to significant changes in density and cementation. Vs measurements in Stratum IIc Chesapeake Clay/Silt ranged from about 1,030 ft/sec to 1,700 ft/sec, with relatively uniform trend in values throughout the entire thickness, except for occasional minor peaks at intermittent depths. Vs measurements in Stratum III Nanjemoy Sand ranged from about 1,690 ft/sec to 3,060 ft/sec, with initially increasing trend in depth, however, relatively uniform at greater depth, except for occasional minor peaks at intermittent depths. Results are relatively consistent with those reported from CCNPP Units 1 and 2 (Figure 2.5.4-20). Based on all 10 suspension P-S velocity measurements, an average Vs profile was estimated for the upper 400 ft, as shown in Figure 2.5.4-23. The measurements from the two deepest boreholes (B-301 and B-401) are also shown for comparison purposes.

Poisson's ratio values were determined based on the Vp and Vs measurements, and are shown in Figure 2.5.4-24. Ignoring the values above elevation 85 ft, Poisson's ratio measurements in Stratum I Terrace Sand ranged from about 0.27 to 0.50. Poisson's ratio measurements in Stratum IIa Chesapeake Clay/Silt ranged from about 0.4 to 0.49, with typically decreasing trend with depth. Poisson's ratio measurements in Stratum IIb Chesapeake Cemented Sand ranged from about 0.26 to 0.49. Poisson's ratio measurements in Stratum IIc Chesapeake Clay/Silt ranged from about 0.45 to 0.48, with a relatively uniform trend in values throughout the entire thickness. Poisson's ratio measurements in Stratum III Nanjemoy Sand ranged from about 0.39 to 0.46, with initially a decreasing trend in depth, however, becoming relatively uniform at greater depth, except for occasional minor peaks at intermittent depths. Based on all 10

borehole measurements, an average Poisson's ratio profile was estimated for the upper 400 ft, which is shown in Figure 2.5.4-25. The values obtained based on velocity measurements from the two deepest boreholes (B-301 and B-401) are also shown for comparison purposes.

It is noted that the above Vp, Vs, and Poisson's ratio measurements reflect the conditions for the approximately upper 400 ft of the site, or to about elevation -317 ft. Information on deeper soils, as well as bedrock, was obtained from the available literature; it is discussed in Section 2.5.4.7.

2.5.4.4.2.2 CPT Seismic Measurements

Shear wave velocity measurements were made using a seismic cone at eight soundings (C-301, C-304, C-307, C-308, C-401, C-404, C-407, and C-408). The measurements were made at 5-ft intervals. At several locations, the soils required pre-drilling to advance the cone, particularly in the cemented zones. Although the deepest CPT sounding was about 142 ft, the combined measurements provided information for the upper approximately 200 ft of the site soils, extending to about elevation -80 ft. Further penetration was not possible due to continued cone refusal. An average of the seismic CPT results is compared with the suspension P-S velocity logging results and shown in Figure 2.5.4-26. The CPT results are found to be relatively consistent with the suspension P-S velocity logging results. The variations in different soils that were observed in the suspension P-S velocity logging data are readily duplicated by the CPT results, including the peaks associated with cemented or hard zones. Further details on testing and the results are provided, in tables and graphs, in Appendix 2.5-A.

Given the similarity between the suspension P-S velocity logging and the seismic CPT results, and that the CPT results only extend to limited depth, the suspension P-S velocity logging results were used as the basis for determination of shear wave velocity profile for the site. The overall recommended velocity profile for the site soils is addressed in Section 2.5.4.7, including the velocity profile for soils below 400 ft depth and bedrock. }

2.5.4.4.2.3 Shear Wave Velocity Profile Selection

Given the similarity between the suspension P-S velocity logging and the seismic CPT results, and that the CPT results only extend to limited depth, the suspension P-S velocity logging results were used as the basis for determination of shear wave velocity profile for the site. The overall recommended velocity profile for the site soils is addressed in Section 2.5.4.7, including the velocity profile for soils below 400 ft depth and bedrock. }

2.5.4.5 Excavation and Backfill

2.5.4.5.1 {Source and Quantity of Backfill and Borrow

A significant amount of earthwork is anticipated in order to establish the final site grade and to provide for the final embedment of the structures. It is estimated that approximately 3.5 million cubic yards (cyd) of materials will be moved during earthworks to establish the site grade.

The materials excavated as part of the site grading are primarily the surficial soils belonging to the Stratum I Terrace Sand. To evaluate these soils for construction purposes, 20 test pits were excavated at the site, as shown in Figure 2.5.4-3. The maximum depth of the test pits was limited to 10 ft. Results of laboratory testing on the bulk samples collected from the test pits for moisture-density and other indices are summarized in Table 2.5.4-26, with the details included in Appendix 2.5-A. The results clearly indicate that there are both plastic and non-plastic soils included in Stratum I soils, including material designated as fill. These fill soils are predominantly non-plastic. A similar observation was made from the borings that extended deeper than the test pits. Their composition consists of a wide variety of soils, including poorly-

graded sand to silty sand, well graded sand to silty sand, clayey sand, silty sand, clay, clay of high plasticity, and silt of high plasticity, based on the USCS. The highly plastic or clay portion of these soils will not be suitable for use as structural fill, given the high percentage of fines (average 59 percent) and the average natural moisture content nearly twice the optimum value of 10 percent. The remaining sand or sandy portion will be suitable; however, these materials are typically fine (sometimes medium to fine) sand in gradation, and likely moisture-sensitive that may require moisture-conditioning. Additionally, the suitable portions of the excavated soils are used for site grading purposes, with very little, if any, remaining to be used as structural fill. It is estimated that about 2 million cyd of structural backfill are needed. Therefore, structural fill shall be obtained from off-site borrow sources. The structural fill for CCNPP Unit 3 shall be sound, durable, well-graded sand or sand and gravel, with maximum 25 percent fines content, and free of organic matter, trash, and deleterious materials. Once the potential sources of structural fill have been identified, the material(s) are sampled and tested in the laboratory to establish their static and dynamic properties. Chemical tests are also performed on the candidate backfill materials. The results are evaluated to verify that the candidate backfill materials meet the design requirements for structural fill.

2.5.4.5.2 Extent of Excavations, Fills, and Slopes

In the area of planned CCNPP Unit 3, the current ground elevations range from approximately elevation 50 ft to elevation 120 ft, with an approximate average elevation 88 ft, as shown in Figure 2.5.4-1. The planned finished grade in CCNPP Unit 3 powerblock area ranges from about elevation 75 ft to elevation 85 ft; with the centerline of Unit 3 planned at approximately Elevation 85 ft. Earthwork operations are performed to achieve the planned site grades, as shown on the grading plan in Figure 2.5.4-27. All safety-related structures are contained within the outline of CCNPP Unit 3, except for the water intake structures that are located near the existing intake basin, also shown in Figure 2.5.4-27. A listing of the Category I structures with relevant foundation information is as follows (note that foundation elevations may be subject to minor change at this time).

	Foundation elevation
	<u>(ft)</u>
Reactor Building	44
Safeguards Buildings	44
Fuel Building	44
Emergency Diesel Power Generating Building	79
ESWS Cooling Towers	63
UHS Makeup Water Intake Structure	-25

Foundation excavations result in removing about 2 million cyd of materials. The extent of all excavations, backfilling, and slopes for Category I structures are shown in Figures 2.5.4-28 through 2.5.4-32. These sections are taken at locations identified in Figures 2.5.4-1 and 2.5.4-2. These figures illustrate that excavations for foundations of Category I structures will result in removing Stratum I Terrace Sand and Stratum IIa Chesapeake Clay/Silt in their entirety, and will extend to the top of Stratum IIb Chesapeake Cemented Sand, except in the UHS Makeup Water

Intake Structure area. In the UHS Makeup Water Intake Structure area, the foundations are supported on Stratum IIc soils, given the interface proximity of Strata IIb and IIc.

The depth of excavations to reach Stratum IIb is approximately 40 ft to 45 ft below the final site. grade in the Powerblock area. Since foundations derive support from these soils, variations in the top of this stratum were evaluated, reflected as elevation contours for top of Stratum IIb in CCNPP Unit 3 and in CLA1 areas, as shown in Figure 2.5.4-33. This figure shows that the variation in top elevation of these soils is very little, approximately 4 ft or less (about 1 percent) across each major foundation area. The extent of excavations to final subgrade, however, is determined during construction based on observation of the actual soil conditions encountered and verification of their suitability for foundation support. Once subgrade suitability in Stratum IIb Cemented soils is confirmed, the excavations are backfilled with compacted structural fill to the foundation level of structures. Subsequent to foundation construction, the structural fill is extended to the final site grade, or near the final site grade, depending on the details of the final civil design for the project. Compaction and quality control/quality assurance programs for backfilling are addressed in Sections 2.5.4.5.3.

Permanent excavation and fill slopes, created due to site grading, are addressed in Section 2.5.5. Temporary excavation slopes, such as those for foundation excavation, are graded on an inclination not steeper than 2:1 horizontal:vertical (H:V) or even extended to inclination 3:1 H:V, if found necessary, and having a factor of safety for stability of at least 1.30 for static conditions. These slopes are currently shown as 3:1 H:V in Figures 2.5.4-28 through 2.5.4-31.

Excavation for the Ultimate Heat Sink Makeup Water Intake Structure is different than that for other CCNPP Unit 3 structures, as shown in Figure 2.5.4-32. Given the proximity of this excavation to the Chesapeake Bay, this excavation is made by installing a sheetpile cofferdam that not only provides excavation support but also aids with the dewatering needs. This is addressed further in Section 2.5.4.5.4.

2.5.4.5.3 Compaction Specifications

Once structural fill sources are identified, as discussed in Section 2.5.4.5.1, several samples of the materials are obtained and tested for indices and engineering properties, including moisturedensity relationships. For foundation support and backfill against walls, structural fill is compacted to minimum 95 percent of its maximum dry density, as determined based on the Modified Proctor compaction test procedure (ASTM, 2002c). The fill is compacted to within 3 percent of its optimum moisture content.

Fill placement and compaction control procedures are addressed in a technical specification prepared during the detailed design stage of the project. It includes requirements for suitable fill, sufficient testing to address potential material variations, and in-place density and moisture content testing frequency, e.g., a minimum of one test per 10,000 square ft of fill placed. The technical specification also includes requirements for an on-site testing laboratory for quality control, especially material gradation and plasticity characteristics, the achievement of specified moisture-density criteria, fill placement/compaction, and other requirements to ensure that the fill operations conform to the earthwork specification for CCNPP Unit 3. The soil testing firm is required to be independent of the earthwork contractor and to have an approved quality program. A sufficient number of laboratory tests are required to be performed to ensure that variations in the fill material are accounted for. A trial fill program is normally conducted for the purposes of determining an optimum number of compactor coverages (passes), the maximum loose lift thickness, and other relevant data for optimum achievement of the specified moisture-density (compaction) criteria.

2.5.4.5.4 Dewatering and Excavation Methods

Groundwater control is required during construction. Groundwater conditions and dewatering are addressed in Section 2.5.4.6.

Given the soil conditions, excavations are performed using conventional earth-moving equipment, likely using self-propelled scrapers with push dozers, excavators and dump trucks. Most excavations should not present any major difficulties. Blasting is not anticipated. The more difficult excavations would have been in Stratum IIb Cemented Sand, due to the cemented nature and proximity to groundwater, but the cemented portions are not planned to be excavated, except where minor excavations are needed due to localized conditions or due to deeper foundation elevations such as at the UHS Makeup Water Intake Structure area. Excavations in localized, intermittent cemented soils may require greater excavating effort, such as utilizing hoe-rams or other ripping tools; however, these zones are very limited in thickness, with probably only occasional need for expending additional efforts. Excavations for the CCNPP Unit 3 powerblock foundations are planned as open cut. Upon reaching the final excavation levels, all excavations are cleaned of any loose materials, by either removal or compaction in place. All final subgrades are inspected and approved prior to being covered by backfill or concrete. The inspection and approval procedures are addressed in the foundation and earthworks specifications developed during the detailed design stage of the project. These specifications include measures, such as proof-rolling, excavation and replacement of unsuitable soils, and protection of surfaces from deterioration.

As discussed in Section 2.5.4.5.2, excavation for the UHS Makeup Water Intake Structure requires the installation of a sheetpile cofferdam. The sheetpile structure extends from the ground surface to a depth of about 50 ft. The full scope of the sheetpile cofferdam is developed during the detailed design stage of the project. Excavation of soils in this area should not present any major difficulties given their compactness.

Foundation rebound (or heave) is monitored in excavations for selected Category I structures. Rebound estimates are addressed in Section 2.5.4.10. Monitoring program specifications are developed during the detailed design stage of the project. The specification document addresses issues, such as the installation of a sufficient quantity of instruments in the excavation zone, monitoring and recording frequency, and evaluation of the magnitude of rebound and settlement during excavation, dewatering, and foundation construction. }

2.5.4.6 Groundwater Conditions

2.5.4.6.1 {Groundwater Conditions

The groundwater data collection and monitoring program is still in progress subsequent to the installation of observation wells during the CCNPP subsurface investigation. Details of available groundwater conditions at the site are given in Section 2.4.12. Based on available information through March 2007, the shallow (surficial) groundwater level in CCNPP Unit 3 and CLA1 areas ranges from approximately elevation 73 to elevation 85 ft, or an average elevation of 80 ft. This evaluation was used as the design groundwater elevation in the geotechnical calculations, as opposed to the design groundwater elevation of 73 ft as discussed in Section 2.4.12. The value used in the geotechnical calculations is bounded by the DCD value. Similarly, the groundwater level associated with the deeper hydrostatic surface was found to range from approximately elevation 42 ft, with an average elevation of 39 ft. The shallow groundwater should have little to no impact on the stability of foundations, as the site grading and excavation plans will implement measures to divert these flows away from excavations, e.g., through runoff prevention measures and/or ditches. There are no Category I foundations planned within the

upper water-bearing soils. The deeper groundwater condition, within the cemented sands, could adversely impact foundation soil stability during construction if not properly controlled, resulting in loss of density, bearing, and equipment trafficability.

2.5.4.6.2 Dewatering During Construction

Temporary dewatering is required for groundwater management during construction. Analysis of the groundwater conditions at the site is ongoing at this time, given continued groundwater monitoring, as addressed in Section 2.4.12. Nonetheless, on the basis of defined subsurface conditions, it is understood that groundwater control/construction dewatering is needed at the site during excavations for CCNPP Unit 3 foundations. Groundwater control associated with seepage in the shallow (upper) zones is controlled through site grading and/or a system of drains and ditches, as previously discussed. The deeper groundwater regime requires a more positive control, including a series of sumps and pumps strategically located in the excavation to effectively collect and discharge the seepage that enters the excavation, in addition to ditches, drains, or other conveyance systems. The groundwater level in excavations shall be maintained a minimum of 3 ft below the final excavation level. A groundwater dewatering specification is developed as part of the detailed design for the project.

Temporary dewatering is required for the excavation of the Ultimate Heat Sink Makeup Intake Structure. A sheetpile cofferdam is designed to aid with the dewatering needs; however, some level of groundwater control is still required to maintain a relatively "dry" excavation during construction. As a minimum, sumps are installed to control and/or lower the groundwater level inside the cofferdam. Full details of the dewatering requirements are developed during the detailed design stage of the project.

2.5.4.6.3 Analysis and Interpretation of Seepage

Analysis of the groundwater conditions at the site is ongoing at this time, given continued groundwater monitoring that is still in progress, as addressed in Section 2.4.12. A groundwater model, based on information currently available, has been prepared for the overall groundwater conditions at the site and is addressed in detail in Section 2.4.12. The groundwater program and milestones are provided in Section 2.4.12.

2.5.4.6.4 Permeability Testing

Testing for permeability of the site soils was performed using Slug tests, as discussed in Section 2.5.4.3. A detailed description of the tests and the results is provided in Section 2.4.12. A summary of the hydraulic conductivity values is presented in Table 2.5.4-21.

2.5.4.6.5 History of Groundwater Fluctuations

A detailed treatment of the groundwater conditions is provided in Section 2.4.12.

2.5.4.7 Response of Soil and Rock to Dynamic Loading

{The SSE spectra and its specific location at a free ground surface reflect the seismic hazard in terms of PSHA and geologic characteristics of the site and represent the site-specific ground motion response spectrum. These spectra would be expected to be modified as appropriate to develop ground motion for design considerations. Detailed descriptions on response of site soils and rocks to dynamic loading are addressed in Section 2.5.2.

2.5.4.7.1 Site Seismic History

The seismic history of the area and the site, including any prior history of seismicity, evidence of liquefaction or boils, is addressed in Sections 2.5.1.1.4.4.5 and 2.5.1.2.6.4.

2.5.4.7.2 P- and S-Wave Velocity Profiles

Given the depth to bedrock of about 2,500 ft and the depth of velocity measurements during the CCNPP Unit 3 subsurface investigation, additional studies were performed to complete the soil column profile for the CCNPP Unit 3 site.

2.5.4.7.2.1 Subsurface Conditons in the Upper 400 Feet

Geophysical measurements in the upper 400 ft were made during the CCNPP Unit 3 subsurface investigation and are addressed in Section 2.5.4.4.2. The average shear wave velocity and Poisson's ratio profiles for the upper approximately 400 ft of the site, as obtained from the CCNPP Unit 3 subsurface investigation, are shown in Figures 2.5.4-23 and 2.5.4-25, respectively.

2.5.4.7.2.2 Subsurface Conditions Below 400 Feet

It is known that sediments at the site extend below the maximum depth of the CCNPP Unit 3 subsurface investigation. With the maximum depth of the subsurface exploration at 400 ft, additional subsurface information was sought to characterize the site conditions below this depth, including bedrock.

Soil Shear Wave Velocity Profile

In seeking available resources, various geologic records were reviewed and communication made with staff at the Maryland Geological Survey, the United States Geological Survey, and the Triassic-Jurassic Study Group of Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory, Columbia University. The results of this work, and associated references, are addressed in Section 2.5.1. In summary, a soil column profile was prepared, extending from the ground surface to the top of rock, as shown in Figure 2.5.1-34. Soils below 400 ft consist of Coastal Plain sediments of Eocene, Paleocene, and Cretaceous eras, extending to an estimated depth of about 2,500 ft below the ground surface. These soils contain sequences of sand, silt, and clay. Given their geologic age, they are expected to be competent soils, consolidated to at least the weight of the overlying soils.

Several available geologic records were also reviewed in order to obtain information on both the depth to bedrock and the bedrock type, as addressed in Section 2.5.1. Accordingly, the estimated depth to bedrock in the proximity of the site is about 2,555 ft, which is consistent with the depth of 2,500 ft reported in the CCNPP Units 1 and 2 UFSAR (BGE, 1982) and as shown in Figure 2.5.4-20. Top of rock elevation at the CCNPP site is estimated, and adopted, at approximately elevation -2,446 ft which corresponds to a depth of about 2,531 feet. Regional geologic data were also researched for information on bedrock type. This revealed various rock

types in the region, including Triassic red beds and Jurassic diabase, granite, schist, and gneiss. However, only granitoid rocks (metamorphic gneiss, schist, or igneous granitic rocks), similar to those exposed in the Piedmont, could be discerned as the potential regional rock underlying the CCNPP Unit 3 site. For the purpose of rock response to dynamic loading, granitoid was considered as the predominant rock type at the CCNPP site.

With the geology established below a depth of 400 ft, velocity profiles also needed to be established. The velocity data were found through a research of available geologic information for the area. From the Maryland Geological Survey data, two sonic profiles were discovered for wells in the area that penetrated the bedrock, one at Chester, MD (about 38 miles north the site, (USGS, 1983) and another at Lexington Park, MD (about 13 miles south of the site, (USGS, 1984); their locations relative to the site are shown in Figure 2.5.4-34. These two sonic profiles were digitized and converted to shear wave velocity, based on a range of Poisson's ratios for the soil and the rock. The two Vs profiles for Chester and Lexington Park are plotted versus elevation, with the superimposed measured velocity profile from the upper 400 ft at the CCNPP site, as shown in Figures 2.5.4-35 and 2.5.4-36.

The bottom of the <u>measured</u> Vs profile in the upper 400 ft fits well with the Chester data for which a soil's Poisson's ratio=0.4 was used (Figure 2.5.4-35), whereas, in the case of Lexington Park data (Figure 2.5.4-36), the bottom of the <u>measured</u> data in the upper 400 ft fits well with the profile for which the soil's Poisson's ratio=0.45 was used. Geologically, the soils at the two sites are quite comparable (refer to Section 2.5.1 for more details on site geology). The reason(s) for the different "fits" is not clear. However, based on actual Poisson's ratio measurement at another deep Coastal Plain site (SNOC, 2006), where suspension P-S velocity logging measurements extended to a depth of over 1,000 ft, a Poisson's ratio of 0.4 was adopted to represent the soil conditions at the CCNPP site, given the geologic similarity of the soils at both sites.

If a Poisson's ratio of 0.4 is used to convert the Chester sonic log to a shear wave velocity log, this shear wave velocity log fits well with the bottom of the site Vs profile measured with suspension logging at comparable elevations (Figure 2.5.4-35). A similarly good fit is obtained for the Lexington Park data when a Poisson's ratio of 0.45 is used (Figure 2.5.4-36). Although geologically the soils at the Chester and Lexington Park sites are quite comparable (refer to Section 2.5.1 for more details on site geology), there are reasons why the soils at the elevation of the bottom of the site profile could have slightly different Poisson's ratio values, e.g., the Lexington Park soils may be more cohesive than the Chester soils. Nevertheless, a single Poisson's ratio value was needed for below the bottom of the measured profile for the CCNPP site. Based on actual Poisson's ratio measurements at another deep Coastal Plain site (SNOC, 2006), where suspension P-S velocity logging measurements extended to a depth of over 1,000 ft, a Poisson's ratio of 0.4 was adopted to represent the soil conditions at the CCNPP site, given the geologic similarity of the soils at CCNPP site and the other Coastal Plain site.

Both profiles (particularly the Chester profile) include significant "peaks," giving a visual impression that the difference in the two profiles may be large. To further look at the variation in these two profiles based on the adopted Poisson's ratio of 0.4, both profiles were averaged over 100-ft <u>intervals</u> along the entire depth to "smooth" the peaks. The original profiles for the two sites (based on a Poisson's ratio of 0.4) and the 100-ft interval average for the two measurements are shown in Figure 2.5.4-37. A comparison of the two 100-ft interval averages show that once the effect of the "peaks" are removed, the two profiles are relatively similar for the same Poisson's ratio of 0.4. Finally, an average of the 100-ft interval data for both sites was taken, as also shown in Figure 2.5.4-37. This latter profile was compared with an available measured profile in deep Coastal Plain soils (SNOC, 2006); its similarity to the measured profile

CCNPP Unit 3 FSAR

is indicative of its appropriateness for the geologic setting, as shown in Figure 2.5.4-38. Accordingly, based on measured data in the upper 400 ft and data obtained from available literature in areas surrounding the CCNPP site, the recommended shear wave velocity profile in soils at the CCNPP Unit 3 site is shown in Figure 2.5.4-39. This profile is later compared to the profile used for CCNPP Units 1 and 2.

Bedrock Shear Wave Velocity Profile

Similar to the soil profiles addressed above, two velocity profiles were also available for bedrock, based on the sonic data from Chester (USGS, 1983) and Lexington Park (USGS, 1984) sites. Rock was encountered at different depths at these two sites; however, the elevation difference in top of rock is only 11 ft between the two sites. The bottom portions of Figures 2.5.4-35 and 2.5.4-36 (near the soil-rock interface) are enlarged for clarity and are shown in Figures 2.5.4-40 and 2.5.4-41 for the Poisson's ratios shown.

A comparison of the Vs profiles in bedrock for the two sites reveals different velocity responses, regardless of the Poisson's ratio values considered. The Chester profile is somewhat transitional and does not approach 9,200 ft/sec at termination of measurements. The Lexington Park profile is rather abrupt, and is in excess of 9,200 ft/sec. The difference in these two responses is found in the geologic description of the bedrock at the two sites. At Chester, the bedrock is described as more the typical, regional metamorphic rock (granitic, schist, or gneiss). At Lexington Park, the bedrock is described as an intrusive diabase. Based on further evaluation of regional bedrocks, as addressed in Section 2.5.1, the following description was established for the CCNPP Unit 3 site: bedrock is probably granitoid rock, less likely to be sandstone or shale, even less likely to be diabase. Accordingly, the Lexington Park profile (that is for diabase rock) was excluded from further consideration.

Closer examination of the Chester bedrock velocity results reveal that the velocities are rather "insensitive" to the assumption of Poisson's ratio, as is evident in Figure 2.5.4-40. For all practical purposes, the assumption of Poisson's ratio of 0.2, 0.25, or 0.3 for the bedrock renders identical velocity profiles. The responses also follow a particular velocity gradient. For a Poisson's ratio of 0.3 for the rock, one could assume a bedrock velocity starting at some value at the soil-rock interface, transitioning to the 9,200 ft/sec at some depth. This approach was followed, as shown in Figure 2.5.4-42, showing the Vs profile versus elevation in bedrock. From this figure, starting at Vs of 5,000 ft/sec at the soil-rock interface, the 9,200 ft/sec velocity is reached within about 20 ft depth into rock. Many variations were tried (varying the starting velocity at soil-rock interface, varying the slope of transitioning velocity profile, transition in "slope" or in "step," different Poisson's ratios, etc.); the end result appeared relatively unchanged, i.e., the 9,200 ft/sec velocity is achieved within a short distance of penetrating the rock. On this basis, the "stepped" velocity gradient shown in Figure 2.5.4-42 was adopted to define the velocity profile for the rock. The recommended velocity profile for bedrock begins with Vs=5,000 ft/sec at the soil-rock interface, as indicated from the sonic data and also shown in Figure 2.5.4-42, transitioning to 9,200 ft/sec in steps shown in Figure 2.5.4-42.

Both the soil and bedrock velocity profile are reflected in an overall site velocity profile for the CCNPP site, as shown in Figure 2.5.4-43. It should be noted that the top of rock elevation shown in Figure 2.5.4-43 was adjusted to conform to the estimated rock elevation for the CCNPP Unit 3 site, or elevation -2,446 ft (refer to Section 2.5.1). Figure 2.5.4-43 is considered the design shear wave velocity profile for the CCNPP Unit 3 site. A companion figure shows the Poisson's ratios that were measured in the upper 400 ft and those estimated below 400 ft in Figure 2.5.4-44. The numerical values of velocity steps for the entire profile are given in Table 2.5.4-27.

A comparison was made of the adopted Vs and Poisson's ratio profiles described above (Figures 2.5.4-43 and 2.5.4-44) with those used for the original design of CCNPP Units 1 and 2 (as shown in Figure 2.5.4-20). The average values for both CCNPP Units 1 and 2 and from the CCNPP Unit 3 investigation are summarized below, after being "weighted" with respect to a common depth. The weighting included obtaining an average value for each parameter over a particular depth (in this case 1,000 ft) for comparison purposes.

	Average CCNPP Units 1 and 2		<u>Average CCNPI</u> <u>Unit 3</u>	
	<u>Vs (ft/sec)</u>	П	<u>Vs (ft/sec)</u>	ħ
Upper ≈1,000 ft	1,500	0.44	1,900	0.44
Below ≈1,000 ft to Bedrock	3,400	0.35	2,500	0.40
Bedrock	10,000	0.15	9,200	0.30

The average Vs (weighted) values in the upper 1,000 ft for the CCNPP Units 1 and 2 is about 1,500 ft/sec, compared to a weighted average Vs adopted for the CCNPP Unit 3 of 1,900 ft/sec over the same depth. For the soils below 1,000 ft, the CCNPP Units 1 and 2 Vs is reported as 3,400 ft/sec, compared to a weighted average Vs adopted for the CCNPP Unit 3 of about 2,500 ft/sec over the same depth. For bedrock, the CCNPP Units 1 and 2 used Vs=10,000 ft/sec at the top of bedrock, compared to a "transitional" Vs adopted for the CCNPP Unit 3, starting at 5,000 ft/sec, transitioning to 9,200 ft/sec with depth.

The differences between the CCNPP Units 1 and 2 UFSAR (BGE, 1982) and CCNPP Unit 3 subsurface investigation values may be attributed to a variety of factors, including measurement techniques and available technology at the time of measurement, assumptions in data reduction, and available geologic references at the time, among many others. It should be noted that the original 1967 investigation relied primarily on refraction survey and results of a 1943 geophysical survey several miles south of the site to define the soil-rock column profile (reference to both the 1967 and 1943 work are contained in the CCNPP Units 1 and 2 UFSAR (BGE, 1982)); only one measurement in a boring at the site to a depth of about 148 ft provided uphole measurements. Conversely, the CCNPP Unit 3 subsurface investigation used 10 suspension P-S velocity logging sets of measurements at the site, a more advanced technology for velocity measurements than 1960s technology, extending to depths of about 400 ft, including deriving the deeper velocities from actual borehole sonic measurements as close as 13 miles from the site. Similarly, the Poisson's ratios adopted in the CCNPP Unit 3 subsurface investigation derivation of velocity profiles below 400 ft were based on actual suspension P-S velocity logging measurements by others in similar Coastal Plain geology. Equally, the geologic references adopted for estimation of the CCNPP Unit 3 subsurface investigation shear wave velocity profile are recent, building on prior decades of geologic knowledge in the area. On these bases, the shear wave velocity profile adopted for the CCNPP Unit 3 subsurface investigation phase is considered a closer reflection of the site dynamic characterization.

2.5.4.7.3 Dynamic and Static Laboratory Testing

Dynamic laboratory testing, consisting of RCTS tests, to obtain data on shear modulus and damping characteristics of the soils has been completed. A total of 13 undisturbed soil samples, from depths of about 15 feet to about 400 feet below the existing ground surface, were assigned for RCTS testing. Results from the RCTS tests are provided in Appendix 2.5-B. Initially, in the absence of RCTS test results, shear modulus degradation and damping ratio

© 2007 UniStar Nuclear Development, LLC. All rights reserved. COPYRIGHT PROTECTED curves that were adopted from available literature were used for the material characterization. The RCTS results were then evaluated by comparing them to the adopted literature values. The results of this comparison are discussed in Appendix 2.5-C. Evaluation of the impact of the RCTS test results on the seismic soil characterization calculations, and the acceptability of use of literature values for shear modulus degradation and damping ratio curves in these calculations, is provided in the report "Reconciliation of EPRI and RCTS Results, Calvert Cliffs Nuclear Power Plant Unit 3" (Bechtel, 2007), and is included as Appendix 2.5-C. Descriptions of shear modulus degradation parameters adopted for seismic soil characterization are presented below.

2.5.4.7.3.1 Shear Modulus Degradation and Damping Ratio Curves for Soils

In absence of actual data for the site soils, generic EPRI curves were adopted from EPRI TR-102293 (EPRI, 1993). EPRI "sand" curves were used for predominately granular soils and "clay" curves were used for predominately clay soils based on estimated PI values. The EPRI "sand" curves cover a depth range up to 1,000 ft. Since soils at the CCNPP site extend beyond 1,000 ft, similar curves were extrapolated from the EPRI curves, extending beyond the 1,000-ft depth, to characterize the deeper soils. For instance, the "1,000-2,000 ft" curve was extrapolated by "off-setting" this curve by the amount shown between the "250-500 ft" and "500-1,000 ft" curves in EPRI TR-102293 (EPRI, 1993). EPRI curve selection for the upper 400 ft of the site soils was based on available soil characterization data from the site investigation. Below 400 ft, the geologic profile that was prepared (Figure 2.5.1-34) was used as a basis for the soil profiles, including engineering judgment to arrive at the selected EPRI curves. The developed EPRI (shear modulus and damping ratio) curves for the CCNPP Unit 3 site are shown in Figure 2.5.4-45. These curves are shown being extended beyond the 1-percent shear strain provided in EPRI TR-102293 (EPRI, 1993), only to aid with the randomization process. In reality, the extended portions will not be used in the final analyses due to the very low strain levels. It should be noted that the damping ratio curves will be truncated at 15 percent, consistent with the maximum damping values that will be used for the site response analysis. Tabulated values of shear modulus reduction and damping ratios are presented in Table 2.5.4-28.

2.5.4.7.3.2 Shear Modulus Degradation Curves for Rock

The two velocity profiles for the Chester and Lexington Park sites (Figures 2.5.4-40 and 2.5.4-41), indicate that "hard" rock (identified with Vs = 9,200 ft/sec) is present at these two site. Hard rocks typically exhibit an elastic response to loading, with little, if any, change is stiffness properties. For the range of shear strains anticipated in the analysis (10^{-4} to 1 percent range), essentially no shear modulus reduction is expected; therefore, for rocks at the site, the estimated shear moduli should remain unaffected, given the relatively high velocity observed from the area rocks.

Hard rocks are considered to have damping, but it is not strain dependent. A damping ratio of 1 percent has been used for bedrock at other sites, e.g., for the Vogtle Early Site Permit application (SNOC, 2006) in order to obtain compatibility with soils above bedrock. Experience on similar work has indicated that using damping ratios of 0.5 percent, 1 percent, 2 percent, and 5 percent produces essentially identical results (Dominion, 2006). Therefore, for the CCNPP Unit 3, a damping ratio of 1 percent was adopted for the bedrock. Bedrock shear modulus was considered to remain constant, i.e., no degradation, in the shear strain range of 10⁻⁴ percent to 1 percent. The groundwater level of elevation 80 ft was also adopted for the analyses.

Other material parameters that were used for dynamic analysis included material density and soil Plasticity Index. The soil unit weights for the upper 400 ft were obtained from the laboratory

CCNPP Unit 3 FSAR	Page 2.5.4-40	Rev. 1
© 2007 U	JniStar Nuclear Development, LLC. All rights re COPYRIGHT PROTECTED	eserved.

test results and site characterization. Those below a depth of 400 ft were estimated based on an approximate correlation of available laboratory data with Gamma-Gamma density measurements available from USGS (USGS, 1983). The values are shown in Table 2.5.4-29. The rock unit weight was estimated from the available literature (Deere, 1966)), as 162 pcf. The Plasticity Index values were used for the selection of appropriate shear modulus and damping ratio curves for the clay soils. Indices for soils in the upper 400 ft of the site were selected and based on available laboratory data. For deeper soils, they were estimated and based on descriptions of the soils in the available literature (USGS, 1983) (USGS, 1984).

2.5.4.7.3.3 Dynamic Properties of Structural Fill

As stated in Section 2.5.4.5.2, all Category I structures will be supported on structural fill, which is in turn supported on Stratum IIb Chesapeake Cemented Sand. Material parameters, static or dynamic, are not available at this time, because the backfill source has yet to be determined. In absence of this information, it is assumed that material parameters for the structural backfill will be similar to parameters for Stratum I Terrace Sand, and therefore, measurements available for Terrace Sand soils were adopted to represent the fill and used in the analyses. Once the structural fill is identified and tested for characterization, a comparison will be made between the assumed parameters and actual data to verify that it meets the project requirements. Should the results prove to be substantially different, such that they are likely to alter the seismic characterization of the site, a new set of data will be adopted based on the test results, and the calculations will be repeated.

2.5.4.7.4 Shear Modulus Estimation

With shear wave velocity and other parameters established, the low strain soil and rock shear modulus values can be estimated from the following equation (Bowles, 1996):

Gmax =
$$\gamma \cdot (Vs)^2/g$$
 Eq. 2.5.4-15

where, γ =total unit weight, Vs=shear wave velocity, and g=acceleration of gravity. The shear wave velocity data are given in Table 2.5.4-27. The unit weight data are given in Table 2.5.4-29. Strain compatible shear modulus values are estimated during the analysis using Eq. 2.5.4-15.

2.5.4.7.5 Acceleration Time History for Sail-Structure Interaction Analysis

A spectrum-compatible acceleration-time history was developed for use with the velocity profile described in Section 2.5.4.7.2. This acceleration-time history was chosen based on the probabilistic seismic hazard deaggregation information described in Section 2.5.2.

The development of the single horizontal component spectrum-compatible time history is based on the mean 10^4 uniform hazard target spectrum described in Section 2.5.2. The spectrum compatible time history was developed for the frequency range of 100 Hz to 0.5 Hz.

Using the site-specific soil column extended to the ground surface and the amplification factor, and the performance-based hazard methodology utilized to develop the SSE (refer to Sections 2.5.2.5 and 2.5.2.6), a zero depth peak ground acceleration of 0.084g associated with a magnitude M5.5 earthquake was computed. These parameters apply to analysis of liquefaction and seismic stability of the soils.

For reconciliation of site specific design parameters affecting the SSE analysis results, refer to Sections 3.7.1 and 3.7.2.}

2.5.4.8 Liquefaction Potential

{The potential for soil liquefaction at the CCNPP Unit 3 site was evaluated following NRC Regulatory Guide 1.198 (NRC, 2003c). The soil properties and profiles utilized are those described in Section 2.5.4.2.

2.5.4.8.1 **Previous Liquefaction Studies**

Two liquefaction studies are cited in the CCNPP Units 1 and 2 UFSAR (BGE, 1982), as follows. The same reference cites a horizontal ground acceleration of 0.08 g and a Richter magnitude of 4 to 5 for the OBE case, and a horizontal ground acceleration of 0.15 g and a Richter magnitude of 5 to 5.5 for the SSE case.

2.5.4.8.1.1 Liquefaction Potential of Units 1 and 2

CCNPP Units 1 and 2 UFSAR (BGE, 1982) reports that the liquefaction potential at the site was evaluated using data from standard penetration test borings, laboratory test results, in-place density determinations, and geologic origin of the site soils. The results showed that the site soils did not possess the potential to liquefy. Quantitative values for the factor of safety against liquefaction were not given.

2.5.4.8.1.2 Liquefaction Potential of Diesel Generator Building

CCNPP Units 1 and 2 UFSAR (BGE, 1982) also reports on results of a liquefaction study for the siting of the Diesel Generator Building in the North Parking area as a part of CCNPP Units 1 and 2 development. This liquefaction evaluation was performed on data from standard penetration test borings, resulting in computed factors of safety from 1.3 to 2.4, with a median value of 1.8. On this basis, it was determined that the site of the Diesel Generator Building had adequate factor of safety against liquefaction (Bechtel, 1992).

2.5.4.8.2 Soil and Seismic Conditions for CCNPP Unit 3 Liquefaction Analysis

Preliminary assessments of liquefaction for the CCNPP Unit 3 soils were based on observations and conclusions contained within CCNPP Units 1 and 2 UFSAR (BGE, 1982). The site soils that were investigated for the design and construction of CCNPP Units 1 and 2 did not possess the potential to liquefy. Given the relative uniformity in geologic conditions between existing and planned units, the soils at CCNPP Unit 3 were preliminarily assessed as not being potentially liquefiable for similar ground motions, and were further evaluated for confirmation, as will be described later in this subsection. Based on this assessment, it was determined that aerial photography as outlined in Regulatory Guide 1.198 (NRC, 2003c) would not add additional information to the planning and conduct of the subsurface investigation; therefore, was not conducted.

Given the relative uniformity in top and bottom elevations of various soil strata at the site, as indicated in the subsurface profiles in Figures 2.5.4-5 through 2.5.4-9, a common stratigraphy was adopted for the purpose of establishing soil boundaries for liquefaction evaluation. The adopted stratigraphy was that shown in Figure 2.5.4-6 for its location relative to Category I structures and including the deepest borings located on this profile. Only soils in the upper 400 ft of the site were evaluated for liquefaction, based on available results from the CCNPP Unit 3 subsurface investigation. Soils below a depth of 400 ft are considered geologically old and sufficiently consolidated. These soils are not expected to liquefy, as will be further discussed in Section 2.5.4.8.4.

As described in Section 2.5.4.7.5, the resulting peak ground acceleration for the site was found to be 0.084g associated with a magnitude M5.5 earthquake. For conservatism, a peak ground

acceleration of 0.125g and an earthquake magnitude of 6.0 were adopted and used for the liquefaction analysis.

2.5.4.8.3 Liquefaction Evaluation Methodology

Liquefaction is defined as the transformation of a granular material from a solid to a liquefied state as a consequence of increased pore water pressure and reduced effective stress (Youd, 2001). The prerequisite for soil liquefaction occurrence (or lack thereof) are the state of soil saturation, density, gradation and plasticity, and earthquake intensity. The present liquefaction analysis employs state-of-the-art methods provided in Youd (Youd, 2001) for evaluating the liquefaction potential of soils at the CCNPP Unit 3 site. Given the adequacy of these methods in assessing liquefaction of the site soils, and the resulting factors of safety which will be discussed later in this subsection, probabilistic methods were not used.

In brief, the present state-of-the-art method considers evaluation of data from SPT, Vs, and CPT data. Initially, a measure of stress imparted to the soils by the ground motion is calculated, referred to as the cyclic stress ratio (CSR). Then, a measure of resistance of soils to the ground motion is calculated, referred to as the cyclic resistance ratio (CRR). And finally, a factor of safety (FOS) against liquefaction is calculated as a ratio of cyclic resistance ratio and cyclic stress ratio. Details of the liquefaction methodology and the relationships for calculating CSR, CRR, FOS, and other intermediate parameters such as the stress reduction coefficient, magnitude scaling factor, accounting for non-linearity in stress increase, and a host of other correction factors, can be found in Youd (Youd, 2001). A magnitude scaling factor (MSF) of 1.97 was used in the calculations based on the adopted earthquake magnitude and guidelines in Youd (Youd, 2001). Below are examples of liquefaction resistance calculations using the available SPT, Vs, and CPT data in the powerblock area of CCNPP Unit 3 and the adjoining CLA1 area. Calculations were performed mainly using spreadsheets, supported by spot hand-calculations for verification.

2.5.4.8.3.1 FOS Against Liquefaction Based on SPT Data

The equivalent clean-sand CRR_{7.5} value, based on SPT measurements, was calculated following recommendations in Youd (Youd, 2001), based on corrected SPT N-values $(N_1)_{60}$, as recommended in Youd (Youd, 2001), including corrections based on hammer-rod combination energy measurements at the site. It is noted that soils at CCNPP site include $(N_1)_{60} \ge 30$; Youd (Youd, 2001) indicates that clean granular soils with $(N_1)_{60} \ge 30$ are considered too dense to liquefy and are classified as non-liquefiable. Similarly, corrections were made for the soils fines contents, based on average fines contents provided in Table 2.5.4-12 and the procedure recommended in Youd (Youd, 2001).

The collected raw (uncorrected) SPT N-values are shown in Figure 2.5.4-46. SPT data from 41 borings located in Unit 3 power block area and in CLA1 are shown in this figure and were used for the liquefaction FOS calculations, or over 2,000 SPT N-value data points. An example of a FOS calculation for a SPT N-value=8 from Boring B-330 at elevation 25.5 ft was hand-calculated for verification and found to conform to the spreadsheet calculations. The SPT value for this sample calculation is identified in Figure 2.5.4-46.

For completeness, all data points, including data for clay soils and data above the groundwater level, were included in the FOS calculation, despite their known high resistance to liquefaction. The SPT N-values shown in Figure 2.5.4-46 were mostly taken at 5-ft intervals. SPT in the deepest borings (B-301 and B-401) extended to about 400 ft below the ground surface. The calculated FOS associated with each of the SPT values in Figure 2.5.4-46 is shown in Figure 2.5.4-47. Also, the FOS=2.25 hand calculated for the SPT value in Boring B-330 at elevation

25.5 ft is shown. Figure 2.5.4-47 additionally shows a demarcation line for FOS=1.1 (FOS=1.1 is discussed at the end of this subsection).

Of the over 2,000 SPT N-value data points for which FOS values were calculated, all but 7 points resulted in FOS>1.1. The 7 points with FOS<1.1 amount to less than 0.5 percent of all the data points evaluated; in other words, over 99.5 percent of the calculated FOS values exceeded 1.1. The FOS<1.1 are highlighted within a "dotted" inset in Figure 2.5.4-47 and are re-plotted for clarity to a higher scale in Figure 2.5.4-48. They range from 0.80 to 1.09. An examination of each FOS is as follows.

Boring	Ground elevation (ft)	El of FOS < 1.1	Value of FOS < 1.1	Overlying Structure	Structure BOF elevation (ft)	Disposition of Soils in the Area with FOS < 1.1	
B-305	72.0	63.0	0.93	Safeguard Bldg.	43.6	Soils will be removed to elevation 38± ft during excavation for Safeguard Bldg.	1
B-314	52.8	50.9	0.80	RadWaste Bldg.	47.1	Soils will be removed to at least elevation 47± ft during excavation for RadWaste Bldg	~
B-331	68.3	66.1	0.94	Turbine Bldg.	45.0	Soils will be removed to at least elevation 45 ft during excavation for Turbine Bldg. foundation	√
B-404	67.9	27.9	0.82	CLA1	N.A.	No structures planned	
B-419	55.3	53.1, 48.8 & 30.3	1.06, 0.81& 1.09	CLA1	N.A.	No structures planned	

For $\sqrt{}$, see comments below.

From the above list, it is noted that all soils indicating FOS<1.1 are either at elevations that will eventually be lowered during construction which would result in the removal of these soils (as indicated by $\sqrt{}$), or are at locations where no structures are planned. Hence, the low FOSs should not be a concern for these samples.

2.5.4.8.3.2 FOS Against Liquefaction Based on Vs Data

Similar to the FOS calculations for the SPT values, equivalent clean-sand CRR_{7.5} values, based on Vs measurements, were calculated following recommendations in Youd (Youd, 2001). Similarly, corrections were made for the soils fines contents, based on average fines contents provided in Table 2.5.4-12 and the procedure recommended in ASCE (ASCE, 2000). It is noted that soils at CCNPP site include soils with normalized shear wave velocity (V_{s1}) exceeding a value of 215 m/sec. Clean granular soils with V_{s1}≥215 m/sec are considered too dense to liquefy and are classified as non-liquefiable (Youd, 2001). The limiting upper value of V_{s1} for liquefaction resistance is referred to as V_{s1}*; the latter varies with fines content and is 215 m/sec

N.A.=Not Applicable

and 200 m/sec for fines contents of ≤ 5 percent and ≥ 35 percent, respectively. As such, when values of $V_{s1} \geq V_{s1}$, the soils were considered too dense to liquefy, and therefore, the maximum CRR value of 0.5 was used in the FOS calculations.

Shear wave velocity data from the P-S logging measurements were used for the FOS calculations. The collected raw (uncorrected) V_s data are shown in Figure 2.5.4-49, which is from all the 10 suspension P-S velocity logging boreholes in CCNPP Unit 3 and in CLA1 areas. Suspension P-S velocity logging measurements were made at 0.5-m intervals (~1.6-ft). The two deepest measurements (at borings B-301 and B-401) extended to about 400 ft below the ground surface. Approximately 1,400 Vs data points were used for the FOS calculations. An example of a FOS calculation for Vs=590 ft/sec from Boring B-423 at elevation 80.6 ft was hand-calculated for confirmation. This Vs value is identified in Figure 2.5.4-49.

For completeness, all data points, including data for clay soils, were included in the calculation, despite their known high resistance to liquefaction. The calculated FOS associated with each of the Vs values shown in Figure 2.5.4-49 is shown in Figure 2.5.4-50. Also, the FOS=2.2 hand calculated for the Vs value in Boring B-423 at elevation 80.6 ft is shown. Figure 2.5.4-50 additionally shows a demarcation line for FOS=1.1.

The results show that all calculated FOSs exceeded 1.1; almost all are at least 4.0, with a few scattered values at about 2.0. The high calculated FOS values are the result of V_{s1} values typically exceeding the limiting V_{s1} values, indicating no potential for liquefaction, and therefore, a maximum CRR=0.5 was used in the calculations. The effect of CRR=0.5, as applicable to $V_{s1} \ge V_{s1}$ cases, is observed in the rather consistent FOS values shown in Figure 2.5.4-50.

2.5.4.8.3.3 FOS Against Liquefaction Based on CPT Data

The CPT testing at the CCNPP Unit 3 site included the measurement of both commonly measured cone parameters (tip resistance, friction, and pore pressure) and shear wave velocity. The evaluation of liquefaction based on both the commonly measured parameters and shear wave velocity is addressed herein. The CCNPP Unit 3 site CPT data was reviewed and correlated with the applicable SPT data and compared with guidelines in Robertson (Robertson, 1988). As discussed in subsections 2.5.4.2.1.1 through 2.5.4.2.1.3, this review .process verified the CPT data by correlation to the CCNPP Unit 3 site-determined SPT values and data published for relevant soil parameters.

The equivalent clean-sand CRR7.5 value, based on CPT tip measurements, was calculated following recommendations in Youd (Youd, 2001), based on normalized clean sand cone penetration resistance (qc1N)cs and other parameters such as the soil behavior type index, Ic.

Cone tip resistance values, q_c, from all 27 CPT soundings in CCNPP Unit 3 powerblock and CLA1 areas are shown in Figures 2.5.4-51 and 2.5.4-52. The CPT soundings encountered repeated refusal in the cemented sand layer, and could only be advanced deeper after predrilling through these soils, indicative of their high level of resistance to liquefaction. The deepest CPT sounding (C-407) penetrated 142 ft below the ground surface, encountering refusal at that depth, terminating at approximately elevation -80 ft. Tip resistance measurements were made at 5-cm intervals (~2-in). Approximately 5,200 tip resistance measurements were made in the soundings in CCNPP Unit 3 powerblock and CLA1 areas, and were used for the FOS calculations. An example of a FOS calculation for a tip resistance value of 36.8 tsf in C-408 at elevation 76.4 ft was hand-calculated for confirmation. This value is identified in Figure 2.5.4-52.

For completeness, all data points, including data for clay soils, were included in the calculation, despite their known high resistance to liquefaction. The calculated FOS associated with each of the tip resistance values shown in Figure 2.5.4-52 are shown in Figure 2.5.4-53. Also, the FOS=1.52 hand-calculated for the tip resistance value of 36.8 tsf in CPT C-408 at elevation 76.4 ft is shown. Figure 2.5.4-53 additionally shows a demarcation line for FOS=1.1.

Of the over 5,000 data points for which FOSs were calculated, about 100 points indicated FOS<1.1, or approximately 2 percent; in other words, 98 percent of the data points resulted in FOS>1.1. The points with FOS<1.1 are highlighted within a "dotted" inset on Figure 2.5.4-53 and are re-plotted for clarity to a higher scale in Figure 2.5.4-54. An examination of each of these FOSs is as follows.

Boring	Ground elevation (ft)	El range of FOS<1. 1	Range of FOS<1. 1	Overlying Structure	Structure BOF elevation (ft)	Disposition of Soils in the Area with FOS<1.1
C-304	60.9	60.1 – 60.0	0.93– 1.04	Emergency Power Generating Bldg.	78.6	Soils will be removed to elevation 40± ft* in excavation for Emergency Power Generating Building.
C-308	84.3	61.4	1.03	ESWS Cooling Towers	62.6	Soils will be removed to elevation 38± ft* in excavation for ESWS Cooling Towers
C-314	80.1	78.1 – 64.7	0.82– 1.08	Transformers	N.K.	Soils will be removed to elevation 45± ft in excavation for Turbine Bldg.
C-311	73.9	72.8– 70.5	1.05	Turbine Bldg.	45.0	Soils will be removed to elevation 45 ft* in excavation for Turbine Bldg. foundations
C-313	79.9	78.8 – 67.5	1.05– 1.07	Transformers	N.K.	Soils will be removed to elevation 65± ft in excavation for Turbine Bldg.
C-402	73.1	72.5 – 70.8	0.81– 1.05	CLA1	N.A.	No structures planned
C-406	43.9	41.9 – 29.0	0.72– 1.08	CLA1	N.A.	No structures planned

For $\sqrt{}$ and * see comments below.

w. N.K.=Not Known

N.A.=Not Applicable

From the above list, it is noted that all soils that indicated FOS<1.1 are either within elevations that will eventually be lowered during construction which will result in the removal of these soils

© 2007 UniStar Nuclear Development, LLC. All rights reserved. COPYRIGHT PROTECTED (as indicated by $\sqrt{}$) or are at locations where no structures are planned. Excavation for the Emergency Power Generating Building, the ESWS Cooling Towers, and the Turbine Building (as indicated by *) will extend to the noted elevations for deriving support for their foundations from the Chesapeake Cemented Sand. Nevertheless, it is noted that the CPT-based CRR relationship was intended to be conservative, not necessarily to encompass every data point; therefore, the presence of a few data points beyond the CRR base curve is acceptable (Youd, 2001).

Shear wave velocity measurements were made in 7 of the CPT soundings in Unit 3 and CLA1 areas at the locations shown in Figure 2.5.4-2. As noted earlier, the CPT soundings encountered repeated refusal in the cemented sand layer, and they could only be advanced deeper after pre-drilling through these soils. Shear wave velocity measurements from the seismic cone were compared to similar measurements using the P-S logging method. The average results are shown in Figure 2.5.4-26. By observation, the two independent measurements are comparable. Given that Vs data from the suspension P-S velocity logging method resulted in high values of FOS against liquefaction, as described in this subsection, similar results are expected from the seismic CPT data, and therefore, separate calculations were not made for the CPT Vs results.

2.5.4.8.4 Liquefaction Resistance of Soils Deeper Than 400 Feet

Liquefaction evaluation of soils at the CCNPP Unit 3 site was focused on soils in the upper 400 ft. The site soils, however, are much deeper, extending to approximately 2,500 ft below the ground surface. Geologic information on soils below a depth of 400 ft was gathered from the available literature, indicating that these soils are from about 50 to over 100 million years old, as shown in Figure 2.5.1-34. Liquefaction resistance increases markedly with geologic age, therefore, the deeper soils are geologically too old to be prone to liquefaction. Additionally, their compactness and strength are only anticipated to increase with depth, compared with the overlying soils. The Pleistocene soils have more resistance than Recent or Holocene soils and pre-Pleistocene sediments are generally immune to liquefaction (Youd, 2001). Additionally, liquefaction analyses using shear wave velocity values of about 2,000 ft/sec near the 400-ft depth did not indicate any potential liquefaction at that depth, with the FOSs exceeding 4.0. With shear wave velocities increasing below the 400-ft depth, in the range of about 2,200 ft/sec to 2,800 ft/sec as indicated in Figure 2.5.4-39, high resistance to liquefaction would be expected from these deeper soils. On this basis, liquefaction of soils at the CCNPP Unit 3 site below a depth of 400 ft is not considered possible.

2.5.4.8.5 Concluding Remarks

A liquefaction analysis was performed using procedures outlined in Youd (Youd, 2001). Over 2,000 SPT data points were analyzed from 41 test borings, from which 99.5 percent of the calculated FOSs exceeded 1.1. Over 1,400 Vs data points from 10 suspension P-S velocity logging boreholes were analyzed; the calculated FOS for the overwhelming majority exceeded 4.0, with few values in the 2.0 range. All values exceeded 1.1. Finally, over 5,000 CPT data points from CPT soundings were evaluated. Approximately 98 percent of the calculated FOSs exceeded 1.1. An examination of the remaining 2 percent with FOS<1.1 revealed that the affected soils will either be removed during construction or are at locations where no structures are planned.

It is evident, from the collective results, that soils at the CCNPP Unit 3 site are so consolidated, geologically old, and sometimes even cemented that they are not susceptible to liquefaction due to acceleration levels from the anticipated earthquakes. A very limited portion of the data at isolated locations indicated potentially liquefiable soils, however, this indication cannot be

supported by the overwhelming percentage of the data that represent these soils. Moreover, the state-of-the-art methodology used for the liquefaction evaluation was intended to be conservative, not necessarily to encompass every data point; therefore, the presence of a few data points beyond the CRR base curve is acceptable (Youd, 2001). Additionally, in the liquefaction evaluation, the effects of age, overconsolidation, and cementation were ignored, which tend to increase resistance to liquefaction. Finally, the earthquake acceleration and magnitude levels adopted for the liquefaction analysis are conservative. More importantly, there is no documented liquefaction case for soils in the State of Maryland (USGS, 2000). Therefore, liquefaction should not be a concern. A similar conclusion was arrived at for the original CCNPP Units 1 and 2 (BGE, 1982).

A significant level of site grading is anticipated at the CCNPP Unit 3 site during construction. This primarily results in the removal of geologically younger materials (the upper soils) from the higher elevations, and the placement of dense compacted fill in lower elevations, further improving the liquefaction resistance of soils at the site.

It is noted that limited man-made fill may be present at the CCNPP Unit 3 site at isolated locations. These soils will be removed during construction, further improving the liquefaction resistance of soils at the site.

2.5.4.8.6 Regulatory Guide 1.198

Before and during the foregoing evaluation, guidance contained in NRC Regulatory Guide 1.198 (NRC, 2003c) was used. The liquefaction evaluation conforms closely to the NRC Regulatory Guide 1.198 guidelines.

Under "Screening Techniques for Evaluation of Liquefaction Potential," NRC Regulatory Guide 1.198 (NRC, 2003c) lists the most commonly observed liguefiable soils as fluvial-alluvial deposits, eolian sands and silts, beach sands, reclaimed land, and uncompacted hydraulic fills. The geology at the CCNPP site includes fluvial soils and man-made fill at isolated locations. The liquefaction evaluation included all soils at the CCNPP site. The man-made fill, which is suspected only at isolated locations, will be removed during the site grading operations. In the same section, NRC Regulatory Guide 1.198 (NRC, 2003c) indicates that clay to silt, silty clay to clayey sand, or silty gravel to clayey gravel soils can be considered potentially liquefiable. This calculation treated all soils at the CCNPP Unit 3 site as potentially liquefiable, including the finegrained soils. The finer-grained soils at the CCNPP Unit 3 site contain large percentages of fines and/or are plastic and are, therefore, considered non-liquefiable, as also indicated by the calculated FOSs for these soils. In fact, all soils at the CCNPP Unit 3 site contain some percentage of fines and exhibit some plasticity, which tends to increase their liquefaction resistance. The same section of NRC Regulatory Guide 1.198 (NRC, 2003c) confirms that potentially liquefiable soils that are currently above the groundwater table, are above the historic high groundwater table, and cannot reasonably be expected to become saturated, pose no potential liquefaction hazard. In the liquefaction analyses, the groundwater level was taken at elevation 80 ft. This water level may be a "perched" condition, situated above Stratum IIa Chesapeake Clay/Silt, with the actual groundwater level near the bottom of the same stratum in the Chesapeake Cemented Sand, or at about an average elevation 39 ft. Despite the adopted higher groundwater level (a higher piezometric head of more than 40 ft), the calculated FOS overwhelmingly exceeded 1.1. The site historic groundwater level is not known, however, it is postulated that the groundwater level at the site has experienced some fluctuation due to pumping from wells in the area and climatic changes. Groundwater levels at the site are not expected to rise in the future given the relief and topography of the site, promoting drainage. Similarly, NRC Regulatory Guide 1.198 (NRC, 2003c) indicates that potentially liquefiable soils

may not pose a liquefaction risk to the facility if they are insufficiently thick and of limited lateral extent. At the CCNPP Unit 3 site, the soil layers are reasonably thick and uniformly extend across the site, except where they have been eroded, yet the FOSs overwhelmingly exceeded 1.1. Soils identified as having FOS<1.1, regardless of the thickness, will be removed during grading operations or are located where no structures are planned.

Under "Factor of Safety Against Liquefaction," NRC Regulatory Guide 1.198 (NRC, 2003c) indicates that FOS \leq 1.1 is considered low, FOS \approx 1.1 to 1.4 is considered moderate, and FOS \geq 1.4 is considered high. A FOS=1.1 appears to be the lowest acceptable value. On the same issue, the Committee on Earthquake Engineering of the National Research Council (CEE, 1985) states that "There is no general agreement on the appropriate margin (factor) of safety, primarily because the degree of conservatism thought desirable at this point depends upon the extent of the conservatism already introduced in assigning the design earthquake. If the design earthquake ground motion is regarded as reasonable, a safety factor of 1.33 to 1.35 ... is suggested as adequate. However, when the design ground motion is excessively conservative, engineers are content with a safety factor only slightly in excess of unity." This, and a minimum FOS=1.1 in NRC Regulatory Guide 1.198 (NRC, 2003c), are consistent with the FOS=1.1 adopted for the assessment of FOSs for the CCNPP Unit 3 site soils, considering the conservatism adopted in ignoring the cementation, age, and overconsolidation of the deposits, as well as the seismic acceleration and magnitude levels. Such level of conservatism in the evaluation, in conjunction with ignoring the geologic factors discussed above, justifies the use of FOS=1.1 for liquefaction assessment of the CCNPP site soils.}

2.5.4.9 Earthquake Design Basis

{Section 2.5.2.6 describes the development of the horizontal Safe Shutdown Earthquake (SSE) ground motion for the CCNPP Unit 3 site. The selected SSE ground motion is based on the risk-consistent/performance-based approach of NRC Regulatory Guide 1.208, "A Performance-Based Approach to Define the Site-Specific Earthquake Ground Motion" with reference to NUREG/CR-6728 and ASCE/SEI 43-05 (refer to Section 2.5.2.6 for references). Any deviation from the guidance provided in Regulatory Guide 1.208 is discussed in Section 2.5.2. Horizontal ground motion amplification factors are developed in Section 2.5.2.5 using site-specific data and estimates of near-surface soil and rock properties presented in Section 2.5.4. These amplification factors are then used to scale the hard rock spectra, presented in Section 2.5.2.4, to develop Uniform Hazard Spectra (UHS), accounting for site-specific conditions using Approach 2A of NUREG/CR-6769. Horizontal SSE spectra are developed from these soil UHS. using the performance-based approach of ASCE/SEI 43-05, accepted by Regulatory Guide 1.208. The SSE motion is defined at the free ground surface of a hypothetical outcrop at the base of the foundation. Section 2.5.2.6 also describes vertical SSE ground motion, which was developed by scaling the horizontal SSE by a frequency-dependent vertical-to-horizontal (V:H) factor, presented in Section 2.5.2.6.}

2.5.4.10 Static Stability

{The area of planned Unit 3 is graded to establish the final site elevation, which is to be at about elevation 85 ft at the center of the unit. The Reactor, Safeguard, and Fuel Buildings are seismic Category I structures and are supported on a common basemat. The common basemat has an irregular shape, estimated to be approximately 64,400 square ft, or about 322 ft x 200 ft in plan dimensions if a rectangular configuration is considered. All Category I structures' size and depth ranges are summarized below.

Category I Structure	Estimated Foundation elevation (ft)	Estimated Final Site Grade elevation (ft)	Estimated Foundation Depth (ft)*	Estimated Footing Size (ft x ft)
Reactor	44	85	41	322 x 200
ESWS Cooling Towers	63	81–82	18–19	147 x 96
Emergency Power Generating Building	79	82	3	131 x 93
UHS Water Intake Makeup Structure	-25	10	35	78 x 47

* below respective final site grade

Structures locations and designations are shown in Figure 2.5.4-2. Other major structures in the power block area are the Auxiliary Building, RadWaste Building, and the Turbine Building, which are Category II structures.

Construction of the Reactor basemat requires an excavation of about 41 ft (from approximately elevation 85 ft). The resulting rebound (heave) in the ground due to the removal of the soils is expected to primarily take place in Stratum IIc Chesapeake Clay/Silt soils. A rebound of about 2 in. is estimated due to excavation for the Reactor basemat, and is expected to take place concurrent with the excavation. Ground rebound is monitored during excavation. The heave estimate was made based on the elastic properties of the CCNPP site soils and the response to the unloading of the ground by about 41 ft of excavation. The magnitude and rate of ground heave is a function of, among other factors, excavation speed and duration that the excavation remains open. Other factors remaining unchanged, shorter durations culminate in smaller values of ground heave. The excavation shall remain open for a period sufficiently long such that ground heave fully develops.

2.5.4.10.1 Bearing Capacity

The U.S. EPR DCD includes the following COL item in Section 2.5.4.10.1:

A COL applicant that references the U.S. EPR design certification will verify that sitespecific foundation soils beneath the NI basemat have the capacity to support bearing pressures with a factor of safety of 3.0 under static conditions.

This COL item is addressed in the following sections.

© 2007 UniStar Nuclear Development, LLC. All rights reserved. COPYRIGHT PROTECTED

2.5.4.10.1.1 Bearing Condition of Units 1 and 2 Soils

CCNPP Units 1 and 1 UFSAR (BGE, 1982) provides an evaluation of the site soils for bearing purposes for CCNPP Units 1 and 2. It indicates that the upper (Pleistocene Age) soils are capable of supporting light loads, on the order of 2 to 3 kips per square foot (ksf) for a small amount of settlement. The lower (Miocene Age) soils are described as being capable of supporting heavy loads, on the order of 15 ksf to 20 ksf with slight consolidation.

The CCNPP Units 1 and 2 Turbine Building, Auxiliary Building, Containments, Turbine Generators, and Circulating Water Systems are supported on mat foundations on the Miocene soils. Site grading prior to foundation construction resulted in significant ground unloading. The following is a summary of pertinent information (BGE, 1982).

Structure	<u>Contact</u> <u>Pressure</u> <u>(ksf)</u>	<u>Foundation</u> elevation (ft)	<u>Average</u> <u>Ground</u> <u>elevation (ft)</u>	<u>Average</u> <u>Excavation</u> <u>Unloading (ksf)</u>
Containment Structure Mat	8	-1	60 to 75	6.6 to 8.4
Auxiliary Building Mat	.8	-14 to -19	70	8.3 to 8.85
Turbine Pedestal Mat	5			
Turbine Building Column Footings	5	-11	40 to 60	4.9 to 7.3
Intake & Discharge Structure Mat	2.5	-27 to -30	20 to 80	4.05 to 10.8

It is also reported in CCNPP Units 1 and 1 UFSAR (BGE, 1982) that elastic expansion of the soils occurred as a result of the excavations, producing "slight upward movement." No magnitude, however, is given. Reference is also made to downward movement of the soils as the foundation load was applied, resulting in a "small" movement and "was complete when construction was completed." No magnitude, however, is given.

2.5.4.10.1.2 Bearing Capacity of CCNPP Unit 3 Structures

The ultimate (gross) bearing capacity of a footing, q_{ult}, supported on homogeneous soils can be estimated by (Vesic, 1975):

$$q_{uit} = cN_c\zeta_c + \gamma'D_fN_a\zeta_a + 0.5\gamma BN_y\zeta_\gamma$$
 Eq. 2.5.4-16

where, c=undrained shear strength for clay material (c_u) or cohesion intercept for (c, ϕ) material,

 $\gamma' D_f$ = effective overburden pressure at base of foundation,

 γ' = effective unit weight of soil,

 D_f = depth from ground surface to base of foundation,

B = width of foundation,

 N_c , N_q , and N_γ are bearing capacity factors (defined in Vesic, 1975), and

 $\zeta_{c}, \zeta_{q}, \text{ and } \zeta_{\gamma} \text{ are shape factors (defined in Vesic, 1975).}$

The ultimate bearing capacity, q_u, of a footing supported on a strong sandy layer underlain by weaker soil (a 2-layer system) can be estimated by Meyerhof (Meyerhof, 1978):

CCNPP (Jnit 3	FSAR
---------	--------	------

$$q_{u} = q_{b} + \gamma_{1} H^{2} \left(1 + \frac{B}{L} \right) \left(1 + \frac{2D_{f}}{H} \right) \left(\frac{K_{s} \tan \phi_{1}}{B} \right) - \gamma_{1} H \le q_{t}$$
 Eq. 2.5.4-17

where, $q_b = c_2 N_{c2}\zeta_{c2} + \gamma_1(D_f + H)N_{a2}\zeta_{a2} + 0.5\gamma_2 BN_{\gamma 2}\zeta_{\gamma 2}$

Eq. 2.5.4-18A

 $\mathbf{q}_t = \mathbf{c}_1 \mathbf{N}_{c1} \zeta_{c1} + \gamma_1 \mathbf{D}_f \mathbf{N}_{q1} \zeta_{q1} + \mathbf{0.5} \gamma_1 \mathbf{B} \mathbf{N}_{\gamma 1} \zeta_{\gamma 1}$

Eq. 2.5.4-18B

 K_s = punching shear coefficient, defined in Meyerhof (Meyerhof, 1978)

H = depth to the lower layer

The factors in Eqs. 2.5.4-18A and 2.5.4-18B, are defined as follows:

Layer	Effective Unit Weight	Soil Friction	Shear Strength	Bearing Capacity Factors	Shape Factors
Top (strong layer)	γ1	φ1	C ₁	Ν _{c1} , Ν _{q1} , Ν _{γ1}	ζ _{c1} , ζq1, ζ _{γ1}
Bottom (weak layer)	γ ₂	φ ₂	C ₂	$N_{c2}, N_{q2}, N_{\gamma 2}$	ζ _{c2} , ζq2, ζ _{γ2}

For each of the Category I structures under consideration, the bearing capacity of the foundations was estimated using two methods, i.e., (1) considering a layered system (Meyerhof, 1978), assuming a strong layer (Stratum IIb Chesapeake Cemented Sand) over a "weak" layer (Stratum IIc Chesapeake Clay/Silt), and (2) considering homogenous soils (Vesic, 1975), assuming Stratum IIc Chesapeake Clay/Silt soils are present under the foundation in entirety. This assumption provides a lower-bound estimate of the bearing capacity.

It is noted that the Reactor, Safeguard, and Fuel Buildings, which are on a common basemat, will essentially derive support from Stratum IIb Chesapeake Cemented Sand. All other structures, except the UHS Water Intake Structure, are supported on compacted structural fill resting on Stratum IIb Chesapeake Cemented Sand. The UHS Water Intake Structure derives support from Stratum IIc Chesapeake Clay/Silt soils. No Category I structure is supported on Stratum I Terrace Sand or Stratum IIa Chesapeake Clay/Silt.

The subsurface conditions and material properties were described in Section 2.5.4.2. Material properties, conservatively designated for the various strata, were used for foundation evaluation, as shown in Table 2.5.4-12. The specific parameter values used in the bearing capacity evaluations are provided in Table 2.5.4-30. The following bounding property values for compacted fill were used in the analyses: a unit weight of 120 pcf, an angle of internal friction of 32 degrees, and a modulus of elasticity of 500 tsf. Compacted fill is verified to meet these design requirements during construction. Location of structures, relative to the subsurface conditions, are shown in Figures 2.5.4-28 through 2.5.4-32. An average groundwater level at elevation 80 ft was used for foundation evaluation. For the case of the UHS Makeup Water Intake Structure where the ground surface was below elevation 80 ft, the groundwater elevation was considered to be at the ground surface.

Rev. 1

A summary of the estimated allowable bearing pressures, using both the layered and the homogeneous soils assumptions, including recommended values, are as follows. A factor of safety of 3.0 was applied to obtain the allowable values.

Category I Structure	Allowable Bearing Pressure (Layered System) (ksf)	<u>Lower-Bound</u> <u>Allowable Bearing</u> <u>Pressure (ksf)</u>	<u>Recommended</u> <u>Max. Bearing</u> <u>Pressure (ksf)</u>
Essential Service Water System (ESWS) Cooling Tower (UHS)	13 - 14	8.0	13
Emergency Power Generating Building (EDGB)	14 - 15	7.8	13
Common Basemat	24	8.3	20
UHS Makeup Water Intake Structure		8.0	8

Design values of foundation pressures for the Category I structures were estimated based on project knowledge and typical loading for similar structures. The design values were adopted for comparison with the allowable values above and are as follows.

ESWS Cooling Tower (UHS)	7
EDGB	5
Common Basemat	15
UHS Makeup Water Intake Structure	- 6

The recommended maximum bearing pressures exceed the estimated design foundation pressures. Traditionally, a factor of safety of 3.0 has been found acceptable for foundation design, although lower factors of safety (1.7 to 2.5) have been suggested for mat foundations (Bowles, 1996). A factor of safety of 3.0 was used in the bearing capacity evaluations. A comparison of the recommended maximum bearing pressures with the estimated foundation pressures suggest that the final factor of safety may even be higher than 3.0. Additionally, the recommended bearing pressures are comparable with estimates of bearing capacity identified in the CCNPP Units 1 and 2 UFSAR (BGE, 1982); the notable difference is between the estimate of design foundation pressure of 15 ksf for the Common Basemat and the "contact pressure" of 8 ksf for the Containment Structure Mat of CCNPP Units 1 and 2.

The site-specific foundation soils beneath the NI basemat have been verified to have the capacity to support the bearing pressures with a factor of safety of 3.0 under static conditions.

2.5.4.10.2 Settlement

The pseudo-elastic method of analysis was used for settlement estimates. This approach is suitable for the overconsolidated soils at the site. The analysis is based on a stress-strain model that computes settlement of discrete layers:

 $\delta = \Sigma(\Delta \mathbf{p}_i \times \Delta \mathbf{h}_i)/\mathbf{E}_i$

Eq. 2.5.4-19

where, δ = settlement

CCNPP Unit 3 FSAR

Page 2.5.4-53

© 2007 UniStar Nuclear Development, LLC. All rights reserved. COPYRIGHT PROTECTED Rev. 1

i = 1 to n, where n is the number of soil layers

p_i = vertical applied pressure at center of layer i

h_i = thickness of layer i

Ei = elastic modulus of layer i

The stress distribution below the rectangular foundations is based on a Boussinesq-type distribution for flexible foundations (Poulos, 1974). The computation extends to a depth where the increase in vertical stress (Δp) due to the applied load is equal to or less than 10 percent of the applied foundation pressure. The Boussinesq-type vertical pressure under a rectangular footing, σ_z , is as follows (Poulos, 1974):

 $\sigma_z = (p/2\pi)(\tan^{-1}(lb/(zR_3)) + (lbz/R_3)(1/R_1^2 + 1/R_2^2))$ Eq. 2.5.4-20

where, I = length of footing b = width of footing z = depth below footing at which pressure is computed $R_1 = (l^2 + z^2)^{0.5}$ $R_2 = (b^2 + z^2)^{0.5}$ $R_3 = (l^2 + b^2 + z^2)^{0.5}$

Settlement estimates were made following the preceding relationships and using available soils properties given in Table 2.5.4-12. To estimate settlement values, a subsurface profile in the foundation area of interest was adopted, as shown in Figures 2.5.4-28 through 2.5.4-32. The soil layers were further subdivided into sublayers for refined estimates. From the stress distribution in Eq. 2.5.4-20, sublayer thickness, and elastic modulus for the particular soil, values for settlement were estimated using Eq. 2.5.4-19. The final settlement is the sum of the estimated values for all of the sublayers combined. Significant to estimating settlement values is the value of elastic modulus, E. This parameter was selected from the available summary of soil engineering properties, as shown in Table 2.5.4-12, complimented with estimates of elastic moduli, reduced for strain magnitude, based on the average shear wave velocity values shown in Table 2.5.4-12. Settlement estimates were made for all Category I structures, for the estimated design foundation pressures given in this subsection. They are as follows.

Category I Structure	<u>Est. Design</u>	Est. Foundation Settlement (in.)		
	Pressure (ksf)	Center	<u>Edge</u>	<u>Average</u>
ESWS Cooling Tower (UHS)	7	5	3	4
EDGB	5	4	2	3
Common Basemat	15	10	6	8
UHS Makeup Water Intake Structure	6	2	1	1.5

The settlement magnitudes are discussed later.

The planned site grading results in removing as much as 23 ft of soil from the area of the Emergency Power Generating Building-South (1UBP and 2UBP, shown in Figure 2.5.4-2) and in adding as much as 17 ft of fill to the Emergency Power Generating Building-North (3 UBP and 4 UBP shown in Figure 2.5.4-2). Additionally, foundations rest as much as 3 ft to 41 ft below the final site grade for the Emergency Power Generating Building and the Common Basemat, respectively, resulting in further changes in the net foundation loading. Net foundation pressures were estimated, based on available grading information, as follows.

Category I Structure ⁽¹⁾	<u>Average</u> <u>Existing Site</u> <u>Grade elevation</u> <u>(ft)</u>	<u>Final</u> <u>Grade</u> <u>elevation</u> <u>(ft)</u>	Foundation elevation (ft)	<u>Est. Design</u> <u>Foundation</u> Pressure (ksf)	Est. Net Foundation Pressure (ksf)
ESWS Cooling Tower North(URB3&4)	60 - 95 [80]	81	63	7	6
ESWS Cooling Tower- South(URB1&2)	90 - 120 [100]	82	63	7	4
EDGB-North(UBP3&4)	55 - 70 [65]	82	79	5	7
EDGB-South(UBP1&2)	105 – 115 [105]	82	79	5	2
Common Basemat	70 – 110 [90]	85	44	15	· 11 [·]
UHS Makeup Water Intake Str.	10 [10]	10	-25	6	4

(1) Refer to Figure 2.5.4-2 for locations

Estimated settlements corresponding to the net foundation pressures are given below. It is noted, however, that the magnitude of estimated settlements are generally not significantly changed, given the typically small change in foundation pressures.

Category I Structure	Est. Net Foundation	Est. Foundation Settlement (in.)			
<u>Oalegory i Otracture</u>	Pressure (ksf)	Center	Edge	<u>Average</u>	
ESWS Cooling Tower-North	6	5	3	4	
ESWS Cooling Tower-South	4	3	2	2	
EDGB-North	7	5	3	4	
EDGB-South	2	2	· 1	1	
Common Basemat	11	7	5	6	
UHS Makeup Water Intake Structure.	4	1	1	1	

© 2007 UniStar Nuclear Development, LLC. All rights reserved. COPYRIGHT PROTECTED The average total settlement estimates above are in the range of about 1 to 4 in. except for the Common Basemat which is about 6 in. for the 11 ksf loading case and about 8 in. for the 15 ksf loading case. The maximum total settlement (at center of Common Basemat) is estimated to be about 10 in. resulting from the 15 ksf loading. Generally acceptable total and differential settlements for mat foundations supported on clays are typically in the range of 2.5 in. and 1.5 in., respectively, although tolerable total settlements as high as 4 in. have been suggested for mat foundations (Bowles, 1996). Higher total settlements are accommodated by delaying critical connections to adjacent structures, utilities, and pavements until as late in the construction schedule as practicable. Differential settlement, however, is more critical than total settlement. Acceptable tilt for foundations is on the order of 1/300 (Bowles, 1996), although values as low as 1/750 have been stated for foundations that support machinery sensitive to settlement (Das, 1990).

From the above estimates, average foundation settlement for the UHS Makeup Water Intake Structure is within the acceptable range of 2.5 in. to 4 in. Similarly average settlement estimates for the Emergency Power Generating Building and the ESWS Cooling Towers are within the acceptable range of 2.5 in. to 4 in. For the Common Basemat, an average settlement of about 8 in. was estimated for the 15 ksf loading. This estimated total settlement is largely the result of the extreme foundation size and loading as well as the depth of influence of the large mat.

Differential settlements were estimated as the difference in settlement values at the center and edge of foundations. The estimated values are as follows: 1 in. to 2 in. for the ESWS Cooling Towers, 1 in. to 2 in. for the Emergency Power Generating Building Building, 2 in. to 4 in. for the Common Basemat, and practically zero for the UHS Makeup Water Intake Structure. From these values, tilt was estimated at about 1/600 for the ESWS Cooling Towers, 1/550 for the EDGB, and in the range of 1/600 to 1/1,200 for the Common Basemat foundations. Estimates of tilt for all structures, including the Common Basemat, are well within the acceptable limit of 1/300, however, they exceed the 1/750 for the special case of sensitive machinery, although the difference is not substantial. It is noted that the tabulated settlement estimates are based on the assumption of a flexible foundation; they do not take into account the effects of a thick, highly reinforced foundation mat which tends to mitigate differential settlements.

Foundation settlements largely take place concurrent with construction; therefore, a majority (i.e., more than half) of the settlements will have taken place prior to placing the equipment, piping, and the final finishes. Hence, post-construction total and differential settlements are expected to be lower than the values noted herein, particularly after accounting for foundation mat rigidity.

To verify that foundations perform according to estimates, and to provide an ability to make corrections, if needed, major structure foundations are monitored for rate of movement during and after construction.

In general, the estimated foundation settlements are larger than those indicated for CCNPP Units 1 and 2, although no estimates or measured values are available for Units 1 and 2, as discussed in Section 2.5.4.10.1. The difference in settlement between the two areas is not due to differing soil conditions, as the soils are comparable. Rather, they are largely due to the difference in magnitude of net loading imposed by these structures on the soils, and foundation size. The influence of the larger and heavier Common Basemat for Unit 3 extends deeper, thereby influencing a larger volume of soils.

However, all foundations are designed to safely tolerate the anticipated total and differential settlements. Additionally, engineering measures are incorporated into design for control of

differential movements between adjacent structures, piping, and appurtenances sensitive to movement, consistent with settlement estimates. This includes the development and implementation of a monitoring plan that supplies and requires evaluation of information throughout construction and post-construction on ground heave, settlement, pore water pressure, foundation pressure, building tilt, and other necessary data. This information provides a basis for comparison with design conditions and for projections of future performance.

2.5.4.10.3 Earth Pressures

Static and seismic lateral earth pressures are addressed for plant below-ground walls. Seismic earth pressure diagrams are structure-specific and are, therefore, only addressed generically herein. Specific earth pressure diagrams are developed for specific structures based upon each structure's final configuration. Passive earth pressures are not addressed; they are ignored for conservatism for general purpose applications. The following soil properties were assumed for the backfill; an angle of shearing resistance of 30 degrees and a total unit weight of 120 pcf. Structural backfill material is verified to meet the design requirements prior to use during construction. A surcharge pressure of 500 psf was assumed as well. The validity of this assumption will be confirmed during detailed design. Lateral pressures due to compaction are not included; these pressures are controlled by compacting backfill with light equipment near structures.

Earthquake-induced horizontal ground accelerations are addressed by the application of k_h g. Vertical ground accelerations (k_v g) are considered negligible and were ignored (Lambe, 1969). A seismic acceleration of 0.125g was adopted for developing the generic earth pressure diagrams. Backgrounds on seismic accelerations are discussed in Section 2.5.4.8.2.

2.5.4.10.3.1 Static Lateral Earth Pressures

The static active earth pressure, p_{AS}, is estimated using (Lambe, 1969):

p_{AS} = K_{AS}·γ·z

Eq. 2.5.4-21

where K_{AS} =Rankine coefficient of static active lateral earth pressure γ =unit weight of backfill

z=depth below ground surface

The Rankine coefficient, KAS, is calculated from

$$K_{AS} = \tan^2 (45 - \phi'/2)$$

Eq. 2.5.4-22

where, ϕ '=angle of shearing resistance of the backfill, in degrees.

The static at-rest earth pressure, p_{0s}, is estimated using (Lambe, 1969):

$$p_{0S} = K_{0S} \gamma z$$
 Eq. 2.5.4-23

where, K_{0s}=coefficient of at-rest static lateral earth pressure and is given by

 $K_{0S} = 1 - \sin \phi'$ Eq. 2.5.4-24

Hydrostatic groundwater conditions are considered for active and at-rest static conditions. The lateral hydrostatic pressure is calculated by:

 $p_W = \gamma_W \cdot z_w$

Eq. 2.5.4-25

CCNPP Unit 3 FSAR

Page 2.5.4-57

© 2007 UniStar Nuclear Development, LLC. All rights reserved. COPYRIGHT PROTECTED

where, pw=hydrostatic lateral earth pressure

 z_w =depth below ground water table γ_w =62.4 pcf

2.5.4.10.3.2 Seismic Lateral Earth Pressures

The active seismic pressure, p_{AE}, is given by the Mononobe-Okabe equation (Whitman, 1991), represented by

$$p_{AE} = \Delta K_{AE} \cdot \gamma \cdot (H-z)$$

Eq. 2.5.4-26

where, ΔK_{AE} =coefficient of active seismic earth pressure = K_{AE} - K_{AS} K_{AE} =Mononobe-Okabe coefficient of active seismic earth thrust

Eq. 2.5.4-27

 ΔK_{AE} may be estimated as $3/4 \cdot k_h$ for k_h values less than about 0.25g, regardless of the angle of shearing resistance of the backfill.

The at-rest seismic conditions are reported to be two times as large as the active earth pressures calculated by the Mononobe-Okabe equation (Whitman, 1991). Given that most below-grade walls actually yield to some extent, the actual "at rest" seismic pressures may not be as high as previously indicated (Whitman, 1991). Thus the "at rest" seismic earth pressures will be taken as twice the active values, or, $\Delta K_{0E} = 2 \Delta K_{AE}$.

For well-drained backfills, seismic groundwater pressures need not be considered (Ostadan, 2004). Since granular backfill is used for the project, only hydrostatic pressures are taken into consideration, as given in Eq. 2.5.4-25. It is noted that seismic groundwater thrust greater than 35 percent of the hydrostatic thrust can develop for cases when $k_h>0.3g$ (Whitman, 1990). Given the relatively low seismicity at the CCNPP Unit 3 site ($k_h<0.3g$), seismic groundwater considerations can be ignored.

2.5.4.10.3.3 Lateral Earth Pressures Due to Surcharge

Lateral earth pressures as a result of surcharge applied at the ground surface at the top of wall, p_{sur} , are calculated as follows:

 $p_{sur} = K' q$

Eq. 2.5.4-28

where, K=earth pressure coefficient; K_{AS} for active; K_0 for at-rest; ΔK_{AE} or ΔK_{oE} for seismic loading depending on the nature of loading, and q=uniform surcharge pressure.

2.5.4.10.3.4 Sample Earth Pressure Diagrams

Using the relationship outlined above and assumed backfill properties, sample earth pressures were estimated. Sample earth pressure diagrams are provided in Figures 2.5.4-55 and 2.5.4-56 for a wall height of 41 ft, level ground surface, and with groundwater level at 5 ft below the surface. The backfill is taken as granular soils, with ϕ '=30 degrees and γ =120 pcf. The horizontal ground acceleration is taken as 0.125g. A permanent uniform surcharge load of 500 psf is also included. The validity of assumptions regarding surcharge loads, backfill properties,

```
CCNPP Unit 3 FSAR
```

© 2007 UniStar Nuclear Development, LLC. All rights reserved. COPYRIGHT PROTECTED
and structural configurations is confirmed during the detailed design stage. Actual earth pressure evaluations are performed at that time for the design of below-grade walls, based on actual project conditions. The results of these earth pressure evaluations shall be included in an update to the FSAR at that time.

2.5.4.10.4 Selected Design Parameters

The field and laboratory test results are discussed in Section 2.5.4.2. The parameters employed for the bearing capacity, settlement, and earth pressure evaluations are based on the material characterization addressed in Section 2.5.4.2, and as summarized in Table 2.5.4-12. The parameters reflected in this table were conservatively chosen, as discussed in Section 2.5.4-2. The groundwater level was chosen at elevation 80 ft, whereas this could be a "perched" condition only. The factor of safety utilized for bearing capacity of soils typically exceeds 3.0, whereas a value of 3.0 is commonly used. An angle of shearing resistance of 30 degrees was used for characterization of a structural backfill for earth pressure evaluations, which is considered conservative for granular fill compacted to 95 percent Modified Proctor compaction. Similarly, a seismic acceleration of 0.125g and a magnitude 6.0 earthquake were used in the evaluations, which are higher than the 0.084g zero depth peak ground acceleration and 5.5 magnitude indicated by the seismic analyses, therefore resulting in conservative estimates.}

2.5.4.11 Design Criteria

Section 3.8.5 provides criteria, references, and design methods used in static and seismic analysis and design of foundations, including an explanation of computer programs used in the analyses and a description of soil loads on subsurface facilities.

2.5.4.12 Techniques to Improve Subsurface Conditions

{Major structures derive support from the very dense cemented soils or compacted structural backfill. Given the planned foundation depths and soil conditions at these depths, as shown in Figures 2.5.4-28 through 2.5.4-32, no special ground improvement measures are warranted. Ground improvement is limited to excavation of unsuitable soils, such as existing fill or loose/soft soils, and their replacement with structural backfill. It also includes proof-rolling of foundation subgrade for the purpose of identifying any unsuitable soils for further excavation and replacement, which further densifies the upper portions of the subgrade. In absence of subsurface conditions at the site that require ground improvement, ground control, i.e., maintaining the integrity of existing dense or stiff foundation soils, is the primary focus of earthworks during foundation preparation. These measures include groundwater control, use of appropriate measures and equipment for excavation and compaction, subgrade protection, and other similar measures.}

^{© 2007} UniStar Nuclear Development, LLC. All rights reserved. COPYRIGHT PROTECTED

2.5.4.13 References

ACI, 1994. Manual of Concrete Practice, Part 1, Materials and General Properties of Concrete, American Concrete Institute, 1994.

API, 2007. Cathodic Protection of Aboveground Petroleum Storage Tanks, API Recommended Practice Number 651, American Petroleum Institute, 2007

ASCE, 1978. Definition of Terms Related to Liquefaction, ASCE Journal of Geotechnical and Environmental Engineering, W. Marcusson III, Volume 104, Number 9, 1978.

ASCE, 2000. Liquefaction Resistance of Soils from Shear Wave Velocity, ASCE Journal of Geotechnical and Environmental Engineering, R. Andrus and K. Stokoe, November 2000.

ASTM, 1999. Standard Test Method for Penetration Test and Split-Barrel Sampling of Soils, American Society for Testing and Materials, ASTM D1586-99,1999.

ASTM, 2000a. Standard Practices for Preserving and Transporting Soil Samples, American Society for Testing and Materials, ASTM D4220-95(2000), 2000.

ASTM, 2000c. Standard Practice for Thin-Walled Tube Sampling of Soils for Geotechnical Purposes, American Society for Testing and Materials, ASTM D1587-00, 2000.

ASTM, 2000d. Standard Test Method for Moisture, Ash, and Organic Matter of Peat and Other Organic Soils, American Society for Testing and Materials, ASTM D2974-00, 2000.

ASTM, 2000e. Standard Test Method for Performing Electronic Friction Cone and Piezocone Penetration Testing of Soils, American Society for Testing and Materials, ASTM D5778-95 (reapproved 2000), 2000.

ASTM, 2001a. Standard Test Method for Field Measurement of Soil Resistivity Using the Wenner Four-Electrode Method, American Society for Testing and Materials, ASTM G57-95 (reapproved 2001), 2001

ASTM, 2001b. Standard Test Method for pH of Soils, American Society for Testing and Materials, ASTM D4972, 2001.

ASTM, 2002a. Standard Test Method for Particle Size Analysis of Soils, American Society for Testing and Materials, ASTM D422-63 (reapproved 2002) 2002.

ASTM, 2002b. Standard Test Method (Field Procedure) for Instantaneous Change in Head (Slug) Tests for Determining Hydraulic Properties of Aquifers, American Society for Testing and Materials, ASTM D4044-96 (reapproved 2002), 2002.

ASTM, 2002c. Standard Test Methods for Laboratory Compaction Characteristics of Soil Using Modified Effort (56,000 ft-lbf/ft3 (2,700 kN-m/m3)), American Society for Testing and Materials, ASTM D1557-02, 2002.

ASTM, 2003. Standard Test Method for Unconsolidated Undrained Triaxial Compression Test on Cohesive Soils, American Society for Testing and Materials, ASTM D2850-03, 2003.

ASTM, 2004a. Standard Practice for Design and Installation of Ground Water Monitoring Wells, American Society for Testing and Materials, ASTM D5092-04, 2004.

ASTM, 2004b. Standard Test Method for Particle Size Distribution (Gradation) of Soils Using Sieve Analysis, American Society for Testing and Materials, ASTM D6913-04, 2004.

ASTM, 2004c. Standard Test Method for Consolidated Undrained Triaxial Compression Test for Cohesive Soils, American Society for Testing and Materials, ASTM D4767-04, 2004.

ASTM, 2004d. Standard Test Method for Direct Shear Test of Soil Under Consolidated Drained Conditions, American Society for Testing and Materials, ASTM D3080-04, 2004.

ASTM, 2004e. Standard Test Method for One-Dimensional Consolidation Properties of Soils Using Incremental Loading, American Society for Testing and Materials, ASTM D2435-04, 2004.

ASTM, 2004f. Standard Practice for Determining the Normalized Penetration Resistance of Sands for Evaluation of Liquefaction Potential, American Society for Testing and Materials, ASTM D6066-96 (reapproved 2004), 2004.

ASTM, 2005a. Standard Test Method for Energy Measurement for Dynamic Penetrometers, American Society for Testing and Materials, ASTM D4633-05, 2005.

ASTM, 2005b. Standard Test Method for Liquid Limit, Plastic Limit, and Plasticity Index of Soils, American Society for Testing and Materials, ASTM D4318-05, 2005.

ASTM, 2005c. Standard Test Method for Laboratory Determination of Water (Moisture) Content of Soil and Rock by Mass, American Society for Testing and Materials, ASTM D2216-05, 2005.

ASTM, 2005d. Standard Test Method for CBR (California Bearing Ratio) of Laboratory-Compacted Soils, American Society for Testing and Materials, ASTM D1883-05, 2005.

ASTM, 2005e. Standard Specification for Portland Cement, American Society for Testing and Materials, ASTM C150-05, 2005.

ASTM, 2006a. Standard Test Method for Classification of Soils for Engineering Purposes (unified Soil Classification System), American Society for Testing and Materials, ASTM D2487-06, 2006.

ASTM, 2006b. Test Method for Specific Gravity of Soil Solids by Water Pycnometer, American Society for Testing and Materials, ASTM D854-06, 2006.

ASTM, 2006c. Standard Test Method for Unconfined Compressive Strength of Cohesive Soils, American Society for Testing and Materials, ASTM D2166-06, 2006.

ASTM, 2006d. Standard Practice for Description and Identification of Soils (Visual-Manual Procedure), American Society for Testing and Materials, ASTM D2488-06, 2006.

ASTM, 2007a. Standard Specification for Blended Hydraulic Cements, American Society for Testing and Materials, ASTM C595-07, 2007.

Bechtel, 1992. Subsurface Investigation and Foundation Report for Calvert Cliffs Nuclear Plant Diesel Generator Project, Prepared for Baltimore Gas and Electric Company, Bechtel Power Corporation, June 1992.

Bechtel, 2007. Reconciliation of EPRI and RCTS Results, Calvert Cliffs Nuclear Power Plant Unit 3, Bechtel Power Corporation, December 2007.

BGE, 1982 Updated Final Safety Analysis Report, Calvert Cliffs Nuclear Power Plant (Units 1 and 2), Docket 50-317 and 50-318, Calvert County, Maryland, Baltimore Gas and Electric Company, Baltimore, Maryland, 1982.

Bowles, 1996. Foundation Analysis and Design, J. Bowles, 5th Edition, McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1966.

CEE, 1985. Liquefaction of Soils During Earthquakes, National Research Council, Committee on Earthquake Engineering, National Academy Press, 1985.

Das, 1990. Principles of Foundation Engineering, 2nd Edition, B. Das, PWS-Kent, 1990.

Davie, 1988. Settlement of Two Tall Chimney Foundations, J. Davie and M. Lewis, Proceedings 2nd International Conference on Case Histories in Geotechnical Engineering, pp 1309-1313, 1988.

Dominion, 2006. North Anna Early Site Permit Application, Revision 9 Docket Number. 05200008, Dominion Nuclear North Anna LLC, September 2006.

Deere, 1966. Engineering Classification and Index Properties of Intact Rock, University of Illinois, Prepared for Air Force Weapons Laboratory, Technical Report Number AFWL-TR-65-116, D. Deere and R. Miller, December 1966.

ECL, 2007. Standard Operating Procedure, Cation Exchange Capacity, Enviro-Chem Laboratories, Inc., ECL-SOP-313, 2007.

EPA, 1993. EPA 300.0, Method for the Determination of Inorganic Substances in Environmental Samples, United States Environmental Protection Agency, Report Number EPA/600/R-93/100, 1993.

EPRI, 1990. Manual on Estimating Soil Properties for Foundation Design, F. Kulhawy and P. Mayne, Electric Power Research Institute, Report EL-6800, 1990.

EPRI, 1993. Guidelines for Determining Design Basis Ground Motions, Electric Power Research Institute, Report Number TR-102293, 1993.

FHWA, 1990. Reinforced Soil Structures, Vol. 1, Design and Construction Guidelines, Federal Highway Administration, Federal Highway Administration Report Number FHWA-RD-89-043,1990.

IEEE, 1983. Guide for Measuring Earth Resistivity, Ground Impedance, and Earth Surface Potentials of a Ground System Part 1: Normal Measurements, Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers, IEEE 81, 1983.

Hansen, 1996. Hydrostratigraphic Framework of the Piney Point-Nanjemoy Aquifer and Aquia Aquifer in Calvert and St. Mary's Counties, Maryland, H. Hansen, Maryland Geological Survey, Open-File Report No. 96-02-8, 1996.

Lambe, 1969. Soil Mechanics, T. Lambe and R. Whitman, John Wiley and Sons Inc, New York, p 553, 1969.

Lowe, 1975. Subsurface Explorations and Sampling, Chapter 1 in Foundation Engineering Handbook, J. Lowe III, and P. Zaccheo, edited by H. Winterkorn and H. Fang, pp 1-66, Van Nostrand Reinhold Co, 1975.

Meyerhof, 1978. Ultimate Bearing Capacity of Foundation on Layered Soil Under Inclined Load, G. Meyerhof and A. Hanna, Canadian Geotechnical Journal, Volume 15, Number 4, pp 565-572, 1978.

NFEC, 1986. Foundations and Earth Structures, Design Manual 7.02, Naval Facilities Engineering Command, pp 7.02-63, Table 1, 1986.

NRC, 2003a. Site Investigations for Foundations of Nuclear Power Plants, Regulatory Guide 1.132, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, 2003

NRC, 2003b. Laboratory Investigations of Soils for Engineering Analysis and Design of Nuclear Power Plants, Regulatory Guide 1.138, Revision 2, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, 2003.

NRC, 2003c. Procedures and Criteria for Assessing Seismic Soil Liquefaction at Nuclear Power Plant Sites, Regulatory Guide 1.198, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, 2003.

NRC, 2006. Combined License Applications For Nuclear Power Plants (LWR Edition), Regulatory Guide 1.206, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, 2006.

Ohya, 1986. In Situ P and S Wave Velocity Measurement, Proceedings of In Situ '86, American Society of Civil Engineers, 1986.

Ostadan, 2004. Seismic Soil Pressure for Building Walls-An Updated Approach, F. Ostadan, 11th International Conference on Soil Dynamics and Earthquake Engineering and 3rd International Conference on Earthquake Geotechnical Engineering, University of California, Berkeley, January 2004.

Poulos, 1974. Elastic Solutions for Soil and Rock Mechanics, H. Poulos and E. Davis, John Wiley, New York, 1974.

Robertson, 1988. Guidelines for Geotechnical Design Using CPT and CPTU, P. K. Robertson, and R. G. Campanella, Soil Mechanics Series No. 120, University of British Columbia, 1988.

Rosen, 1986. Origin of Dolomite Cement in Chesapeake Group (Miocene) Siliciclastic Sediments: An Alternative Model to Burial Dolomatization, M. Rosen and G. Holdren, Journal of Sedimentary Petrology, Volume 56, Number 6, pp 788-798, November 1986.

Schnabel, 2007a. Geotechnical Subsurface Investigation Data Report (Revision No. 1), CGG Combined Operating License Application (COLA) Project, Calvert Cliffs Nuclear Power Plant (CCNPP), Calvert County, Maryland, Report by Schnabel Engineering North, LLC, April 2007.

Schnabel, 2007b. Geotechnical Subsurface Investigation Data Report Addendum No. 3 (RCTS Test Results), Revision 2, CGG Combined Operating License Application (COLA) Project, Calvert Cliffs Nuclear Power Plant (CCNPP), Calvert County, Maryland, Report by Schnabel Engineering North, LLC, December 2007.

Seed, 1988. Design of Earth Retaining Structures for Dynamic Loads, Proc. Specialty Conference on Lateral Stresses in the Ground and Design of Earth-Retaining Structures, H. Seed and R. Whitman, ASCE, NY, pp 103-147, 1988.

Senapathy, 2001. Estimating Dynamic Shear Modulus in Cohesive Soils, H. Senapathy, J. Clemente, and J. Davie, XVth International Conference on Soil Mechanics and Geotechnical Engineering, August 2001.

SGS, 1993. Swedish Geotechnical Society, Recommended Standard for Cone Penetration Tests, Report SGF 1:93E, Stockholm, Sweden, 1993

SNOC, 2006. Vogtle Early Site Permit Application, Revision 1, Docket No. 052011, Southern Nuclear Operating Company, Inc., November 2006.

Terzaghi, 1955. Evaluation of Coefficient of Subgrade Reaction, Geotechnique, K. Terzaghi, Volume 5, pp 297-326, Tables 1 and 2, 1955.

USGS, 1983. Preliminary Analysis of Geohydrologic Data from Test Wells Drilled Near Chester, on Kent Island, Queen Anne's County, Maryland, U.S. Geological Survey, Open File Report 82-854, Maryland Geological Survey, F. Mack, 1983.

USGS, 1984. Summary of Hydrogeologic Data from a Deep (2,678 ft) Well at Lexington Park, St. Mary's County, Maryland, U.S. Geological Survey, Open File Report 84-02-1, Maryland Geological Survey, H. Hansen and J. Wilson, 1984

USGS, 2000. Data for Quaternary Faults, Liquefaction Features, and Possible Tectonic Features in the Central and Eastern United States, East of the Rocky Mountain Front, U.S. Geological Survey, Open File Report 00-260, J. Crone and R. Wheeler, 2000.

Vesic, 1975. Bearing Capacity of Shallow Foundations, Foundation Engineering Handbook, A. Vesic, H. Winterkorn and H. Fang, Editors, Van Nostrand Reinhold Co, 1975.

Whitman, 1990. Seismic Design and Behavior of Gravity Walls, Proceedings, Specialty Conference on Design and Performance of Earth-Retaining Structures, R. Whitman, ASCE, NY, pp 817-842, 1990.

Whitman, 1991. Seismic Design of Earth Retaining Structures, R. Whitman, Proceedings 2nd International Conference on Recent Advances in Geotechnical Earthquake Engineering and Soil Dynamics, pp 1767-1778, 1991.

Youd, 2001. Liquefaction Resistance of Soils: Summary Report from the 1996 NCEER and 1998 NCEER/NSF Workshops on Evaluation of Liquefaction of Soils, ASCE Journal of Geotechnical and Geoenvironmental Engineering, T. Youd et al., Volume 127, Number 10, pp 817-833, October 2001.

CCNPP Unit 3 FSAR

Page 2.5.4-64

© 2007 UniStar Nuclear Development, LLC. All rights reserved. COPYRIGHT PROTECTED

Drill Rig	Standard	Quantity
Test Borings	ASTM D1586/1587	145
Observation Wells	ASTM D5092	40
CPT Soundings	ASTM D5778	50*
Suspension P-S Velocity Logging	EPRI TR-102293	10
Test Pits	N/A	20
Field Electrical Resistivity Arrays	ASTM G57/IEEE 81	4
SPT Hammer Energy Measurements	ASTM D4633	5

Table 2.5.4-1Summary of Field Testing Quantities(Page 1 of 1)

Note:

* Not including additional off-set soundings performed

CCNPP Unit 3 FSAR © 2007 UniStar Nuclear Development, LLC. All rights reserved. COPYRIGHT PROTECTED

Stratum I Terrace Sand				Nanjemoy			
From Existing Ground Surface (ft)		Below elevation 85 (ft)	Stratum Ila Clay/Silt (ft)	Stratum IIb Cemented Sand (ft)	Stratum lic Clay/Silt (ft)	Stratum III Sand (ft)	
			CCNPP	Unit 3		-	
Maximum	51	20	35	73	190*	>101*	
Minimum	2	0	4	57	190*	>101*	
Average	21	14	20	66	190*	>101*	
		Construc	tion Laydo	wn Area 1 (0	CLA1)		
Maximum	59	27	26	65	190*	>119*	
Minimum	nimum 2 11		8	24	190*	>119*	
Average	verage 34 18		20	20 58		190* >119*	
		CCNPP	Unit 3 and	CLA1 Comb	ined		
Maximum	59	27	35	73	190	>119	
Minimum	inimum 2 0		4 24 190		190	>101	
Average	27	16	20	55	190	>110	
			Cooling To	wer Area			
Maximum	69	38	31	65	>13*		
Minimum	2	5	5	>1	>13*		
Average	30	25	19	>30	>13*		
		r	Switchya	rd Area			
Maximum	53	27	36	>63			
Minimum	7	14	4	>8			
Average	30	21	22	>31			
		·······	Entire	Site			
Maximum	69	38	36	73	190	>119	
Minimum	2	0	4	28	190	>101	
Average	28	19	20	60	190	>110	

Table 2.5.4-2Summary Thickness of Various Soil Strata(Page 1 of 1)

Note:

* Data based on a single boring

© 2007 UniStar Nuclear Development, LLC. All rights reserved. COPYRIGHT PROTECTED

			Nanjemoy				
	Stratum I Terrace Sand (ft)	Stratum Ila Clay/Silt (ft)	Stratum IIb Cemented Sand (ft)	Stratum IIc Clay/Silt (ft)	Stratum III Sand (ft)		
			CCNPP U	nit 3			
Maximum	80	56	3	-208*			
Minimum	47	38	-31	-208*			
Average	66	47	-19	-208*			
	C	onstructio	n Laydown /	Area 1 (CL	A1)		
Maximum	74	50	-8	-211*			
Minimum	35	27	-23	-211*			
Average	63	45	-14	-211*			
•		CCNPP	Unit 3 and C	LA1 Comb	ined		
Maximum	80	56	3	-208			
Minimum	35	27	-31	-211			
Average	65	46	-17	-209			
		Cool	ing Tower A	rea			
Maximum	66	46	-24				
Minimum	46	26	-24				
Average	56	36	-24				
		Sw	itchyard Are	a			
Maximum	71	67					
Minimum	58	30					
Average	64	42					
Entire Site							
Maximum	80	72	-8	-208			
Minimum	7	21	-31	-211			
Average	61	42	-18	-209	·		

Table 2.5.4-3 Summary Termination Elevation of Various Soil Strata(Page 1 of 1)

* Data based on a single boring

Note: Only data from borings that fully penetrated each stratum was considered for determination of the maximum, minimum, and average termination elevations shown. For instance, a termination elevation for Stratum III is not provided since no boring reached the bottom of this stratum, as indicated by "---".

© 2007 UniStar Nuclear Development, LLC. All rights reserved. COPYRIGHT PROTECTED

Table 2.5.4-4Summary of Measured (Uncorrected) SPT N-Values for Various Soil Strata(Page 1 of 1)

				Chesapeake	Nanjemoy	
	Stratum I Terrace Sand (blows/ft)		Stratum Ila Clay/Silt (blows/ft)	Stratum IIb Cemented Sand (blows/ft)	Stratum lic Clay/Silt (blows/ft)	Stratum III Sand (blows/ft)
	Maximum	70	46	100	100	100
CCNPP Unit 3	Minimum	0	1	4	12	34
	Average	10	9	45	23	64
	Maximum	43	45	100	39	100
CLA1	Minimum	0	1	0	10	28
	Average	12	9	45	20	56
CCNPP Unit 3	Maximum	70	46	100	100	100
and CLA1	Minimum	0	1	0	10	28
Combined	Average	11	9	45	21	61
Switchyard	Maximum	27	19	100		
	Minimum	2	4	7		
	Average	9	10	35		
	Maximum	49	26	100	25	
	Minimum	0	1	9	19	
Alea	Average	12	10	38	23	·
	Maximum	70	46	100	100	100
Entire Site	Minimum	0	1	0	10	28
	Average	11	10	41	22	61

Note: A cut off SPT N-value of 100 blows/ft is shown whenever SPT refusal (50 blows/6" or less) was measured or the linearly extrapolated N-value exceeded 100 blows/ft.

Drill Rig	Measurement in Boring No.	ETR range (%)	Average ETR (%)	Energy Adjustment (ETR% / 60%)
Failing 1500	B-401	67-88	78	1.30
CME 550X ATV	B-403	73-92	84	1.40
CME 750 ATV	B-404	78-90	87	1.45
CME 75 Truck	B-409	69-90	84	1.40
Deidrich D50 ATV	B-744	73-84	81	1.35

Table 2.5.4-5Summary of Hammer-Rod Energy Measurements
(Page 1 of 1)

Note:

ETR= Percentage of theoretical hammer energy measured in the field

CCNPP Unit 3 FSAR © 2007 UniStar Nuclear Development, LLC. All rights reserved. COPYRIGHT PROTECTED

Table 2.5.4-6Summary of Adjusted SPT N-Values Based on Energy Measurements(Page 1 of 1)

Stratum	Adjusted Minimum N-value (blows/ft)	Adjusted Maximum N-value (blows/ft)	Adjusted Average N-value (blows/ft)	Adopted N-value for Engineering Purposes (blows/ft)
I – Terrace Sand	0	91	16	15
IIa – Ches. Clay/Silt	1	64	13	10
IIb - Ches. Cemented sand	0	100	48	45
IIc – Ches. Clay/Silt	14	100	29	25
III – Nanjemoy Sand	36	100	72	70

Note: Adjusted values are for "Entire Site" shown in Table 2.5.4-4.

Identification and Index				Regulatory Guide
Testing		Quantity	Standard/Method Used	1.138 Recommended
	Unified Soil Classification		ASTM D2487 (ASTM, 2006a)	
	System (USCS)	NA	ASTM D2488 (ASTM, 2006d)	ASTM D2487-00
			ASTM D422 (ASTM, 2002a)	
	Sieve and Hydrometer Analysis	398	ASTM D6913 (ASTM, 2004b)	ASTM D422-63(98)
	Atterberg Limits	330	ASTM D4318 (ASTM, 2005b)	ASTM D431800
	Natural Moisture Content	812	ASTM D2216 (ASTM, 2005c)	ASTM D2216-98
	Specific Gravity	77	ASTM D854 (ASTM, 2006b)	ASTM D854-00
	Organic Content	9	ASTM D2974 (ASTM, 2000d)	ASTM D2974-00
Compaction and Strength Tests				
	Moisture-Density Relationship		ASTM D1557 (ASTM, 2002c)	ASTM D1557-00
	California Bearing Ratio	12	ASTM D1883 (ASTM, 2005d)	
	Unconfined Compression	22	ASTM D2166 (ASTM, 2006c)	ASTM D2166-98
	Unconsolidated-Undrained			
	Triaxial Compression	38	ASTM D2850 (ASTM, 2003)	ASTM D2850-95 (99)
•	Consolidated-Undrained Triaxial	<u>.</u>		
	compression	10	ASTM D4767 (ASTM, 2004c)	ASTM D4767-95
	Direct Shear	19	ASTM D3080 (ASTM, 2004d)	ASTM D3080-98
Compressibility Tests	Consolidation	50	ASTM D2435 (ASTM, 2004e)	ASTM D243596
Chemical Testing – Soils				
	рН	77	ASTM D4972 (ASTM, 2001b)	*
	Chloride	77.	EPA 300.0 (EPA, 1993)	*
	Sulfate	77	EPA 300.0 (EPA, 1993)	*
	Cation Exchange Capacity	NA	(ECL, 2007)	Not Specified
Proctor Compaction		28	ASTM D1587	Not Specified
Unit Weight		78	Not specified	Not specified
Resonant Column	· · · · ·	13	Not specified	Not specified
Torsional Shear (RCTS)				

Table 2.5.4-7Summary of Laboratory Tests and Quantities(Page 1 of 1)

* Regulatory Guide 1.138 states that Manual of Soil Laboratory Testing Volume 1, 1992 information on the most widely used clinical test for soils and groundwater.

Results of Cation Exchange Capacity tests are addressed with the groundwater chemistry data in Subsection 2.4.13.

CCNPP Unit 3 FSAR

© 2007 UniStar Nuclear Development, LLC. All rights reserved. COPYRIGHT PROTECTED

Table 2.5.4-8Summary Average Values of Laboratory Index Properties(Page 1 of 2)

Stratum	No. of Tests	Average LL (%)	Average Pl (%)	Average WC (%)	USCS Classification**	Adopted PI for Engineering Purposes (%)
I - Terrace Sand	31	NP	NP	15	SP-SM, SC, SM, CL, SW-SM, CH, ML, MH	NP
lla- Chesapeake Clay/Silt	67	57	35	32	CH, MH, CL, SM, SC-SM, OH	35
IIb- Chesapeake Cemented Sand	67	46	22	34	SM, ML, MH, CH, CL, SP-SM, SC, OH	20
IIc- Chesapeake Clay/Silt	88	94	44	54	MH, CH, SM, CL, OH	45
III- Nanjemoy Sand	7	59	27	30	SC, SM, CH, MH	30

Atterberg Limits

Fines Content (% Passing No. 200 Sieve)

Stratum	No. of Tests	Average Fines Content (%)	Adopted Value for Engineering Purposes (%)
I -Terrace Sand	85	19	20
IIa - Chesapeake Clay/Silt	72	77	75
IIb - Chesapeake Cemented Sand	115	24	25
IIc - Chesapeake Clay/Silt	82	54	50
III - Nanjemoy Sand	10	19	20

Unit Weight

Stratum	No. of Tests	Average Unit Weight (pcf)	Adopted Value for Engineering Purposes (pcf)
I - Terrace Sand	3	120	120
Ila - Chesapeake Clay/Silt	40	116	115
IIb - Chesapeake Cemented Sand	16	118	120
IIc - Chesapeake Clay/Silt	19	107	110
III – Nanjemoy Sand	0	N.A.	120*

Notes:

N.A. – Not Available

* – Estimated

** – Classification legend on Page 2.

Table 2.5.4-8Summary Average Values of Laboratory Index Properties(Page 2 of 2)

Group Symbols	Typical Names
SW	Well graded sands, gravelly sands, little or no fines
SP	Poorly graded sands, gravelly sands, little or no fines
SM	Silty sands, poorly graded sand-silt mixtures
SC	Clayey sands, poorly graded sand-clay mixtures
ML	Inorganic silts and very find sands, rock flour, silty or clayey fine sands with slight plasticity
CL	Inorganic clays of low to medium plasticity, gravelly clays, sandy clays, silty clays, lean clays
MH	Inorganic silts, micaceous or diatomaceous fine sandy or silty soils, elastic silts
СН	Inorganic clays of high plasticity, fat clays
ОН	Organic clays of medium to high plasticity

Table 2.5.4-9 Summary Laboratory Strength Results(Page 1 of 2)

Summary - Direct Shear Test Results

		USC				2.11			
Boring	elevation	S	φ'	C'	Boring	elevation	USCS	φ'	1.1
	(ft)		(deg.)	(tsf)		(ft)		(deg.)	c' (tsf)
St	ratum I – Terr	ace San	d		Stratu	ım IIb – Ches	apeake	Cemented	Sand
B-743	78.1	CL	29.2	0.3	B-724	21.5	OL	27.5	0.6
Stratun	n Ila – Chesar	beake Cl	ay/Silt		B-440	3.3	SC	30.3	0.4
B-319	67.4	CL	24.9	0.4	B-420	-2.9	SC	34	0.2
B-320	65.9	SC	26	0.2		Maximum		34	0.6
B-735	61.2	СН	27.2	0.4		Minimum		27.5	0.2
B-319	57.7	СН	20.8	0.7		Average		31	0.4
B-326	57.6	OH	19	0.4					
B-433	57.0	CH	20.2	0.7		tratum llo	hoconor	ka Clavie	:14
B-320	56.4	СН	21.6	0.7			nesahea	ike Glay/S	nu -
B-316	52.6	CL	30.1	0.3	B-313	-44.0	CL	29	0.8
B-427	50.8	OH	29.2	0.4	B-307	-61.1	SC	35	0
B-737	51.0	CH	22.7	0.4	B-423	-78.9	MH	18.5	1.7
B-413	47.9	CH	31.4	0.5	B-401	-102.3	СН	18.9	2.3
	Maximum		31.4	0.7	.7 Maximum 35 2			2.3	
	Minimum		19	0.2	Minimum 18.5 0			0	
	Average		25	0.5		Average		25	1.6

CCNPP Unit 3 FSAR © 2007 UniStar Nuclear Development, LLC. All rights reserved. COPYRIGHT PROTECTED

Table 2.5.4-9Summary Laboratory Strength Results(Page 2 of 2)

Summary – CIU-bar Test Results

			Effective		Tota	al
Boring	elevation	USCS				
	(ft)		φ' (deg.)	c' (tsf)	φ (deg.)	c (tsf)
Stratum IIa	<u>– Chesape</u>	eake Clay	/Silt			
B-320	65.9	SC	27.9	0.3	13.3	0.6
B-317	63.9	CL	31	0.2	17	0.4
B-316	52.6	CL	32.1	0.5	12.5	1.0
B-414	51.2	CH	20	0.7	10.4	1.0
B-433	47	CH/CL	19.3	0.3	8.3	0.4
B-317	43.9	CL	33.5	0.3	19.5	0.6
	M	aximum	33.5	0.7	19.5	1.0
	N	linimum	19.3	0.2	8.3	0.4
		Average	27	0.4	14	0.7
Stratum IIb	- Chesape	eake Cem	ented San	d		
B-328	10.8	OH	34.6	0.0	13.4	1.7
B-423	6.6	SP-SC	27	0.8	14.1	2.3
B-321	-4.8	SM	30	0.5	20	1.0
	M	aximum	34.6	0.8	20	2.3
	M	linimum	27	0.5	13.4	1.0
		Average	31	0.5	16	1.7
Stratum IIc – Chesapeake Clay/Silt						
B-420	-65.9	OH	29.1	1.0	15.4	1.5

CCNPP Unit 3 FSAR

© 2007 UniStar Nuclear Development, LLC. All rights reserved. COPYRIGHT PROTECTED

Table 2.5.4-10 Summary Consolidation Properties(Page 1 of 1)

Laboratory Testing

Stratum	No. of Tests		Cr ⁽¹⁾	C _c ⁽¹⁾	eo	Pp' (tsf)	OCR
		Maximum	0.018	0.146	0.82	6	4.5
Stratum I – Terrace Sand	2	Minimum	0.018	0.071	0.78	4	3.7
		Average	0.018	0.108	0.80	5	4.1
	:	Maximum	0.126	0.915	1.95	18.5	12.5
Stratum IIa – Ches. Clay/Silt	25	Minimum	0.018	0.071	0.78	4	1.2
		Average	0.054	0.526	1.09	9.1	5.6
		Maximum	0.137	1.092	1.73	14.2	11.6
Stratum IIb – Ches. Cemented Sand	9	Minimum	0.005	0.109	0.70	1.1	0.4
		Average	0.033	0.396	1.05	9	5.2
	14	Maximum	0.152	2.052	2.80	23	5.9
Stratum IIc Ches. Clay/Silt		Minimum	0.004	0.276	0.93	7	1.2
		Average	0.041	0.905	1.53	15.5	3.3

CPT Data Interpretation

Stratum	Min. OCR	Max. OCR	Average OCR
Stratum I - Terrace Sand	0.6	10	5.3
Stratum IIa – Ches. Clay/Silt	0.6	10	5.9
Stratum IIb – Ches. Cemented Sand	0.8	10	7.1
Stratum IIc Ches. Clay/Silt	1.2	10	9.2

Average Values Adopted for Engineering Purposes

Stratum	OCR	Pp' (tsf)
Stratum I - Terrace Sand	4	4
Stratum IIa – Ches. Clay/Silt	4	6
Stratum IIb – Ches. Cemented Sand	3	8
Stratum IIc Ches. Clay/Silt	3	14

Notes:

 C_r = recompression index

 C_c = compression index

 e_o = void ratio

Pp' = preconsolidation pressure

OCR = overconsolidation ratio

(1) values are void ratio-based

CCNPP Unit 3 FSAR

© 2007 UniStar Nuclear Development, LLC. All rights reserved. COPYRIGHT PROTECTED

Table 2.5.4-11High Strain Elastic and Shear Moduli Estimation
(Page 1 of 1)

High Strain Elastic Modulus (E)

		1. A. S.	Nanjemoy		
Relationship	Stratum I Terrace Sand (tsf)	Stratum Ila Clay/Silt (tsf)	Stratum IIb Cemented Sand (tsf)	Stratum IIc Clay/Silt (tsf)	Stratum III Sand (tsf)
E = 18 N	270		810		1,260
$E_{u} = 450 s_{u}$		450		900	1,800
$E_{.375\%} = f(V_s)$	302		1,134		1,879
E _{.375%} = f (PI)		1,766		2,477	
$E_{.375\%} = f(s_u)$		580		1,160	2,080

Adopted E-Values for Engineering Purposes

E (tsf)	280	510	970	1,030	1,750
			···· ···		

High Strain Shear Modulus (G)

			Nanjemoy		
Relationship	Stratum I Terrace Sand (tsf)	Stratum IIa Clay/Silt (tsf)	Stratum IIb Cemented Sand (tsf)	Stratum IIc Clay/Silt (tsf)	Stratum III Sand (tsf)
$G_{.375\%} = f(V_s)$	116		436		723
G _{.375%} = f (PI)		609		853	
$G_{.375\%} = f(s_u)$		200		400	***
G _{.375%} =E/[2(1+µ)]	108	176	373	355	673

Adopted G-Values for Engineering Purposes

G (tsf)	110	180	400	370	700

Table 2.5.4-12Summary Average Soils Engineering Properties⁽¹⁾
(Page 1 of 1)

	Stratum						
Parameter	l Terrace Sand	lla Chesapeake Clay/Silt	llb Chesapeake Cemented Sand	lic Chesapeake Clay/Silt	III Nanjemoy Sand		
Average thickness, feet	20	20	60	190	>110		
USCS symbol (Predominant class. underlined)	<u>SP-SM, SM,</u> SP, SC	<u>CH, MH</u> , CL, SM, SC-SM, OH	<u>SM, SC, SP-</u> <u>SM</u> , SP , OH	<u>МН, СН</u> , SM, CL, OH	<u>SC, SM,</u> MH, CH		
Natural water content (WC), %	15	32	34	54	30		
Moist unit weight □ _{moist}), pcf	120	115	120	110	120		
Fines content, %	20	75	20	50	20		
Liquid limit (LL), %	NP	57	46	94	60		
Plasticity index (PI), %	NP	35	20	45	30		
Measured SPT N-value, bpf	11	10	41	22	61		
Adjusted SPT N ₆₀ -value, bpf	15	10	45	25	70		
Shear Wave Velocity, ft/sec	790	1,100	1,530	1,250	1,970		
Undrained shear strength (s _u), tsf	N/A ⁽²⁾	1.0	N/A ⁽²⁾	2.0	4.0		
Friction angle (Ø'), degree Cohesion (c') tsf	32 0	26	34 0	27 1 0	40		
Elastic modulus (high strain) (E _s), tsf	280	510	970	1.030	1 750		
Shear modulus (high strain) (G _s), tsf	110	180	400	370	700		
Coefficient of Subgrade Reaction (k ₁), tcf (for 1-ft. sq. area) Earth Pressure Coefficients	75	75	300	150	N/A ⁽²⁾		
Active (K _a)	0.3	0.4	0.3	0.4	N/A ⁽²⁾		
Passive (K _p)	3.3	2.6	3.5	2.6	N/A ⁽²⁾		
At Rest (K₀)	0.5	0.8	0.5	0.7	N/A ⁽²⁾		
Coefficient of Sliding	0.40	0.35	0.45	0.40	N/A ⁽²⁾		
Consolidation Properties C _c [C _r] (void ratio-based)	0.108 [0.018]	0.526 [0.054]	0.396 [0.033]	0.905 [0.041]	N/A ⁽²⁾		
Void Ratio, e	0.80	1.09	1.05	1.53	N/A ⁽²⁾		
P _p ', tsf [OCR]	4[4]	6[4]	8[3]	14 [3]	N/A ⁽²⁾		

Notes.

⁽¹⁾ The values tabulated above are designated for the various strata. Reference should be made to specific boring and CPT logs and laboratory test results for appropriate modifications at specific locations and for specific calculations.
 ⁽²⁾ N/A indicates that the properties were either not measured or are not applicable.

CCNPP Unit 3 FSAR

© 2007 UniStar Nuclear Development, LLC. All rights reserved. COPYRIGHT PROTECTED

Table 2.5.4-13Summary Undrained Shear Strength for Cohesive Soils
(Page 1 of 1)

From Correlation with SPT N-Values

Stratum	SPT N-Value (blows/ft)	S _u (tsf)
Stratum IIa – Ches. Clay/Silt	10	0.63
Stratum IIc – Ches. Clay/Silt	25	1.6
Stratum III – Nanjemoy Clayey Sand	70	4.4*

From Laboratory UU and UC Tests

Stratum	Max. S _u (tsf)	Min. S _u (tsf)	Average S _u (tsf)
Stratum IIa – Ches. Clay/Silt	2.4	0.3	1.1
Stratum IIc – Ches. Clay/Silt	5.2	0.2	2.2

From Correlation with CPT Results

Stratum	Max. S _u (tsf)	Min. S _u (tsf)	Average S _u (tsf)
Stratum IIa – Ches. Clay/Silt	9.3	0.7	1.6
Stratum IIc – Ches. Clay/Silt	9.6	1.4	4.7

Adopted Values for Engineering Purposes

Stratum	S _u (tsf)
Stratum IIa – Ches. Clay/Silt	1.0
Stratum IIc – Ches. Clay/Silt	2.0
Stratum III – Nanjemoy Clayey Sand	4.0*

Note:

* Assuming "undrained" behavior

Table 2.5.4-14Summary Soils Chemical Test Results
(Page 1 of 1)

From CCNPP Unit 1 and 2 Exploration

	Stratum IIa Chesapeake Clay/Silt	Stratum IIb Chesapeake Cemented Sand
pH (unit)		
- min. value	6.2	7.1
- max. value	7.1	8.0
 average value 	6.7	7.5
Sulfate (ppm)		
- min. value	1,800	· 600
- max. value	2,000	600
 average value 	1,900	600
Chloride (ppm)		
- min. value	20	10
- max. value	110	60
- average	60	57

From CCNPP Subsurface Investigation

	No. of Tests		pH (CaCl)	pH (H₂O)	Sulfate (%)	Chloride (ppm)
Stratum I		Maximum	6.7	7.6	2.570	48.6
Terrace Sand	21	Minimum	2.6	2.7	0.001	<10
Terrace Sallu		Average	4.6	5.5	0.236	<12
Stratum IIa	18	Maximum	4.9	5.8	2.590	10.7
		Minimum	2.6	2.5	0.006	<10
ones. oldy/one		Average	3.1	3.5	0.914	<10
Stratum IIb		Maximum	7.4	8	3.130	145
Ches.	37	Minimum	2.4	2.5	0.010	<10
Cemented	57					
Sand		Average	5.7	5.8	0.567	<22
Stratum IIc Ches. Clay/Silt	c //Silt 1		6.6	7	0.196	<10

CCNPP Unit 3 FSAR

© 2007 UniStar Nuclear Development, LLC. All rights reserved. COPYRIGHT PROTECTED

Table 2.5.4-15Summary Field Electrical Resistivity Test Results
(Page 1 of 1)

Location		R-1	R-2	R-3	R-4	Values in Ohm-m		
Ground Sur	face El. (ft)	85.5	85.5	89.1	99.4	Min.	Max.	Average
	1.5 ft	1,210	1,520	3,070	471	471	3,070	1,568
,	3 ft	2,480	2,410	3,750	640	640	3,750	2,320
	5 ft	3,220	2,780	4,550	660	660	4,550	2,803
L L	7.5 ft	3,110	2,890	5,440	806	806	5,440	3,062
C.	10 ft	2,490	2,700	6,240	1,130	1,130	6,240	3,140
a	15 ft	1,870	2,780	5,370	1,340	1,340	5,370	2,840
a v	20 ft	1,570	1,960	4,100	1,790	1,570	4,100	2,355
	30 ft	1,310	2,060	1,960	1,640	1,310	2,060	1,743
a)	40 ft	739	1,590	1,010	1,280	739	1,590	1,155
	50 ft	314	1,080	415	975	314	1,080	696
	100 ft	45	487	69	463	45	487	266
	200 ft	37	116	38	57	37	116	62
	300 ft	48	76	31	41	31	76	49

Measured Data ("apparent" values)

Modeled Data ("true" values)

	Depth of	Resistivity
Location	Layer (ft)	(Ohm-m)
	0.5	428
	2.2	12,318
	6.3	966
	15	3,114
	43.1	51
	119.4	17
R-1	N/A	94
	0.5	639
	7.6	3,648
	17.9	2,247
	62.9	1,184
R-2	N/A	68
	2.4	2,952
	10.6	11,930
	59.8	128
R-3	N/A	30
	4.6	494
	13.8	5,040
	39.9	891
	53.2	375
R-4	N/A	36

An Approximate Correlation with Depth

<u>Stratum</u>	Dep
I. Terrace Sand	upp
IIa. Ches. Clay/Silt	20 -
Ilb. Ches. Cem. Sand	40 -
Ilc. Ches. Clay/Silt	belo

Depth Range (ft) upper 20 ft 20 - 40 ft 40 - 100 ft below 100 ft

CCNPP Unit 3 FSAR

© 2007 UniStar Nuclear Development, LLC. All rights reserved. COPYRIGHT PROTECTED

Table 2.5.4-16 Guidelines for Soil Chemistry Evaluation(Page 1 of 1)

Soil Corrosiveness

	Range for Steel Corrosiveness							
antisata da sa	Little Corrosive	Mildly Corrosive	Moderately Corrosive	Corrosive	Very Corrosive			
Resistivity (ohm-m)	>100	20-100 50-100 ⁽ >30	10-20 20-50	5-10 ⁽ 7-20	<5 <7			
рН		>5.0 and <10		5.0-6.5	<5.0			
Chlorides (ppm)		<200		300-1,000	>1,000			

Soil Aggressiveness

Recommendations for Normal Weight Concrete Subject to Sulfate Attack							
Concrete Exposure	Water Soluble Sulfate (SO ₄) in Soil, Percent	Cement Type	Water Cement Ratio (Maximum)				
Mild	0.00-0.10						
Moderate	0.10-0.20	II, IP(MS), IS(MS)	0.5				
Severe	0.20-2.0	V ⁽¹⁾	0.45				
Very Severe	Over 2.0	V with pozzolan	0.45				

Notes:

⁽¹⁾ Or a blend of Type II cement and a ground granulated blast furnace slag or a pozzolan that gives equivalent sulfate resistance.

19 (A)			Coordinates (ft),		Ground	
		Termination	Maryland State Plane		Surface	Data of As
Location	Depth	[bottom]	(NAD	1927)	Elevation	Built
Location	(ft)	Elevation	North	East	(ft)	Survey
		(ft)			(NGVD	Survey
		Contraction of the second s	in the		1929)	
B-301	403.0	-308.5	217024.06	960815.05	94.51	9/15/2006
B-302	200.0	-123.6	217122.24	960766.98	76.41	9/15/2006
B-303	200.0	-112.6	217016.91	960867.69	87.40	9/15/2006
B-304	200.0	-132.0	217188.61	960896.88	68.00	9/15/2006
B-305	151.5	-79.5	217166.25	960686.74	72.01	9/15/2006
B-306	150.0	-31.4	217024.31	960681.82	118.58	9/15/2006
B-307	201.5	-82.2	216955.27	960690.13	119.28	9/15/2006
B-308	150.0	-42.9	216906.69	960771.28	107.10	9/15/2006
B-309	150.0	-49.9	216949.24	960890.70	100.06	9/15/2006
B-310	100.0	-8.4	217081.40	960616.60	91.62	5/15/2006
B-311	150.0	-91.6	217268.61	960771.76	58.43	9/15/2006
B-312	99.5	-44.2	217293.00	960740.00	55.27	5/15/2006
B-313	150.0	-99.3	217372.34	960713.67	50.73	9/15/2006
B-314	100.0	-47.2	217321.89	960654.50	52.78	9/15/2006
B-315	100.0	-34.5	217184.68	960559.43	65.54	9/15/2006
B-316	100.0	8.1	216767.16	960864.35	108.07	9/15/2006
B-317	100.0	-5.6	217094.70	961249.20	94.42	5/15/2007
B-318	200.0	-102.2	217019.30	961227.20	97.82	5/15/2006
B-319	100.0	2.9	216963.62	961123.01	102.87	9/15/2006
B-320	150.0	-43.6	216943.50	961044.10	106.43	5/15/2006
B-321	150.0	-79.3	217152.50	960333.20	70.66	5/25/2006
B-322	100.0	-10.1	217170.03	960202.65	89.87	9/15/2006
B-323	200.0	-92.5	217027.97	960060.86	107.48	9/15/2006
B-324	101.5	3.7	216906.40	960114.44	105.20	9/15/2006
B-325	100.0	-15.0	216948.98	960549.73	84.97	9/15/2006
B-326	100.0	3.1	216859.22	960652.25	103.11	9/15/2006
B-327	150.0	-63.1	216865.70	960573.37	86.92	9/15/2006
B-328	150.0	-73.7	216828.86	960493.21	76.29	9/19/2006
B-329	100.0	-25.2	216800.38	960379.43	74.83	9/19/2006
B-330	100.0	-14.5	216715.40	960523.70	85.46	9/15/2006
B-331	100.0	-31.7	216970.57	960481.79	68.32	9/15/2006
B-332	100.0	-34.6	217127.42	960400.52	65.40	9/15/2006
B-333	98.8	-9.3	216657.04	960386.24	89.49	9/15/2006
B-334	100.0	-13.3	216515.53	960556.61	86.75	9/15/2006
B-335	100.0	-0.5	216732.70	960703.30	99.47	5/15/2006
B-336	100.0	-3.1	216632.91	960750.27	96.87	9/15/2006
B-337	100.0	-28.2	217257.88	960264.41	71.77	9/15/2006
B-338	99.6	-1.6	217121.10	960150.10	97.97	5/25/2006
B-339	100.0	-8.0	217095.21	960211.99	91.96	9/15/2006

Table 2.5.4-17Summary As-Conducted Boring Information(Page 1 of 4)

CCNPP Unit 3 FSAR

© 2007 UniStar Nuclear Development, LLC. All rights reserved. COPYRIGHT PROTECTED

			Coordinates (ft),		Ground	
		Termination	Maryland State Plane		Surface	Data of As
Location	Depth	[bottom]	(NAD	1927)	Elevation	Date of AS
Location	(ft)	Elevation	North	East	(ft)	Survey
	in the second	(ft)			(NGVD	Survey
					1929)	
B-340	100.0	-15.4	217171.34	961225.22	84.57	9/15/2006
B-341	100.5	-2.3	217036.40	961104.48	98.16	9/15/2006
B-401	401.5	-329.4	216344.12	961516.81	72.06	9/15/2006
B-402	200.0	-117.8	216405.10	961463.50	82.22	5/15/2006
B-403	200.0	-136.6	216305.80	961562.90	63.41	5/15/2006
B-404	200.0	-132.1	216441.34	961596.49	67.90	9/21/2006
B-405	150.0	-28.0	216487.38	961408.73	122.00	9/15/2006
B-406	150.0	-31.6	216315.62	961352.01	118.36	9/15/2006
B-407	200.0	-118.4	216238.96	961412.45	81.63	9/15/2006
B-408	150.0	-81.6	216261.74	961482.04	68.41	9/15/2006
B-409	150.0	-88.5	216253.80	961614.80	61.55	4/20/2006
B-410	55.0	64.1	216374.30	961323.70	119.05	4/20/2006
B-410A*	98.7	20.4	216381.30	961323.70	119.05	4/20/2006
B-411	150.0	-68.6	216556.31	961517.19	81.45	9/15/2006
B-412	98.9	-6.7	216589.24	961495.42	92.17	9/15/2006
B-413	150.0	-27.1	216694.88	961413.25	122.90	9/15/2006
B-414	100.0	21.2	216630.18	961354.48	121.20	9/15/2006
B-415	98.7	20.6	216480.90	961264.20	119.26	4/20/2006
B-416	100.0	-13.8	216084.50	961596.34	86.22	9/15/2006
B-417	101.5	-52.3	216435.75	961901.11	49.23	9/15/2006
B-418	200.0	-156.3	216340.25	961976.71	43.67	9/22/2006
B-419	100.0	-44.7	216267.83	961895.60	55.29	9/21/2006
B-420	150.0	-87.4	216213.53	961670.44	62.57	9/15/2006
B-421	150.0	-34.4	216497.56	961019.77	115.58	9/15/2006
B-422	100.0	4.0	216478.23	960915.01	104.02	9/15/2006
B-423	201.5	-91.4	216331.76	960850.21	110.14	9/15/2006
B-424	100.0	18.9	216263.30	960818.60	118.92	4/26/2006
B-425	101.5	16.9	216247.50	961274.70	118.43	4/20/2006
B-426	100.0	-16.3	216193.04	961386.57	83.73	9/21/2006
B-427	150.0	-33.7	216164.05	961272.73	116.27	9/19/2006
B-428	150.0	-35.9	216109.19	961210.06	114.11	9/19/2006
B-429	100.0	3.7	216087.85	961119.27	103.66	9/19/2006
B-430	100.0	2.5	216006.88	961193.12	102.48	9/19/2006
B-431	101.5	16.9	216271.10	961177.30	118.43	4/20/2006
B-432	100.0	18.6	216399.00	961139.10	118.62	4/20/2006
B-433	100.0	-2.5	215963.80	961107.50	97.49	4/27/2006
B-434	100.0	5.2	215827.10	961244.30	105.15	5/2/2006
B-435	100.0	7.7	216020.06	961404.74	107.71	9/15/2006
B-436	100.0	8.3	215923.92	961441.55	108.29	9/22/2006

Table 2.5.4-17Summary As-Conducted Boring Information
(Page 2 of 4)

CCNPP Unit 3 FSAR

© 2007 UniStar Nuclear Development, LLC. All rights reserved. COPYRIGHT PROTECTED

			Coordinates (ft),		Ground	
		Termination	Maryland State Plane		Surface	Date of As
Location	Depth	[bottom]	(NAD	1927)	Elevation	Built
Looution	(ft)	Elevation	North	East	(ft)	Survey
		(ft)			(NGVD	ourrey
-					1929)	
B-437	100.5	10.1	216521.76	960968.80	110.63	9/15/2006
B-438	6.5	99.5	216414.91	960848.90	105.95	9/28/2006
B-438A	100.0	6.6	216411.98	960867.31	106.59	9/28/2006
B-439	100.0	13.8	216340.49	960948.68	113.80	9/15/2006
B-440	100.0	-43.7	216349.47	961813.66	56.34	9/21/2006
B-701	75.0	-66.3	219485.54	960507.60	8.66	9/21/2006
B-702	50.0	-39.7	218980.62	961183.23	10.33	9/21/2006
B-703	100.0	-54.6	218171.00	960957.01	45.42	9/21/2006
B-704	50.0	-10.4	217991.06	960926.05	39.58	9/21/2006
B-705	50.0	-3.3	217581.30	960917.90	46.75	4/19/2006
B-706	50.0	27.4	217140.14	961339.74	77.42	9/21/2006
B-707	50.0	17.4	217396.98	961481.84	67.38	9/21/2006
B-708	100.0	-62.7	217585.84	961810.64	37.35	9/28/2006
B-709	50.0	-18.8	217642.82	961978.18	31.25	9/28/2006
B-710	75.0	-27.0	217542.51	962136.88	47.96	9/28/2006
B-711	50.0	3.0	216755.70	961743.50	53.01	4/19/2006
B-712	50.0	-7.6	216506.16	961997.56	42.41	9/22/2006
B-713	50.0	8.0	216117.68	962283.16	57.99	9/28/2006
B-714	50.0	66.0	215705.73	962034.37	116.02	10/16/2006
B-715	50.0	36.3	214951.76	962639.59	86.29	10/17/2006
B-716	49.5	32.9	215003.21	961364.57	82.35	10/16/2006
B-717	50.0	40.7	214302.45	962349.27	90.72	10/17/2006
B-718	50.0	67.5	214130.52	961929.05	117.47	10/18/2006
B-719	49.4	25.8	213978.69	961500.20	75.23	10/18/2006
B-720	75.0	-1.5	215674.48	962378.47	73.47	9/28/2006
B-721	100.0	1.3	215545.80	962462.10	101.30	5/4/2006
B-722	73.9	25.9	215386.10	962467.00	99.78	5/4/2006
B-723	75.0	15.0	215108.00	963000.80	90.02	4/28/2006
B-724	100.0	-3.0	214780.00	963106.20	96.97	4/28/2006
B-725	75.0	-16.0	214664.30	963219.40	59.02	4/28/2006
B-726	75.0	3.3	215564.67	961709.57	78.33	10/16/2006
B-727	100.0	4.9	215300.85	961884.98	104.88	10/16/2006
B-728	75.0	37.3	215163.63	961910.05	112.30	10/16/2006
B-729	75.0	42.3	214861.87	962454.60	117.28	10/17/2006
B-730	75.0	40.4	214728.50	962523.84	115.36	10/17/2006
B-731	99.3	16.4	214546.48	962547.88	115.67	10/17/2006
B-732	75.0	15.7	215034.10	961594.70	90.72	5/11/2006
B-733	100.0	-12.1	214866.80	961697.70	87.92	5/11/2006
B-734	75.0	30.7	214589.60	961812.50	105.73	5/9/2006

Table 2.5.4-17Summary As-Conducted Boring Information
(Page 3 of 4)

CCNPP Unit 3 FSAR

© 2007 UniStar Nuclear Development, LLC. All rights reserved. COPYRIGHT PROTECTED

			Coordinates (ft),		Ground	
		Termination	Maryland State Plane		Surface	Date of As
Location	Depth	[bottom]	(NAD	1927)	Elevation	Built
Location	(ft)	Elevation	North	East	(ft)	Survey
		(ft)			(NGVD	Ourvey
					1929)	
B-735	75.0	16.2	214805.48	961021.83	91.20	10/16/2006
B-736	75.0	23.3	214681.67	961154.26	98.29	10/16/2006
B-737	100.0	-36.5	214511.91	961147.40	63.47	10/16/2006
B-738	75.0	12.3	213826.30	961679.62	87.29	10/19/2006
B-739	99.8	0.5	213719.60	961793.32	100.35	10/19/2006
B-740	75.0	-0.7	213605.13	961781.13	74.29	10/19/2006
B-741	75.0	6.4	213760.48	961029.82	81.38	10/18/2006
B-742	100.0	2.4	213472.84	961217.19	102.39	10/18/2006
B-743	75.0	28.6	213315.70	961232.00	103.60	5/9/2006
B-744	100.0	13.3	216377.30	959963.38	113.28	9/29/2006
B-745	75.0	36.7	215971.20	960529.02	111.71	9/29/2006
B-746	75.0	7.8	215743.35	960721.36	82.79	9/29/2006
B-747	75.0	15.3	216176.28	959944.95	90.34	9/29/2006
B-748	100.0	-17.6	216039.74	960288.74	82.40	9/29/2006
B-749	75.0	27.5	215775.08	960332.24	102.53	9/29/2006
B-750	73.9	-1.6	215849.16	959930.06	72.35	9/29/2006
B-751	73.9	18.3	215588.86	960146.20	92.23	9/29/2006
B-752	100.0	-4.2	215489.21	960257.57	95.79	9/29/2006
B-753	40.0	8.8	217831.20	960648.86	48.81	9/21/2006
B-754	50.0	17.0	217369.78	960290.37	67.00	9/21/2006
B-755	40.0	55.0	215923.66	961637.86	94.98	9/22/2006
B-756	50.0	56.9	215504.60	961215.10	106.85	4/21/2006
B-757	40.0	66.9	215135.13	960760.60	106.86	10/16/2006
B-758	40.0	42.6	215133.29	960332.67	82.63	10/16/2006
B-759	100.0	-1.7	214526.25	960025.32	98.35	10/19/2006
B-765	102.0	-4.6	216424.51	959701.22	97.37	9/29/2006
B-766	50.0	58.9	216932.89	959791.50	108.89	9/19/2006
B-768	100.0	-51.6	217116.03	962242.98	48.39	9/28/2006
B-769	50.0	4.2	216589.75	962559.47	54.23	9/28/2006
B-770	50.0	71.6	215466.60	962826.95	121.59	10/18/2006

Table 2.5.4-17Summary As-Conducted Boring Information
(Page 4 of 4)

Note:

*Location and elevation approximated based on offset observed in the field and recorded on Field Checklist.

			Sample		10 A C	
Boring	Drill Rig	Date	No.	Depth (ft)	Rec (in.)	Field Remarks
B-301	U. TRUCK	5/25/2006	UD-1	33.5 - 35.5	- 24	MH
			UD-2	43.5 - 45.3	21	MH
			UD-3	88.5 - 90.5	0	
			UD-4	98.5 - 99.8	6	SM
				138.5 -		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
			UD-5	140.5	4	SC / SM
	*			158.5 -		13" push, CL with fine
-		5/30/2006	UD-6	159.6	13	sand
				168.5 -		•
			UD-7	170.5	9	CL / MH
				183.5 -		
			UD-8	184.3	10	MH
						16" push, SM with
B-302	C. ATV	5/30/2006	UD-1	83.5 - 84.9	16	fine sand, shell
				128.5 -	•	
			UD-2	130.5	12	MH
B-303	U. TRUCK	5/9/2006	UD-1	28 - 30	24	CL
				38 - 39.6	19	19" push, SC
B-304	U. ATV	5/30/2006	UD-1	73.5 - 75.5	22	SM
			UD-2	98.5 - 99.5	12	12" push, SC
				138.5 -		
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		UD-3	139.3	10	MH
B-305	C.ATV	7/17/2006	UD-1	12.5 - 14.3	22	СН
			UD-2	19.5 - 21.2	16	MH
						pitcher, cemented
			P-3	35 - 37	5	sand
			P-4	39.5 - 41.5	22	pitcher, SM
			UD-5	52.5 - 53.5	7	f. sandy silt, shell
			P-6	89.5 - 91.5	8.	pitcher, sand
B-306	U. TRUCK	5/5/2006	UD-1	58 - 60	24	CL
		5/5/2006	UD-2	68 - 70	24	CL
				123.5 -		
<u>B-307</u>	U. TRUCK	5/15/2006	UD-1	124.7	14	SM
				178.5 -		
			UD-2	180.4	23	MH
B-308	U. TRUCK	5/3/2006	UD-1	43 - 45	24	CL
		5/4/2006	UD-2	53 - 55	16	CL
		5/4/2006	UD-3	63 - 65	0	sand
B-309	C. TRUCK	5/11/2006	UD-1	33.5 - 35.5	23	CL
		5/11/2006	UD-2	43.5 - 45.5	24	CL
ļ		5/11/2006	UD-3	53.5 - 55.5	23	SC
B-310	C. ATV	6/15/2006	UD-1	78.5 - 79.8	15	SC
B-312	C. ATV	5/18/2006	UD-1	10.5 - 12.3	17	21" push, CH
		5/18/2006	UD-2	38.5 - 38.6	0	0.5" push
		5/18/2006	UD-3	98.5 - 99.5	12	12" push, MH
B-313	U. ATV	5/22/2006	UD-1	93.5 - 94.7		CL
				123.5 -		
			UD-2	124.3		ML

Table 2.5.4-18Summary Undisturbed Tube Sample(Page 1 of 6)

CCNPP Unit 3 FSAR

© 2007 UniStar Nuclear Development, LLC. All rights reserved. COPYRIGHT PROTECTED

		1	Sample			
Boring	Drill Rig	Date	No.	Depth (ft)	Rec (in.)	Field Remarks
B-314			UD-1	13.5 - 15.5	12	СН
B-315	C. ATV	5/22/2006	UD-1	23.5 - 25.5	14	СН
B-316	C. TRUCK	5/4/2006	UD-1	43.5 - 45.5	24	CL
		5/4/2006	UD-2	53.5 - 55.5	24	CL
B-317	C. TRUCK	5/5/2006	UD-1	28.5 - 30.5	24	CL
		5/5/2006	UD-2	38.5 - 40.5	24	СН
	4	5/5/2006	UD-3	48.5 - 50.3	21	SC
				148.5 -		7" push, f. sandy
B-318	U. ATV	6/3/2006	UD-1	149.1	3	SILT
B-319	U. ATV	5/5/2006	UD-1	33.5 - 35.5	24	MH
		5/5/2006	UD-2	.43.5 - 45.5	27	MH
		5/5/2006	UD-3	53.5 - 54.3	10	MH
B-320	C. TRUCK	5/8/2006	UD-1	38.5 - 40.5	24	MH
						18" push, clayey
		5/9/2006	UD-2	48.5 -50	18	sand
B-321	C. ATV	6/5/2006	UD-1	23.5 - 25	18	СН
		6/6/2006	UD-2	73.5 - 75.5	24	SM
B-322	U. ATV	5/18/2006	UD-1	28.5 - 30.5	28	CL
			UD-2	38.5 - 39.9	27	SM
			UD-3	48.5 - 49.3	9	SC
B-323	U. ATV	6/7/2006	UD-1	83.5 - 84.8	15	MH
,				178.5 -		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
			UD-2	179.1	0	MH
B-324			UD-1	60 - 62	24	СН
			P-2	69 - 71	22	SM
			P-3	85.5 - 87.5	5	SM
B-326	U. ATV	5/4/2006	UD-1	33.5 - 35.5	28	CL
		5/4/2006	UD-2	43.5 - 45.5	28	MH
						bottom 2" bent, sandy
		5/4/2006	UD-3	53.5 - 55.5	27	lean clay
_				113.5 -		
B-327	C. ATV	5/25/2006	UD-1	114.2	9	ML
				138.5 -		
			UD-2	140.5	10	SM
B-328	C.ATV	6/19/2006	UD-1	63.5 - 65.5	24	SM
			UD-2	93.5 - 94.6	12	SC
				123.5 -		
			UD-3	124.4	11	ML, shell
B-329	C.ATV	6/13/2006	UD-1	63.5 - 65.3	22	SM
			UD-2	73.5 - 75.5	24	SM
B-330	U. ATV	5/25/2006	<u>UD-1</u>	28.5 - 29.2	0	
B-331	C. ATV	5/24/2006	<u>UD-1</u>	18.5 - 20.5	24	MH
B-332	C. ATV	6/2/2006	UD-1	73.5 - 74.6	13	SM
B-333	U. ATV	5/17/2006	<u>UD-1</u>	28.5 - 30.5	24	MH
			UD-2	38.5 - 40.5	24	CL
			UD-3	48.5 - 48.8	4	SM
B-334	U. TRUCK	5/24/2006	UD-1	23 - 25	24	CL

Table 2.5.4-18Summary Undisturbed Tube Sample
(Page 2 of 6)

CCNPP Unit 3 FSAR

© 2007 UniStar Nuclear Development, LLC. All rights reserved. COPYRIGHT PROTECTED

a a su			Sample			
Boring	Drill Rig	Date	No.	Depth (ft)	Rec (in.)	Field Remarks
			UD-2	33 - 35	13	CL
B-335	U. ATV	5/3/2006	UD-1	31 - 33	24	CL
			UD-2	38.5 - 40.5	24	СН
			UD-3	48.5 - 50.5	24	CL
						tube deformed, SPT
						@ bottom, sand with
			UD-4	58.5 - 58.8	3	shell
B-336	U. ATV	5/15/2006	UD-1	33.5 - 35.5	24	СН
			UD-2	43.5 - 45.5	24	СН
			<u>UD-3</u>	53.5 - 55.5	15	SC
B-337	C. ATV	6/7/2006	UD-1	53.5 - 54.6	13	ML
B-338	C.ATV	6/13/2006	UD-1	48.5 - 50.5	24	MH / ML
				94.5 - 95.0	?	not on boring log
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			95 - 97	?	not on boring log
			UD-4	98.5 - 99.6	7	SM
B-340	C.TRACK	8/4/2006	P-1	66 - 68	12	SC, cemented
B-341			UD-1	88.5 - 90.5	24	SM
			UD-2	98.5 - 100.5	24	SP-SM
B-401	U.TRUCK	6/20/2006	UD-1	68.5 - 70.5	23	SM
			UD-2	98.5 - 99.8	15	ML
				123.5 -		
			UD-3	124.8	16	CL
				138.5 -		
			UD-4	140.5	23	MH
		6/21/2006	UD-5	158.5 -159.3	10	MH
				173.5 -		
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	6/21/2006	UD-6	174.4	11	MH
				198.5 -		
		6/22/2006	UD-7	200.5	21	ML
				213.5 -		
		6/22/2006	UD-8	214.6	13	ML
				228.5 -		
			0D-9	229.6	13	ML
				243.5 -		
			00-10	244.4	8	ML
				348.5 -		
P 402		6/21/2006		300.0	/	
D-403	0.ATV	0/21/2006		03.5 - 04.9	20	SM
			00-2	98.5 - 99.5	12	ML
			י חוו	123.5 -	10 -	N 41
B_404		6/23/2006		124.0 50 50 6	10	
D-404	U.ATV	0/23/2000		02 - 03.0 66 67 5	10	57-5IVI
				00-01.0	10	50
B_405	C TRUCK	5/16/2006		59 5 60 5	1/	50
D-400	0. 1100K	3/10/2000		69 5 70 5	24	
B_406		5/17/2006		63.5 - 70.5	24	
D-400		5/1/2000		73 5 75 2	<u> </u>	
			00-2	1 1 J. J - 1 J.Z	14	ZI PUSH, SC

Table 2.5.4-18Summary Undisturbed Tube Sample(Page 3 of 6)

CCNPP Unit 3 FSAR

© 2007 UniStar Nuclear Development, LLC. All rights reserved. COPYRIGHT PROTECTED

50. A.Y.	14. 14.	4	Sample	3A 5		s de la
Boring	Drill Rig	Date	No.	Depth (ft)	Rec (in.)	Field Remarks
						12" push, SM with
B-407	U. ATV	5/14/2006	UD-1	53.5 - 54.5	11	shell
		5/15/2006	UD-2	78.5 - 79	4	tube bent, SM
		5/15/2006	UD-3	128.5 - 129	6	ML with sand
				153.5 -		
		5/15/2006	UD-4	153.9	5	tube bent, MH
B-409	C.TRUCK	6/22/2006	P-1	35	13	Pitcher, SP
			UD-2	17.5 - 19	24	SC
			UD-3	50 - 52	24	SM
			UD-4	62.5 - 64.5	24	SM
			UD-5	95 -96.6	19	ML, sandy SILT
		6/27/2006	UD-6	137.5 - 139	18	MH
					•	shelby tube lost in
<u> </u>	C. TRUCK	5/1/2006	UD-1	53.5 - 55.5	0	hole, not accepted
						remnant tube
						recovered, not
		5/1/2006	UD-2	60.5 - 62.5	15.5	accepted
B-410A	C. TRUCK	5/1/2006		53.5 - 55.5	24	CH, not on log
		5/1/2006	UD-2	_ 63.5 - 65.5	7	СН
		5/2/2006	UD-3	73.5 - 75	18	CH, f. sand at bottom
B-411	C.ATV	7/26/2006	UD-1	23 - 25	16	СН
B-413	U. TRUCK	5/15/2006	UD-1	73 - 75	24	CL
B-414	U. TRUCK	5/11/2006	UD-1	58 - 60	24	CL
		5/11/2006	UD-2	68 - 70	24	CL
<u> </u>	U.ATV	6/28/2006	UD-1	?	0	
B-420	U. TRUCK	6/6/2006	UD-1	63.5 - 65.5	24	SM
				128.5 -		•
		6/7/2006	UD-2	130.3	22	CL
B-421	C. TRUCK	5/10/2006	UD-1	48.5 - 50.5	24	ML
		5/10/2006	UD-2	58.5 - 60.5	24	CL
B-422	C. ATV	5/4/2006	UD-1	38.5 - 40.5	24	CL
		5/4/2006	UD-2	48.5 - 50.5	23	СН
		5/4/2006	UD-3	58.5 - 59.3	8	CH / SC
			•	103.5 -		
B-423			UD-1	105.3	21	SM
				113.5 -		
			UD-	113.8	0	
				158.5 -		
	<u> </u>		UD-2	160.1	19	CL
				178.5 -		
			UD-3	179.8	16	MH
				188.5 -	<u> </u>	
		E 14 / C C C C C	UD-4	189.2	8	MH
B-425	U. TRUCK	5/1/2006	UD-1	57 - 59	24	CH
		5/1/2006	UD-2	65 - 67	24	СН
	O TENOY	5/1/2006	UD-3	75 - 77	24	CH
B-427	C. TRUCK	5/2/2006	UD-1	63.5 - 65.5	24	СН
		5/2/2006	UD-2	73.5 - 74.8	15	SC

Table 2.5.4-18Summary Undisturbed Tube Sample(Page 4 of 6)

CCNPP Unit 3 FSAR

© 2007 UniStar Nuclear Development, LLC. All rights reserved. COPYRIGHT PROTECTED

			Sample			
Boring	Drill Rig	Date	No.	Depth (ft)	Rec (in.)	Field Remarks
B-428	U. TRUCK	5/2/2006	UD-1	57 - 59	21	CH, bottom 10" bent
		5/2/2006	UD-2	60 - 62	24	CL, bent
		5/2/2006	UD-3	63 - 65	20	CL, bottom 10" bent
		5/2/2006	UD-4	66 - 68	24	CL, bottom 5" bent
		5/2/2006	UD-5	69 - 71	7	CL, bottom 3" bent
B-429	U. ATV	5/1/2006	UD-1	45 - 47	24	СН
		5/1/2006	UD-2	53.5 - 55.5	0	
		5/1/2006	UD-3	58.5 - 60	18	SC
B-430	C. ATV	5/1/2006	UD-1	30 - 32	10	ML
		5/1/2006	UD-2	38.5 - 39.2	5	SC
		5/1/2006	UD-3	48.5 - 50.1	18	MH
		5/1/2006	<u>UD-4</u>	58.5 - 59.3	18	ML
B-433	C. TRUCK	5/17/2006		28.5 - 30.5	24	not on log
		5/17/2006	UD-2	38.5 - 40.5	24	CL
	_	5/17/2006	UD-3	48.5 - 48.8	4	CL from log
B-434	C. ATV	5/9/2006	UD-1	43.5 - 45.5	6.5	CL
		5/9/2006	UD-2	53.5 - 55	18	СН
		5/10/2006	UD-3	63.5 - 64.3	14	СН
B-436	C. ATV	5/9/2006	UD-1	48.5 - 50.5	18	CL ·
B-437	U.TRUCK	7/10/2006	UD-1	13.5 - 15.5	23	SM
			UD-2	98.5 - 100.5	22	SM
B-438a			UD-1	93.5 - 95.5	14	SM
B-440	U. AIV	6/6/2006	UD-1	51 - 53	24	SM
D 704		0/00/0000	UD-2	58.5 - 58.6	0	
B-701	C. IRUCK	6/28/2006	<u>UD-1</u>	43.5 - 44.9	17	ML
B-703			UD-1	18.5 - 20.5	19	CH
D 700		5/0/0000	<u>UD-2</u>	/3.5 - /5.5	10	SM
B-708	U. AIV	5/9/2006	UD-1	/8.5 - /9.5	12	12" push, sand
B-714		7/40/0000	UD-1	48 - 50	24	SC
B-722		//18/2006	UD-1	13 - 15	24	SM
B-723	C.TRACK	6/1/2006	<u>UD-1</u>	28.5 - 30.2	20	SP-SC
D 704		0/5/0000	<u>UD-2</u>	38.5 - 40.5	24	
B-724	C. TRACK	6/5/2006	<u>UD-1</u>	/3.5 - /5.5	21	SM
B-725	C TRACK	6/6/2006	UD-1	63.5 - 65.5	24	SM
B-720	C.TRACK	8/1/2006		10.5 - 12.5	0	No Recovery
P 707		8/1/2006		23.5 - 25.5	19.5	СН
D-121	C. ATV	5/10/2006		48.5 - 50.5	22	0.411
B 729	C ATV	5/11/2006		03.0 - 00.0	20	24° push
B 720		5/10/2006		<u> </u>	23	Сн
B-729	C TRUCK	5/19/2006		00.0 - 70.0 E2 E EE E	24	
<u> </u>	C. TRUCK	5/16/2000		33.3 - 35.5	0	
B-731		5/31/2006		00.0 - /U.0 59.5 - 60.5	24	
B-732	C TRACK	6/8/2006		0.0 - 00.0	24	SIVI
B-732	C TRACK	6/8/2006			24	5M
D-733	U. IRAUN	0/0/2000		23.3 - 23.5	24	
B 724		6/7/0006		00.0 - 90.0	0.1	
D-/34	U. IRAUK	0///2000	00-1	48.5 - 50.5	24	

Table 2.5.4-18Summary Undisturbed Tube Sample(Page 5 of 6)

CCNPP Unit 3 FSAR

© 2007 UniStar Nuclear Development, LLC. All rights reserved. COPYRIGHT PROTECTED

Dering	Deill Die	Dete	Sample		D (1)	
Boring		Date	NO.	υερτη (π)	Rec (In.)	Field Remarks
B-735	C.TRACK	6/28/2006	UD-1	28 - 30	24	sand
B-737	C.TRACK	7/19/2006	UD-1	10.5 - 12.5	24	SC / CL
B-739		6/15/2006	UD-1	51- 52	12	SC
			UD-2	83.5 - 84	5	CL .
			UD-3	96 - 96.8	9	SP-SM
B-742			UD-1	78.5 - 78.6	0	
						SM, sample placed in
			UD-2	88.5 - 88.8	3	jar
B-743	U.ATV	7/10/2006	UD-1	23.5 - 25.5	21	SM
			UD-2	38 - 40	0	
B-746	C. TRACK	7/18/2006	UD-1	13.5 -15.5	24	SM
B-748	C.TRACK	7/17/2006	UD-1	13.5 - 15.5	24	ML
B-749	C. TRUCK	5/23/2006	UD-1	43.5 - 45.5		
B-750	C.TRACK	7/10/2006	UD-1	28.5 - 30.5	0	
			UD-2	48.5 - 49.5	11	clayey sand, shells
B-751	C. TRUCK	5/22/2006	UD-1	33.5 - 35.5		
			UD-2	43.5 - 45.5		
B-752	C.TRACK	7/5/2006	UD-1	58 - 59.5	18	clay
B-759			UD-1	56.5 - 57	0	
			UD-2	66 - 68	24	СН
•			UD-3	98 - 98.5	5	SC, tube bent
						cemented fine sandy
						silt, trace clay, trace
B-765	C. TRACK	7/12/2006	P-	70 - 72	8	shells
			P-	100 - 102	20	clayey fine sandy silt
B-768	C.TRUCK	6/20/2006	UD-1	43.5 - 45.3	20	SM
			UD-2	73.5 - 75.5	24	SM

Table 2.5.4-18Summary Undisturbed Tube Sample(Page 6 of 6)

Total Tubes Attempted: 217

		Termination	Coordinates	(ft), Maryland	Ground	and the second	Remarks		S
L'agation	Depth	[bottom]	State Plane	(NAD 1927)	Sunace	Date of As			
Location	(ft)	Elevation	North	Fact		Built Survey	Pre-	Solomio	Discipation
100 (100 (100 (100 (100 (100 (100 (100		(ft)	NOTUT	Lasi	(1929)		Drill	Seismic	Dissipation
C-301	52.3	42.5	217041.78	960820.13	94.84	9/15/2006		1	
C-302	61.7	29.3	217088.90	960833.77	90.94	9/15/2006			1
C-302-2*	55.3	39.2	217026.56	960817.55	94.51	7/26/2006			
C-302-2a*	138.0	-43.5	217026.56	960817.55	94.51	7/26/2006	√ 85 ft		√
C-303	25.4	36.2	217230.60	960804.00	61.58	4/24/2006			
C-303a*	47.1	14.5	217230.60	960804.00	61.58	7/25/2006	√ 45 ft		
C-303a-1*	71.4	-9.8	217230.60	960804.00	61.58	7/25/2006	√ 50 ft		
C-303b*	123.4	-61.8	217230.60	960804.00	61.58	7/25/2006	√ 80 ft		1
C-304	26.7	34.2	217235.29	960606.73	60.95	9/15/2006		1	V
C-305	74.3	41.6	216876.50	960961.50	115.91	4/24/2006			
C-306	56.9	40.4	217042.12	961184.89	97.31	9/15/2006			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
C-306a*	102.5	-5.2	217038.92	961181.69	97.31	7/27/2006	√ 80 ft		
C-307	75.3	42.4	216853.68	961079.64	117.64	9/15/2006		· V	
C-308	48.2	36.1	217129.90	960263.70	84.33	5/1/2006		V	
C-309	70.1	36.0	217045.62	960110.76	106.04	9/15/2006			1
C-311	34.9	39.0	216869.75	960488.16	73.97	9/15/2006			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
C-312	56.4	43.3	216799.20	960596.36	99.75	9/15/2006			· · ·
C-313	37.2	42.7	216757.92	960336.75	79.93	9/15/2006		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
C-314	39.5	40.6	216531.40	960493.83	80.09	9/15/2006			
C-401	28.1	39.4	216384.26	961574.09	67.46	9/15/2006		√	
C-401-2a*	81.9	-14.4	216381.06	961570.89	67.46	7/27/2006	√ 55 ft	V	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
C-401-2b*	131.2	-63.8	216381.06	961570.89	67.46	7/27/2006	√ 85 ft	V.	
C-402	34.5	38.7	216333.85	961494.18	73.13	9/15/2006			
C-403	43.8	39.2	216517.33	961511.47	82.96	9/15/2006			
C-404	80.1	39.2	216524.30	961308.90	119.21	4/20/2006			V
C-405	40.0	35.5	216163.49	961666.32	75.54	9/15/2006			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
C-406	15.6	28.3	216380.92	961901.51	43.89	9/28/2006			V
C-407	32.3	30.9	216159.20	961732.20	63.23	6/22/2006		V	1
C-407-2a*	96.3	-33.1	216161.50	961726.70	63.23	7/28/2006	√ 50 ft	1	V
C-407-b*	142.4	-79.2	216161.50	961726.70	63.23	7/31/2006	√ 95 ft	$\overline{\mathbf{v}}$	
C-408	77.4	40.8	216396.64	961001.81	118.18	9/15/2006		$\overline{\mathbf{v}}$	······································
C-408a*	98.3	19.9	216398.76	960999.69	118.18	7/24/2006	√ 98 ft		· · ·
C-408-2a*	123.7	-5.5	216393.81	961004.64	118.18	7/31/2006	√ 105 ft	V	
C-409	80.5	38.6	216288.45	960760.56	119.12	9/15/2006			7
C-411	80.4	36.2	216178.94	961178.21	116.60	9/19/2006			
C-412	76.8	37.5	216093.75	961306.66	114.31	9/28/2006			
C-413	13.6	86.3	216045.53	961037.78	99.90	9/28/2006			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
C-414	62.5	.39.9	215893.42	961201.10	102.36	9/28/2006			7
C-415	20.0	36.6	216305.70	961857.40	56.63	5/26/2006			
C-701	29.5	-18.6	219262.19	960933.61	10.95	9/21/2006			√ .
C-701a*	28.1	-17.1	219265.39	960936.81	10.95	7/21/2006			
C-702	20.3	-9.0	218720.05	961033.95	11.34	9/21/2006			
C-703	32.6	35.2	217361.27	961165.03	67.82	10/17/2006			
C-704	48.2	-2.9	217500.74	961710.02	45.36	9/28/2006			
C-705	34.0	-2.9	217637.26	961983.10	31.08	9/28/2006			-

Table 2.5.4-19Summary As-Conducted CPT Information(Page 1 of 2)

CCNPP Unit 3 FSAR

Rev. 1

© 2007 UniStar Nuclear Development, LLC. All rights reserved. COPYRIGHT PROTECTED

Contraction of the second s	Denth	Termination	Coordinates (ft), Maryland State Plane (NAD 1927)		Ground Surface	Date of As	Remarks		
Location	(ft)	Elevation (ft)	North	East	Elevation (ft) (NGVD 1929)	Built Survey	Pre- Drill	Seismic	Dissipation
C-706	50.0	55.2	216958.95	961494.86	105.28	9/21/2006			
C-707	19.5	20.8	216308.12	962079.42	40.35	9/22/2006			
C-708	50.0	62.9	215658.28	961962.86	112.97	10/16/2006			
C-709	50.0	61.7	215027.59	962824.89	111.73	10/18/2006			
C-710	21.2	85.0	214875.83	961187.31	106.15	10/16/2006			
C-711	34.9	65.6	214222.13	962176.75	100.54	10/17/2006			
C-712	29.7	29.4	213909.83	961370.06	59.05	10/18/2006	,		V
C-713	41.8	21.3	215855.86	962296.57	63.11	9/28/2006			
C-714	85.1	24.2	214920.30	963057.62	109.32	10/18/2006			V
C-715	57.3	33.6	215445.62	961798.99	90.85	10/16/2006			
C-716	20.5	75.7	214432.49	962659.44	96.21	10.17/2006			
C-717	66.6	35.8	214698.14	961692.58	102.35	10/16/2006			\checkmark
C-718	34.1	33.6	214343.71	961205.59	67.67	10/16/2006			
C-719	12.0	78.2	214025.30	961636.90	90.21	10/18/2006			-
· C-720	70.7	28.0	213593.77	961134.09	98.66	10/18/2006			\checkmark
C-721	52.0	35.6	216157.88	960330.47	87.62	9/29/2006			
C-722	38.4	36.1	215478.76	960648.26	74.52	10/16/2006			
C-723	68.7	28.9	215988.18	959760.36	97.60	9/29/2006			V

Table 2.5.4-19Summary As-Conducted CPT Information(Page 2 of 2)

* Location and elevation approximated based on offset observed in the field and recorded on Field Checklist

CCNPP Unit 3 FSAR © 2007 UniStar Nuclear Development, LLC. All rights reserved. COPYRIGHT PROTECTED
	Coordinates (ft),		ates (ft),	Ground	Elevation (ft),	Elevation (ft),		
	Dianéh	I ermination	Maryland	State Plane	Surface	Top of	Ground	Deter of As
Location	Deptn (#)	Elevetion	(NAU	1927)	Elevation	Concrete at	water Level	Date of As
	(11)		North	Fret		Base of Well		Built Survey
		(it)	NOTUI	EdSL	(1030)	Protector	Point (V-	
0\\/ 301	80.0	14.5	217048 02	060814 47	1923)			0/15/2006
01/3130	57.5	6.5	217040.02	900014.47	51.02	51.21	52.20	9/15/2000
OW 313A	110.0	-0.5	217307.31	900705.30	51.03	51.51	53.20	9/15/2000
014/2104	25.0	-09.0	217372.34	900713.07	50.75	<u> </u>	53.54 404.04	9/15/2006
0W-319A	35.0	00.1	210902.00	901110.12	103.13	103.31	104.91	9/15/2006
000-319B	85.0	18.5	216957.32	961125.02	103.53	103.85	105.35	9/19/2006
000-323	43.5	63.5	21/034.46	960057.07	106.96	107.55	109.69	9/19/2006
OW-328	/2.0	4.3	216828.86	960493.21	76.29	76.55	77.85	9/19/2006
OW-336	74.0	23.1	216643.18	960746.61	97.11	97.50	99.07	9/16/2006
OW-401	77.5	-6.1	216348.86	961530.99	71.38	71.91	73.49	9/21/2006
OW-413A	50.0	-73.2	216703.14	961418.81	123.15	123.51	125.04	9/15/2006
OW-413B	125.0	-2.1	216694.88	961413.25	122.90	123.25	124.85	9/15/2006
OW-418A	40.0	3.7	216340.41	961966.46	43.66	44.31	45.83	9/22/2006
OW-418B	92.0	-48.3	216340.25	961976.71	43.67	44.13	45.77	9/22/2006
OW-423	43.0	68.1	216339.99	960882.24	111.12	111.67	113.16	9/15/2006
OW-428	50.0	63.9	216105.21	961212.38	113.92	114.32	115.92	9/19/2006
OW-436	50.0	58.1	215922.47	961446.87	108.13	108.53	.110.39	9/22/2006
OW-703A	49.0	-5.0	218171.23	960967.72	44.02	44.44	45.65	9/21/2006
OW-703B	80.0	-34.4	218171.67	960958.91	45.57	45.97	47.53	9/21/2006
OW-705	52.0	-4.3	217566.62	960917.18	47.71	47.77	50.22	9/15/2006
OW-708A	34.0	3.4	217586.23	961803.52	37.44	37.82	39.61	9/28/2006
OW-711	50.0	2.9	216748.48	961741.61	52.92	53.26	55.31	9/22/2006
OW-714	50.0	66.0	215705.73	962034.37	116.02	116.32	117.98	10/16/2006
OW-718	43.0	75.5	214133.58	961924.87	118.53	118.96	120.41	10/18/2006
OW-725	60.0	-2.0	214649.30	963212.73	58.04	58.38	59.94	10/18/2006
OW-729	42.0	76.9	214872.58	962445.93	118.88	119.44	121.11	10/17/2006
OW-735	72.0	19.2	214805.48	961021.83	91.20	91.81	93.44	10/16/2006
OW-743	55.0	48.7	213320.62	961234 01	103 65	104 05	105 89	10/18/2006
OW-744	50.0	47.5	216405.37	960089.41	97.50	97.96	99.81	9/29/2006

Table 2.5.4-20 Summary As-Conducted Observation Well Information(Page 1 of 2)

CCNPP Unit 3 FSAR

© 2007 UniStar Nuclear Development, LLC. All rights reserved. COPYRIGHT PROTECTED

· · · · · · · ·

Location	Depth (ft)	Termination [bottom] Elevation (ft)	Coordin Maryland S (NAD North	ates (ft), State Plane 1927) East	Ground Surface Elevation (ft) (NGVD 1929)	Elevation (ft), Top of Concrete at Base of Well Head Protector	Elevation (ft), Ground Water Level Measuring Point (V- Notch)	Date of As Built Survey
OW-752A	37.0	58.3	215482.18	960250.12	95.30	95.73	97.00	9/29/2006
OW-752B	97.0	-1.2	215489.21	960257.57	95.79	96.09	97.41	9/29/2006
OW-754	44.0	23.0	217369.78	960290.37	67.00	67.21	68.85	9/15/2006
OW-756	42.0	64.6	215497.07	961212.39	106.56	107.07	108.77	10/16/2006
OW-759A	35.0	62.8	214536.47	960055.02	97.78	98.05	99.69	10/19/2006
OW-759B	90.0	8.3	214526.25	960056.32	98.35 [.]	98.72	100.14	10/19/2006
OW-765A	29.0	68.4	216424.51	959701.22	97.37	97.92	99.60	9/29/2006
OW-765B	102.0	-5.2	216420.42	959693.64	96.82	97.19	98.47	9/29/2006
OW-766	50.0	58.9	216932.89	959791.50	108.89	109.32	110.72	9/19/2006
OW-768A	42.0	6.5	217106.06	962238.98	48.48	48.96	49.84	9/28/2006
OW-769	42.0	12.2	216589.75	962559.47	54.23	54.39	56.43	9/28/2006
OW-770	42.0	79.6	215466.60	962826.95	121.59	121.79	123.08	10/18/2006

Table 2.5.4-20Summary As-Conducted Observation Well Information(Page 2 of 2)

© 2007 UniStar Nuclear Development, LLC. All rights reserved. COPYRIGHT PROTECTED

x

Location	Screened Interval Depth (ft)	USCS Soil Classification	Hydraulic Conductivity (feet/sec)
OW-301	65 – 75	SP	1.58X10 ⁻⁴
OW-313A	40 - 50	SM. ML	7.50X10 ⁻⁶
OW-313B	95 - 105	CL. ML. MH	2.74X10 ⁻⁷
OW-319A	20 - 30	SP-SM, SC, CH, CL	2.89X10 ⁻⁶
OW-319B	70 - 80	SM	3.42X10 ⁻⁵
OW-323	30 - 40	SP, SP-SM	6.24X10 ⁻⁵
OW-328	60 – 70	SM, OH	3.79X10 ⁻⁶
OW-336	60 – 70	SP-SM, SM	2.10X10 ⁻⁵
OW-401	63 – 73	SM	6.77X10 ⁻⁶
OW-413A	35 – 45	SP-SM	1.21X10 ⁻⁵
OW-413B	110 – 120	SP-SM, SM	2.78X10 ⁻⁶
OW-418A	25 – 35	SP-SM	4.41X10 ⁻⁶
OW-418B	75 – 85	SC, SM	2.16X10 ⁻⁷
OW-423	28 - 38	SP-SM, SM, SC	6.86X10 ⁻⁵
OW-428	35 – 45	SM, SC	1.19X10 ⁻⁵
OW-436	29 – 39	SC, SM	2.80X10 ⁻⁶
OW-703A	35 – 45	SM	1.34X10 ⁻⁵
OW-703B	68 – 78	SM, ML	1.08X10 ⁻⁶
OW-705	40 - 50	SC, SM	4.99X10 ⁻⁶
OW-708	22 – 32	SM	2.56X10 ⁻⁵
OW-711	35 – 45	SM	6.04X10 ⁻⁶
OW-714	38 – 48	SP-SM, SC	2.81X10 ⁻⁶
OW-718	30 – 40	SP-SM	4.44X10 ⁻⁶
OW-725	48 – 58	SM	7.54X10 ⁻⁶
OW-735	60 – 70	SP-SM, SM	5.48X10 ⁻⁵
OW-743	40 - 50	SP-SM, SM	6.23X10 ⁻⁷
OW-744	38 – 48	CL, SC, SM	1.07X10 ⁻⁶
OW-752A	25 – 35	CH, SM	7.03X10 ⁻⁵
OW-752B	85 – 95	SP-SM	3.35X10 ⁻⁶
OW-754	32 – 42	CL, SM	5.29X10 ⁻⁶
OW-756	30 - 40	SP-SM, SP-SC	2.01X10 ⁻⁴
OW-759A	20 – 30	SM, SC, MH	4.64X10 ⁻⁷
OW-759B	75 – 85	SM, SP, SP-SM	1.17X10 ⁻⁶
OW-765A	17 – 27	SP-SM	1.00X10 ⁻⁵
OW-765B	82 - 92	SM	1.36X10 ⁻⁶
OW-766	20 - 30	SP-SM	1.10X10 ⁻⁶
OW-768	30 - 40	SM	5.29X10 ⁻⁶
OW-769	32 – 42	SM, SC	1.74X10 ⁻⁶

Table 2.5.4-21In-Situ Hydraulic Conductivity (Slug) Test Results
(Page 1 of 1)

		Termination	Coordin Marvland S	ates (ft), State Plane	Ground Surface	
Location	Depth	[bottom]	(NAD	1927)	Elevation	Date of As Built
	(II)	Elevation (ft)	North	East	(π) (NGVD 1929)	Survey
TP-B307	6.7	112.7	216957.53	960690.62	119.35	9/19/2006
TP-B314	9.0	43.8	217320.35	960658.25	52.78	9/15/2006
TP-B315	8.5	57.3	217182.50	960563.12	65.80	9/15/2006
TP-B334	10.0	77.0	216515.64	960560.94	87.03	9/19/2006
TP-B335	8.0	91.6	216730.79	960706.97	99.64	9/19/2006
TP-B407	7.0	74.3	216391.76	961465.02	81.25	9/21/2006
TP-B414	6.5	114.3	216631.18	961530.95	120.83	9/15/2006
TP-B415	6.5	112.4	216490.91	961298.37	118.92	9/15/2006
TP-B423	8.0	97.9	216414.95	960849.03	105.86	9/19/2006
TP-B434	8.5	96.7	215825.90	961244.18	105.24	9/22/2006
TP-B435	10.0	97.7	216020.06	961404.74	107.71	9/19/2006
TP-B715	8.5	79.7	214964.18	962637.77	88.16	10/17/2006
TP-B716	8.8	88.3	214983.83	961289.79	97.13	10/16/2006
TP-B717	8.0	82.5	214297.68	962346.36	90.53	10/17/2006
TP-B719	8.0	64.3	213966.93	961493.94	72.28	10/18/2006
TP-B727	7.0	97.3	215299.14	961883.13	104.33	10/16/2006
TP-B744	6.5	106.8	316377.30	959963.38	113.28	9/29/2006
TP-B758	9.0	73.6	215133.29	960332.67	82.63	10/16/2006
TP-C309	8.0	100.5	217020.05	960105.24	108.45	9/19/2006
TP-C723	7.0	89.8	215989.07	959754.78	96.75	9/29/2006

Table 2.5.4-22Summary As-Conducted Test Pit Information(Page 1 of 1)

Location	Coordin Maryland S (NAD North	ates (ft), State Plane 1927) East	Ground Surface Elevation (ft) (NGVD 1929)	Date of As Built Survey
R-1	215837.30	960255.80	85.45	5/3/2006
R-2	215837.30	960255.80	85.45	5/3/2006
R-3	216622.50	960406.80	89.12	5/2/2006
R-4	215915.40	961114.00	99.40	4/27/2006

Table 2.5.4-23	Summary Field Electrical Resistivity Information
	(Page 1 of 1)

	SURF SEDIM (PLEIST) <u>COMPRE</u>	SURFICIAL SEDIMENTS (PLEISTOCENE) <u>COMPRESSIONAL</u>		OLIDATED MENTS TIARY) ESSIONAL	INTERN SEDI (CRETA) <u>COMPRE</u>	MEDIATE MENTS CEOUS) ^(a) ESSIONAL	BASEMENT ROCK COMPRESSIONAL		
STATION	WAVE <u>VELOCITY</u> (fps)	THICKNESS (ft)	WAVE <u>VELOCITY</u> (fps)	THICKNESS (ft)	WAVE <u>VELOCITY</u> (fps)	THICKNESS (ft)	WAVE <u>VELOCITY</u> (fps)	THICKNESS (ft)	
Solomons Shoal ^(b)	-	-	5900	3080		· _	15,170	3130	
Solomons Deed ^(b)	-	- ,	6080	1070	6980	1900	18,100	3080	
Site ^(c)	2200	40	5500	-	-	-	-	· _	
Site ^(c)	-	-	5900	-	-		-	-	

Table 2.5.4-24Geophysical Data from CCNPP Units 1 and 2 UFSAR
(Page 1 of 1)

Notes:

(a) These measurements refer to a "masked" arrival and the results are questionable.

(b) Adapted from Ewing and Worzel (Reference 3).

(c) Measurements by Dames & Moore.

Table 2.5.4-25ShockscopeData from CCNPP Units 1 and 2 UFSAR(Page 1 of 1)

BORING	DEPTH (ft)	CONFINING <u>PRESSURE</u> (Ibs/ft ²)	COMPRESSIONAL WAVE VELOCITY (fps)
DM-2	5	0 2000 4000 6000	1,000 1,200 1,400 1,700
DM-9	15 ⁻	0 2000 4000 6000	1,200 1,300 1,500 1,700
DM-1	30	0 2000 4000 6000	1,400 1,500 1,800 2,100
DM-10	68	0 2000 4000 6000	2,600 2,600 3,200 3,200
DM-10	111_	0 2000 4000 6000	2,600 2,600 3,000 3,000
DM-10	156	0 2000 4000 6000	1,800 1,800 1,900 1,900
DM-10	211	0 2000 4000 6000	1,600 1,700 1,700 1,700 1,700
DM-10	256	0 2000 4000 6000	2,100 2,100 2,200 2,200
DM-10	271	0 2000 4000 6000	2,000 2,200 2,300 2,600

Table 2.5.4-26Summary Laboratory Test Results on Bulk Soil Samples(Page 1 of 1)

Non-Plastic Soils

Location	Depth (ft)	USCS	WC (%)		<u>%</u>	Material	Passing	Mod. Proctor Compact	tion	CBR	CBR	
			·			#4	#200	Max dry density (pcf)	Opt. WC (%)	Unsoaked	Soaked	
TP-B307	4.5	SP-SM	2.3			100	5.8	109.3	10.5	14.8	4.4	
TP-B315	6.0	SP-SM	5.4			99.8	9.7	114.9	11.4	11.6	18.9	
TP-B334	3.0	SM	7.4			100	13.9	116.3	9.3			
TP-B334	6.0	SM	14.5			100	13.2	129.8	8.0		1	
TP-B335	5.0	SM	8.9			100	24.6	130.5	7.6	36.2	18.0	
TP-B407	4.5	SW-SM	7.1			97.8	9.0	118.9	8.8	14.8	17.0	
TP-B414	6.0	SP-SM	6.0			100	6.4	105.4	11.9			
TP-B415	3.0	SP	10.2			99.8	3.5	116.7	9.8	11.1	4.7	
TP-B435	5.0	SM	6.0			100	13.2	119.1	8.9			
TP-B435	7.0	SP-SM	4.6			99.2	8.3	123.9	8.9	26.8	33.7	
TP-B715	5.5	SP-SM	4.8			99.1	11.0	110.7	11.8			
TP-B716	6.0	SP-SM	3.8			99.0	6.0	116.3	9.4			
TP-B717	7.0	SP-SM	3.4			97.4	6.4	123.8	10.2	17.2	23.1	
TP-B719	7.0	SM	26.7			100	44.3	119.6	. 10.0	41.3	29.0	
TP-8727	6.0	SM	10.3			100	30.1	130.5	6.8			
TP-B758	2.0	SP-SM	6.0			99.2	8.4	121.0	8.8			
TP-B758	7.5	SM	11.8			97.4	31.1	127.3	8.9	11.3	4.4	
TP-C309	2.0	SP	4.3			98.8	3.7	111.2	13.9			
TP-C309	7.0	SP-SM	8.7	_		100	7.8	112.3	9.8			
TP-C723	6.0	SP-SM	4.6			98.8	7.5	113.8	6.8			
Min	2		2.3			97.4	3.5	105.4	6.8	11.1	4.4	
Max.	7.5		26.7			100	44.3	130.5	13.9	41.3	33.7	
Average:	5		8			99	13	119	10	21	17	

Plastic Soils

Location	Depth (ft)	USCS	WC (%)	LL	PL	PI	%	% Material Passing Mod. Proctor Compaction		CBR			
	-							#4	#200	Max dry density (pcf)	Opt. WC (%)	Unsoaked	Soaked
TP-B314	4.0	CH	37.0	71	24	47		100	93.1	114.6	15.5		
TP-B335	3.0	CL	19.0	30	20	10		100	65.3	128.8	9.9		
TP-B423	5.0	CL	16.0	24	16	8		. 100	51.1	123.4	10.8		
TP-B434	2.0	CL	21.0	25	18	7		99.8	59.8	127.1	10.1	9.3	3.2
TP-B435	9.0	SC	6.7	34	17	17		100	14.1	130.2	7.3	34.4	41.8
TP-B719	0.5	CL	23.9	35	22	13		100	84.5	118.4	13.5		
TP-B744	1.5	CL	18.0	25	17	8		100	64.2	131.2	8.0		
TP-C723	2.5	SC	12.0	30	15	15		100	39.5	132.8	7.3	26.8	17.2
Min.	0.5		6.7	24	15	7		99.8	14.1	114.6	7.3	9.3	3.2
Max.	9		37	71	24	47		100	.93.1	132.8	15.5	34.4	41.8
Average:	3		19	34	19	16		100	59	126	10	24	21

CCNPP Unit 3 FSAR

Rev. 1

© 2007 UniStar Nuclear Development, LLC. All rights reserved. COPYRIGHT PROTECTED

Unit	Soil	Depth R	ange (ft)	El Ran	ige (ft)	Vs (feet/sec)
I	Terrace SAND	0	25	+85	+60	790
ll-a	Chesapeake CLAY/SILT	25	40	+60	+45	1,100
II-b-1	Chesapeake Cemented SAND	40	55	+45	+30	1,450
ll-b-2	Chesapeake Cemented SAND	55	70	+30	+15	1,800
II-b-3	Chesapeake Cemented SAND	70	85	+15	0	1,130
II-b-4	Chesapeake Cemented SAND	85	100	0	-15	1,740
ll-c-1	Chesapeake CLAY/SILT	100	135	-15	-50	1,250
II-c-2	Chesapeake CLAY/SILT	135	285	-50	-200	1,250
lll-a-1	Nanjemoy SAND	285	305	-200	-220	1,790
III-a-2	Nanjemoy SAND	305	315	-220	-230	2,330
III-a-3	Nanjemoy SAND	315	355	-230	-270	2,030
III-a-4	Nanjemoy SAND	355	400	-270	-315	1,930
III-b	Nanjemoy CLAY/SILT *	400	500	-315	-415	2,200
IV	Aquia-Brightseat SAND	500	631	-415	-546	2,200
V-1	Patapsco SAND	631	1,085	-546	-1,000	2,200
V-2	Patapsco SAND	1,085	1,585	-1,000	-1,500	2,330
V-3	Patapsco SAND	1,585	1,731	-1,500	-1,646	2,550
VI-1	Patuxent/Arundel CLAY	1,731	2,085	-1,646	-2,000	2,550
VI-2	Patuxent/Arundel CLAY	2,085	2,531	-2,000	-2,446	2,800
VII-1	Granitoid Bedrock	2,531	2,531	-2,446	-2,446	5,000
VII-2	Granitoid Bedrock	2,531	2,541	-2,446	2,456	7,000
VII-3	Granitoid Bedrock	2,541	2,551	-2,456	-2,466	9,200
VII-4	Granitoid Bedrock	2,551	3,085	-2,466	-3,000	9,200

Table 2.5.4-27 Design Vs Profile for CCNPP Unit 3 Subsurface Seismic Evaluation (Page 1 of 1)

* May include the Marlboro Clay

CCNPP Unit 3 FSAR

© 2007 UniStar Nuclear Development, LLC. All rights reserved. COPYRIGHT PROTECTED

Table 2.5.4-28Summary Shear Modulus and Damping Ratios
for the CCNPP Unit 3 Seismic Evaluation
(Page 1 of 2)

Depth 0-25	5 ft (Terrace Sand)		Depth 25-40 ft (Chesapeake Clay/Silt)			Depth 40-100 ft (Ches. Cemented Sand)			Depth 100-285 ft (Ches. Clay/Silt)			Depth 285-355 ft (Nanjemoy Cemented Clay/Silt)		
Cyclic Shear Strain (%)	G/G _{max}	D/D _{max}	Cyclic Shear Strain (%)	G/G _{max}	D/D _{max}	Cyclic Shear Strain (%)	G/G _{max}	D/D _{max}	Cyclic Shear Strain (%)	G/G _{max}	D/D _{max}	Cyclic Shear Strain (%)	G/G _{max}	D/D _{max}
1.E-04	1	1.4	1.E-04	1	1.5	1.E-04	1	1	1.E-04	1	2	1.E-04	1	1.5
3.E-04	1	1.5	3.E-04	1	1.5	3.E-04	1	1	3.E-04	1	2	3.E-04	1	1.5
1.E-03	0.98	1.8	1.E-03	1	1.6	1.E-03	1	1.2	1.E-03	1	2	1.E-03	1	1.6
3.E-03	0.914	2.8	3.E-03	0.97	2.05	3.E-03	0.97	1.64	3.E-03	0.995	2.13	3.E-03	0.97	2.05
1.E-02	0.75	5	1.E-02	0.878	3.21	1.E-02	0.87	2.8	1.E-02	0.955	2.75	1.E-02	0.878	3.21
3.E-02	0.509	9.3	3.E-02	0.685	5.77	3.E-02	0.68	5.49	3.E-02	0.832	4.38	3.E-02	0.685	5.77
1.E-01	0.27	15.3	1.E-01	0.413	10.64	1.E-01	0.43	10.2	1.E-01	0.59	8	1.E-01	0.413	10.64
3.E-01	0.116	21.9	3.E-01	0.208	16.22	3.E-01	0.22	16.5	3.E-01	0.34	13.16	3.E-01	0.208	16.22
1.E+00	0.04	27	6.E-01	0.115	18.65	1.E+00	0.09	22.9	6.E-01	0.22	16.15	6.E-01	0.115	18.65
3.E+00	0.02	30	1.E+00	0.075	19	3.E+00	0.05	27	1.E+00	0.15	17.56	1.E+00	0.075	19

CCNPP Unit 3 FSAR

energia angla a ay is

© 2007 UniStar Nuclear Development, LLC. All rights reserved. COPYRIGHT PROTECTED

Table 2.5.4-28Summary Shear Modulus and Damping Ratiosfor the CCNPP Unit 3 Seismic Evaluation(Page 2 of 2)

Depth 355-456	Depth 456-471 ft (Marlboro Clay)			Depth 471-631 ft (Aquia/Brightseat Sand)			Depth 631-1,731 ft (Patapsco Sand)			Depth 1,731-2,351 ft (Patuxent/Arundel Clay)				
Cyclic Shear Strain (%)	G/G _{max}	D/D _{max}	Cyclic Shear Strain (%)	G/G _{max}	D/D _{max}	Cyclic Shear Strain (%)	G/G _{max}	D/D _{max}	Cyclic Shear Strain (%)	G/G _{max}	D/D _{max}	Cyclic Shear Strain (%)	G/G _{max}	D/D _{max}
1.E-04	1	0.7	1.E-04	1	1.5	1.E-04	1	0.6	1.E-04	1	0.55	1.E-04	1	1.5
3.E-04	1	0.8	3.E-04	1	1.5	3.E-04	1	0.6	3.E-04	1	0.55	3.E-04	1	. 1.5
1.E-03	1	0.8	1.E-03	1	1.6	1.E-03	1	0.6	1.E-03	1	0.55	1.E-03	1	1.6
3.E-03	0.988	1.12	3.E-03	0.97	2.05	3.E-03	0.99	0.81	3.E-03	1	0.77	3.E-03	0.97	2.05
1.E-02	0.93	1.8	1.E-02	0.878	3.21	1.E-02	0.95	1.2	1.E-02	0.96	1.15	1.E-02	0.878	3.21
3.E-02	0.791	3.53	3.E-02	0.685	5.77	3.E-02	0.852	2.5	3.E-02	0.88	2.1	3.E-02	0.685	5.77
1.E-01	0.57	7.1	1.E-01	0.413	10.64	1.E-01	0.65	5.3	1.E-01	0.71	4.2	1.E-01	0.413	10.64
3.E-01	0.321	12.78	3.E-01	0.208	16.22	3.E-01	0.41	10.27	3.E-01	0.47	8.45	3.E-01	0.208	16.22
1.E+00	0.15	19.3	6.E-01	0.115	18.65	1.E+00	0.2	16.7	1.E+00	0.265	14.5	6.E-01	0.115	18.65
3.E+00	0.09	23	1.E+00	0.075	· 19	3.E+00	0.1	20.1	3.E+00	0.16	17.4	1.E+00	0.075	19

© 2007 UniStar Nuclear Development, LLC. All rights reserved. COPYRIGHT PROTECTED

Table 2.5.4-29	Material Density and PI Adopted	
for the CCN	IPP Unit 3 Seismic Evaluation	
	(Page 1 of 1)	

Unit	Soil	Est. Total Unit Weight (pcf)	Est. Pl
I	Terrace SAND	120	NP
ll-a	Chesapeake CLAY/SILT	. 115	35
II-b	Chesapeake Cemented SAND	120	20
II-c	Chesapeake CLAY/SILT	110	45
III-a	Nanjemoy SAND	120	30
III-b	Nanjemoy CLAY/SILT *	120	N/A
IV	Aquia/Brightseat SAND	115	N/A
V	Patapsco SAND	115	N/A
VI	Patuxent/Arundel CLAY	115	N/A

NP = Non-Plastic

PI = Plasticity Index

N/A = not available

* may include the Marlboro Clay

CCNPP Unit 3 FSAR © 2007 UniStar Nuclear Development, LLC. All rights reserved. COPYRIGHT PROTECTED

Structure	Embedment, D (ft)	Length, L (ft)	Width, B (ft)	B/L	Soil Layer	c (ksf)	φ (deg)	N _c	Nq	Ν _γ	ζc	ζq	ζγ
ESWS													
Cooling Towers	13.7–22.7	147	96	0.65	Stratum II-b	0	34	42.16	29.44	41.06	1.46	1.44	0.74
					Stratum II-c	4	0	5.14	1	0	1.13	1	0.74
Emergency Power Generating Buildings	3 - 6	131	93	0.71	Stratum II-b	0	32	35.49	23.18	30.22	1.46	1.44	0.72
					Stratum II-c	4	0	5.14	1	0	1.14	1	0.72
Reactor (Common Basemat)	41	322	200	0.62	Stratum II-b	0	34	42.16	29.44	41.06	1.43	1.42	0.75
					Stratum II-c, III	2.3	16	11.63	4.34	3.06	1.23	1.18	0.75
UHS Makeup Water Intake Structure	30.5	78	47	0.60	Stratum II-c	4	0	5.14	1	0	1.12	1	

Table 2.5.4-30Bearing Capacity Evaluation Parameters(Page 1 of)

CCNPP Unit 3 FSAR

© 2007 UniStar Nuclear Development, LLC. All rights reserved. COPYRIGHT PROTECTED





B-310 B-307 B-308 B-316 B-410 B-407 B-416 120B-315.... B-306 B-406 B-408 120 B-415 Safəğu^lards 1400 F 3115270 Building Emergency Power Generating Building Structural Backfill 110 Access Building 110 Existing Site Grade 100, Emergency Power Generating Building 100 E7 · 2 413 പ്പ 18 90. Final Site Grade 90 E 24 20 EL. 79 C 29 80. 80 EL. 79' 27. de. E 12 414 . Terrace Sand 70. 70 CLAY / SH T SAND 60 60 13 IIa. Chesapeake Clay/Silt 13 CLAY/SIL 50 CLAY/SC 50 EU.P 13 15 44 18 Ľυ 40 40 . E 61 43 r 28 e 22 30. 32 Excavation Limit 24 83.5 30 R 53 50/ el '48' 50% d 70 1. R 50/3 ELEVATION - feet 20. 5073 20 28 10 10 15 33 d 35. 21 25 16 1.7 33 IIb. Chesapeake Cemented Sand 0 14. 13 0 C 10 -10 E 11 E 50 E 20 E 20 32 -10 Bottom of Foundation Elevation 50/1 52 40 -20. -20 23 31 C 28 29 36 r 35 -30. 18 -30 112 23 зc -40 -40 38 129 d 16 -50 -50 AND/SUT 26 -60. -60 rt i + Pi æ IIc. Chesabeake Clay/Sill -70 -70 24 114 -80 -80 CLAY : SILT -90 -90 -100 -100 -110. 120 240 C REL T SAND ! SILT -120 **HORIZONTAL SCALE - FEET**

يريان والأوم والمراجع

FIGURE 2.5.4-30 Rev. 1 EXCAVATION PROFILE NS-3

.

CCNPP UNIT 3 FSAR





Appendix 2.5-B

1

GEOTECHNICAL SUBSURFACE INVESTIGATION DATA REPORT ADDENDUM NO. 3 (RCTS TEST RESULTS) – REV. 02

CGG Combined Operating License Application (COLA) Project Calvert Cliffs Nuclear Power Plant (CCNPP) Calvert County, Maryland

December 13, 2007

Prepared By:

SCHNABEL ENGINEERING NORTH, LLC Gaithersburg, Maryland (Schnabel Project No. 06120048)

Submitted To:

BECHTEL POWER CORPORATION Frederick, Maryland (Bechtel Subcontract No. 25237-103-HC4-CY00-00001)

Binder No. 1 of 1



Schnabel Engineering North, LLC



656 Quince Orchard Road, Suite 700 Gaithersburg, MD 20878

Phone: (301) 417-2400 Fax: (301) 417-2730 www.schnabel-eng.com

December 13, 2007

Mr. Scott Close, P.E. Bechtel Power Corporation 5275 Westview Drive Frederick, MD 21703-8306

Subject:

Geotechnical Subsurface Investigation Data Report Addendum No. 3 (RCTS Test Results) – Rev. 02 CGG Combined Operating License Application (COLA) Project, Calvert Cliffs Nuclear Power Plant (CCNPP), Calvert County, Maryland Subcontract No. 25237-103-HC4-CY00-00001 (Schnabel Project No. 06120048)

Dear Mr. Close:

Schnabel Engineering North, LLC (Schnabel) is pleased to submit this Addendum No. 3 (Rev. 02) to the Geotechnical Subsurface Investigation Data Report dated April 13, 2007 for the above referenced project. This data report addendum was prepared in accordance with the Technical Services Subcontract agreement between Bechtel Power Corporation (Bechtel) and Schnabel, dated March 23, 2006. Revisions to this Addendum are based on Bechtel review comments.

Our scope of work addressed in this report addendum includes resonant column and torsional shear (RCTS), moisture content, soil classification, unit weight and specific gravity geotechnical laboratory testing as prescribed in the Bechtel Geotechnical Laboratory Test Assignment Schedule dated August 11, 2006 (revised January 26, 2007) with associated cover letter dated January 29, 2007 (document number 25237-103-T7S-CY00-00003). RCTS, moisture content and unit weight testing were conducted by Fugro Consultants, Inc. in their Houston, Texas laboratory. The soil classification and specific gravity testing were performed by Schnabel's Baltimore, Maryland laboratory. A total of 13 of the 20 assigned soil samples were tested, the results of which are provided herein. A fourteenth sample (B765-UD25) did not yield a testable specimen due to a high shell content and fractured character and was subsequently rejected. The remaining six samples

"We are committed to serving our clients by exceeding their expectations."

(B310-UD19, B340-UD17, B401-UD45, B409-UD8, B429-UD13, B437-UD23) are being held at the Fugro laboratory for possible future testing. These samples will be held at the Houston laboratory until written direction is received from you for their disposition.

This addendum provides the RCTS and associated soil index test results, including the following attachments:

- 1. Summary of RCTS Test Procedures
- 2. "Final RCTS Report for the Calvert Cliffs (CC) Project," dated December 12, 2007, prepared by Fugro Consultants, Inc.
- 3. Updated "Summary of Soil Laboratory Test Results" spreadsheet, dated November 2, 2007.
- 4. Replacement test boring log pages for Appendix C of the final report.

Sampling and testing activities for this project were performed under Bechtel's quality assurance program meeting NQA-1 requirements, and according to the project technical specification (25237-103-HC4-CY00-00001, Rev. 3, Oct 06), and the approved project procedures and work plans.

We appreciate the opportunity to be of service to you for this project. Please contact Mr. Brian Banks at (301) 417-2400 if you have any questions regarding this addendum.

Very truly yours,

SCHNABEL ENGINEERING NORTH, LLC

Brian K. Banks, P.G. Senior Associate

MHD:BBbb:oa

G:\2006\06120048 Calvert Cliffs\WP\FINAL\Addendum 3\06120048 Calvert Cliffs Data Report - Addendum No 3 (07_12-13) - RCTS Results - REV 02.doc

Attachments:

- 1. Summary of RCTS Test Procedures
- 2. Final RCTS Report for the Calvert Cliffs (CC) Project, dated December 12, 2007 (343 Sheets)
- 3. Summary of Soil Laboratory Test Results (24 Sheets)
- 4. Replacement Boring Log Sheets (26 Sheets)

Schnabel Project No. 06120048

SUMMADV OF D

SUMMARY OF RCTS TEST PROCEDURES

Summary of RCTS Test Procedures Constellation Generation Group COLA Project Calvert Cliffs Nuclear Power Plant (CCNPP) Calvert County, Maryland

Fugro laboratory personnel used resonant column and torsional shear (RCTS) equipment to measure the material properties (shear modulus and material damping in shear) of soil specimens. The RCTS equipment used is of the fixed-free type, with the bottom of the specimen fixed and shear stress applied to the top.

Both the resonant column (RC) and torsional shear (TS) tests were performed in a sequential series on the same specimen over a shearing strain range from about 10^{-4} % to about 1%, depending upon specimen stiffness.

The basic operational principle is to vibrate the cylindrical specimen in first-mode torsional motion. Harmonic torsional excitation is applied to the top of the specimen over a range in frequencies, and the variation of the acceleration amplitude of the specimen with frequency is obtained. Once first-mode resonance is established, measurements of the resonant frequency and amplitude of vibration are made. These measurements are then combined with equipment characteristics and specimen size to calculate shear wave velocity and shear modulus based on elastic wave propagation.

The RC test is based on the one-dimensional wave equation derived from the theory of elasticity. The shear modulus is obtained by measuring the first-mode resonant frequency while material damping is evaluated from either the free-vibration decay curve or from the width of the frequency response curve at the so-called half power points. In the TS test, the actual stress-strain hysteresis loop is determined by means of measuring the torque-twist curve. Shear modulus is calculated from the slope of the hysteresis loop, and the hysteric damping ratio is calculated using the area of the hysteresis loop compared to the triangle made by the slope of the hysteresis loop and a line passing horizontally through the origin. The primary difference between the two types of tests is the excitation frequency. In the RC test, frequencies above 20 Hz are generally required and inertia of the specimen and drive system is considered when analyzing the measurements. The TS test is associated with slow cyclic loading frequencies generally below 10 Hz and inertia is not considered in the data analysis.

Equipment wise, the RCTS apparatus consists of four basic subsystems which are: 1) a confinement system, 2) a drive system, 3) a height-change measurement system, and 4) a motion monitoring system. The test apparatus is automated so that a microcomputer controls the test and collects the data. Compressed air is used to confine isotropically the specimen in the stainless steel confining chamber. The drive system consists of a drive plate, magnets, drive coils, a power amplifier and a signal generating source. The magnets are fixed to the drive plate and the drive coils encircle the ends of the magnets such that the drive plate excites the soil specimen in torsional motion when a current is passed through the coils. The height change of the specimen is measured by a linear variable differential transformer to determine the changes in the length and mass of the

Summary of RCTS Test Procedures

specimen during consolidation or swell, and to calculate change in the mass moment of inertia, mass density, and void ratio during testing.

RCTS testing was performed on each soil specimen at confining pressures of 0.25, 0.5, 1, 2, and 4 times the estimated effective stress. Testing at each successive stage (i.e., confining pressure condition) occurred after the specimens were allowed to consolidate at each pressure step. The soil specimen is sealed in a membrane and pore pressure in the specimen is vented to atmospheric pressure. The samples were not backpressure saturated. In general, the rate of consolidation decreased with increasing confining pressure for each specimen, and cohesive soil specimens take longer to consolidate than granular soils. Consolidation times range from about 1 day up to about 21 days or longer. Fugro laboratory personnel analyzed the resulting stress/strain curve to determine when the sample was sufficiently consolidated for testing.

At each level of shear strain amplitude, the shear modulus (G) and material damping ratio (λ) were determined. For each consolidation stage, the maximum shear modulus (G_{max}) and minimum material damping ratio (λ_{min}) were determined, along with some values of G and λ versus strain amplitude. Typically, in the 0.25-, 0.5-, and 2-times consolidation stages, shear strain amplitude less than 0.001% is applied throughout each testing sequence. In the 1- and 4-times consolidation stages, additional levels of shear strain amplitude are applied, up to that obtainable by the equipment. In each consolidation stage, after testing at the maximum strain amplitude, additional values of G were determined to monitor specimen recovery.

Because different frequencies are applied in the RC and TS tests, different motion monitoring systems are used. The motion monitoring system in the RC test consists of an accelerometer, a charge amplifier, and a data acquisition system (DAQ). The motion monitoring system in the RS test consists of two proximitor probes, an operational amplifier, a DC power supply, a U-shaped target and a digital data acquisition system to monitor torque-twist hysteresis loops of the specimen.

Each critical component of the RCTS apparatus was calibrated prior to testing for the project. Metal specimens were used to evaluate the RCTS equipment for system compliance, and the system was also checked using a standard graded Ottawa Sand specimen.

FINAL RCTS REPORT FOR THE CALVERT CLIFFS (CC) PROJECT December 12, 2007 Fugro Consultants, Inc.

Project No. 06120048/December 13, 2007

FUGRO CONSULTANTS, INC.



6100 Hillcroft (77081) PO. Box 740010 Houston, Texas 77274 Tel: 713-369-5400 Fax: 713-369-5518

December 12, 2007

Mr. Brian K. Banks, P.G. Schnabel Engineering 656 Quince Orchard Road, Suite 700 Gaithersburg, MD 20878

RE: Final RCTS Report for the Calvert Cliffs (CC) Project

Dear Mr. Banks:

Fugro has performed RCTS testing for the referenced project. Dr. Stokoe has reviewed the data and the associated results and found them to be reasonable. Fugro has incorporated all applicable comments from Dr. Kenneth Stokoe.

This report includes the following items (in hardcopy and CD-ROM):

- Index test summary table (supplied by Schnabel Engineering, Inc.),
- Applicability of Report, and
- Appendices A through M with test results for each test.

Each appendix includes the following items:

- Summary sheet,
- Figures,
- Tables, and
- Gradation curve (supplied by Schnabel Engineering, Inc.).

TUGRO

Please let us know if you have questions.

Very truly yours,

Fugro Consultants, Inc.

Magzer

Jiewu Meng, PhD, P.E. Project Engineer

Enclosures

Wellard De Groff

Bill DeGroff, P.E. Laboratory Department Manager

Index Testing Summary for RCTS Samples

Constellation Generation Group COLA Project Calvert Cliffs Nuclear Power Plant (CCNPP) Calvert County, Maryland

						Index Testing						
Appendix		Sample	Sample Top	Sample Bottom	Sample		UW	MC				
No.	Sample	No.	Depth (ft)	Depth (ft)	Туре	Lab Class	(lb/ft ³)	(%)	SG	LL	Pl	
A	B-437	6	13.5	15.5	ŪD	SP-SM	124.1	7.2	2.66	NP	NP	
В	B-301	10	33.5	35.5	UD	СН	117.5	31.1	2.74	59	42	
С	B-305	17	39.5	41.5	UD	SC	117.2	34.7	2.71	72	50	
D	B-404	14	52	53.6	UD	SP-SM	117.6	27.7	2.68	NP	NP	
E	B-401	31	138.5	140.5	UD	СН	104.1	44.1	2.63	80	49	
F	B-401	67	348.5	350.5	UD	SM	116.4	35.6	2.78	52	13	
G	B-401	48	228.5	229.6	UD	MH	98.2	58.6	2.48	139	51	
	B-301	76	368.5	370	jar							
•	B-301	77	378.5	379.5	jar							
	B-301	78	383.5	384.4	jar							
н	B-301	79	388.5	390	jar	SM	116.4	34.4	2.86	40	4	
	B-301	81	398.5	400	jar							
	B-401	68	358.5	359.4	jar							
	B-401	70	378.5	380	jar							
	B-306	17	68	70	UD	СН	115.8	30.7	2.73	62	38	
J	B-409	15	35	36.1	UD	SP-SM	124.8	23.3	2.66	NP	NP	
ĸ	B-404	22	83.5	85.1	UD	SM	115.4	32.2	2.63	53	25	
L	B-401	42	198.5	200.3	UD	SM	101.2	48.8	2.52	82	27	
М	B-409	39	95	96.6	UD	SM	109.3	33.1	2.64	61	19	

Note: Fugro performed UW and MC testing in Houston, TX; Schnabel performed Lab Class, SG, LL, PI testing in Baltimore, MD.

Applicability of Report

The laboratory testing results, as well as the conclusions and recommendations, if any, contained in this report, were completed based on our scope of services and on our established technical practice. We have prepared this report exclusively for Schnabel Engineering, Inc. to assist in their Calvert Cliffs (CC) project. We conducted our services using the standard level of care and diligence normally practiced by recognized engineering laboratories now performing similar services under similar circumstances. We intend for this report, including all illustrations, to be used in its entirety. Data as presented in this report should be used along with other available information and questions should be asked when inconsistency, if any, is observed.

APPENDIX A

CC B437-UD6 POORLY GRADED SAND (SP-SM), with silt, brown* (Non-Plastic; Gs=2.66)*

Borehole B-437 Sample UD6 Sample Depth = 13.5 to 15.5 ft RCTS Test Depth = 14.9 ft Total Unit Weight = 124.1 lb/ft³ Water Content = 7.2 % Estimated In-Situ Ko = 0.5* Estimated In-Situ Ko = 0.5*

*Data supplied by Schnabel Engineering, Inc.

FUGRO JOB #: 0401-1661 Testing Station: RC7



Figure A.1 Variation in Low-Amplitude Shear Modulus with Magnitude and Duration of Isotropic Confining Pressure from Resonant Column Tests



Figure A.2 Variation in Low-Amplitude Material Damping Ratio with Magnitude and Duration of Isotropic Confining Pressure from Resonant Column Tests



Figure A.3 Variation in Estimated Void Ratio with Magnitude and Duration of Isotropic Confining Pressure from Resonant Column Tests



Figure A.4 Variation in Low-Amplitude Shear Wave Velocity with Isotropic Confining Pressure from Resonant Column Tests



Figure A.5 Variation in Low-Amplitude Shear Modulus with Isotropic Confining Pressure from Resonant Column Tests


Figure A.6 Variation in Low-Amplitude Material Damping Ratio with Isotropic Confining Pressure from Resonant Column Tests



Figure A.7 Variation in Estimated Void Ratio with Isotropic Confining Pressure from Resonant Column Tests



Figure A.8 Comparison of the Variation in Shear Modulus with Shearing Strain and Isotropic Confining Pressure from the Resonant Column Tests



Figure A.9 Comparison of the Variation in Normalized Shear Modulus with Shearing Strain and Isotropic Confining Pressure from the Resonant Column Tests



Figure A.10 Comparison of the Variation in Material Damping Ratio with Shearing Strain and Isotropic Confining Pressure from the Resonant Column Tests



Figure A.11 Comparison of the Variation in Shear Modulus with Shearing Strain at an Isotropic Confining Pressure of 8.6 psi from the Combined RCTS Tests



Figure A.12 Comparison of the Variation in Normalized Shear Modulus with Shearing Strain at an Isotropic Confining Pressure of 8.6 psi from the Combined RCTS Tests



Figure A.13 Comparison of the Variation in Material Damping Ratio with Shearing Strain at an Isotropic Confining Pressure of 8.6 psi from the Combined RCTS Tests



Figure A.14 Comparison of the Variation in Shear Modulus with Loading Frequency at an Isotropic Confining Pressure of 8.6 psi from the Combined RCTS Tests



Figure A.15 Comparison of the Variation in Material Damping Ratio with Loading Frequency at an Isotropic Confining Pressure of 8.6 psi from the Combined RCTS Tests



Figure A.16 Comparison of the Variation in Shear Modulus with Shearing Strain at an Isotropic Confining Pressure of 34.4 psi from the Combined RCTS Tests







Figure A.18 Comparison of the Variation in Material Damping Ratio with Shearing Strain at an Isotropic Confining Pressure of 34.4 psi from the Combined RCTS Tests



Figure A.19 Comparison of the Variation in Shear Modulus with Loading Frequency at an Isotropic Confining Pressure of 34.4 psi from the Combined RCTS Tests



Figure A.20 Comparison of the Variation in Material Damping Ratio with Loading Frequency at an Isotropic Confining Pressure of 34.4 psi from the Combined RCTS Tests

Table A.1Variation in Low-Amplitude Shear Wave Velocity, Low-Amplitude Shear Modulus, Low-Amplitude
Material Damping Ratio and Estimated Void Ratio with Isotropic Confining Pressure from RC Tests
of Specimen CC B437-UD6

Isotropic Confining Pressure, σ_o		Low-Amplitude Shear Modulus, G _{max}		Low-Amplitude Shear Wave Velocity, Vs	Low-Amplitude Material Damping Ratio, Dmin	Estimated Void Ratio, e	
(psi)	(psf)	(kPa)	(ksf)	(MPa)	(fps)	(%)	
2.2	317	15	930	45	485	1.76	0.394
4.3	619	30	1202	58	557	1.66	0.393
8.6	1238	59	1637	79	644	1.28	0.392
17.2	2477	119	2517	121	797	1.02	0.382
34.4	4954	237	3474	167	933	0.53	0.379

Table A.2Variation in Shear Modulus and Material Damping Ratio with Shearing Strain from RC Tests of
Specimen CC B437-UD6; Isoptropic Confining Pressure, σ_o =8.6 psi (1.2 ksf = 59 kPa)

Peak Shearing Strain, %	Shear Modulus, G, ksf	Normalized Shear Modulus, G/G _{max}	Average ⁺ Shearing Strain, %	Material Damping Ratio ^x , D, %
6.00E-05	1637	1.00	6.00E-05	1.28
1.42E-04	1637	1.00	1.42E-04	1.36
3.49E-04	1608	0.98	3.49E-04	1.72
8.14E-04	1567	0.96	8.14E-04	2.13
1.91E-03	1474	0.90	1.63E-03	2.55
4.48E-03	1310	0.80	3.64E-03	3.05
1.05E-02	1103	0.67	8.13E-03	4.07
2.56E-02	875	0.53	1.79E-02	5.74
6.21E-02	681	0.42	3.96E-02	7.65
1.47E-01	538	0.33	8.26E-02	10.43

⁺ Average Shearing Strain from the First Three Cycles of the Free Vibration Decay Curve ^{*} Average Damping Ratio from the First Three Cycles of the Free Vibration Decay Curve

Table A.3Variation in Shear Modulus, Normalized Shear Modulus and Material Damping Ratio with Shearing
Strain from TS Tests of Specimen CC B437-UD6; Isotropic Confining Pressure, σ_0 = 8.6 psi (1.2 ksf
= 59 kPa)

First Cycle				Tenth Cycle			
Peak	Shear	Normalized	Material	Peak	Shear	Normalized	Material
Shearing	Modulus,	Shear Modulus,	Damping	Shearing	Modulus,	Shear Modulus,	Damping
Strain, %	G, ksf	G/G _{max}	Ratio, D, %	Strain, %	G, ksf	G/G _{max}	Ratio, D, %
3.38E-04	1623	1.00	1.59	3.26E-04	1659	1.00	1.27
8.87E-04	1623	1.00	1.50	8.83E-04	1653	1.00	1.49
1.81E-03	1616	1.00	1.67	1.82E-03	1601	0.97	1.66
3.54E-03	1530	0.94	2.18	3.57E-03	1516	0.91	1.96
4.76E-03	1478	0.91	2.51	4.78E-03	1472	0.89	2.53
1.07E-02	1316	0.81	3.45	1.07E-02	1310	0.79	3.32
2.69E-02	1049	0.65	7.89	2.60E-02	1086	0.65	6.41

Table A.4Variation in Shear Modulus and Material Damping Ratio with Shearing Strain from RC Tests
of Specimen CC B437-UD6; Isoptropic Confining Pressure, σ_0 = 34.4 psi (5.0 ksf = 237 kPa)

Peak Shearing Strain, %	Shear Modulus, G, ksf	Normalized Shear Modulus, G/G _{max}	Average ⁺ Shearing Strain, %	Material Damping Ratio ^x , D, %
2.30E-05	3463	1.00	2.30E-05	1.04
5.60E-05	3474	1.00	5.60E-05	1.03
1.39E-04	3451	0.99	1.39E-04	1.21
3.27E-04	3417	0.98	3.27E-04	1.38
8.17E-04	3337	0.96	8.17E-04	1.78
1.94E-03	3181	0.92	1.72E-03	1.99
4.68E-03	2913	0.84	4.02E-03	2.33
1.13E-02	2526	0.73	9.28E-03	3.05
2.62E-02	2110	0.61	2.06E-02	3.87
4.20E-02	1848	0.53	3.20E-02	4.35

⁺ Average Shearing Strain from the First Three Cycles of the Free Vibration Decay Curve [×] Average Damping Ratio from the First Three Cycles of the Free Vibration Decay Curve

Table A.5Variation in Shear Modulus, Normalized Shear Modulus and Material Damping Ratio
with Shearing Strain from TS Tests of Specimen CC B437-UD6; Isotropic Confining
Pressure, σ_0 =34.4 psi (5.0 ksf = 237 kPa)

First Cycle				Tenth Cycle			
Peak	Shear	Normalized	Material	Peak	Shear	Normalized	Material
Shearing	Modulus,	Shear	Damping	Shearing	Modulus,	Shear	Damping
Strain, %	G, ksf	Modulus,	Ratio, D,	Strain, %	G, ksf	Modulus,	Ratio, D, %
8.41E-04	3356	0.97	1.20	8.53E-04	3312	0.95	0.87
1.67E-03	3257	0.94	1.13	1.67E-03	3256	0.94	1.00
3.47E-03	3132	0.90	1.16	3.48E-03	3119	0.90	1.22
7.34E-03	2962	0.85	2.00	7.33E-03	2969	0.85	1.86



APPENDIX B

CC B301-UD10 FAT CLAY (CH), with sand, gray* (LL=59, PL=17, PI=42; Gs=2.74)*

Borehole B-301 Sample UD10 Sample Depth = 33.5 to 35.5 ft RCTS Test Depth = 35.4 ft Total Unit Weight = 117.5 lb/ft³ Water Content = 31.1 % Estimated In-Situ Ko = 0.5* Estimated In-Situ Ko = 12.0 psi*

*Data supplied by Schnabel Engineering, Inc.

FUGRO JOB #: 0401-1661 Testing Station: RC7



Figure B.1 Variation in Low-Amplitude Shear Modulus with Magnitude and Duration of Isotropic Confining Pressure from Resonant Column Tests



Figure B.2 Variation in Low-Amplitude Material Damping Ratio with Magnitude and Duration of Isotropic Confining Pressure from Resonant Column Tests



Figure B.3 Variation in Estimated Void Ratio with Magnitude and Duration of Isotropic Confining Pressure from Resonant Column Tests



Figure B.4 Variation in Low-Amplitude Shear Wave Velocity with Isotropic Confining Pressure from Resonant Column Tests



Figure B.5 Variation in Low-Amplitude Shear Modulus with Isotropic Confining Pressure from Resonant Column Tests



Figure B.6 Variation in Low-Amplitude Material Damping Ratio with Isotropic Confining Pressure from Resonant Column Tests



Figure B.7 Variation in Estimated Void Ratio with Isotropic Confining Pressure from Resonant Column Tests



Figure B.8 Comparison of the Variation in Shear Modulus with Shearing Strain and Isotropic Confining Pressure from the Resonant Column Tests



Figure B.9 Comparison of the Variation in Normalized Shear Modulus with Shearing Strain and Isotropic Confining Pressure from the Resonant Column Tests



Figure B.10 Comparison of the Variation in Material Damping Ratio with Shearing Strain and Isotropic Confining Pressure from the Resonant Column Tests



Figure B.11 Comparison of the Variation in Shear Modulus with Shearing Strain at an Isotropic Confining Pressure of 12.0 psi from the Combined RCTS Tests



Figure B.12 Comparison of the Variation in Normalized Shear Modulus with Shearing Strain at an Isotropic Confining Pressure of 12.0 psi from the Combined RCTS Tests



Figure B.13 Comparison of the Variation in Material Damping Ratio with Shearing Strain at an Isotropic Confining Pressure of 12.0 psi from the Combined RCTS Tests



Figure B.14 Comparison of the Variation in Shear Modulus with Loading Frequency at an Isotropic Confining Pressure of 12.0 psi from the Combined RCTS Tests


Figure B.15 Comparison of the Variation in Material Damping Ratio with Loading Frequency at an Isotropic Confining Pressure of 12.0 psi from the Combined RCTS Tests



Figure B.16 Comparison of the Variation in Shear Modulus with Shearing Strain at an Isotropic Confining Pressure of 48.1 psi from the Combined RCTS Tests



Figure B.17 Comparison of the Variation in Normalized Shear Modulus with Shearing Strain at an Isotropic Confining Pressure of 48.1 psi from the Combined RCTS Tests



Figure B.18 Comparison of the Variation in Material Damping Ratio with Shearing Strain at an Isotropic Confining Pressure of 48.1 psi from the Combined RCTS Tests



Figure B.19 Comparison of the Variation in Shear Modulus with Loading Frequency at an Isotropic Confining Pressure of 48.1 psi from the Combined RCTS Tests



Figure B.20 Comparison of the Variation in Material Damping Ratio with Loading Frequency at an Isotropic Confining Pressure of 48.1 psi from the Combined RCTS Tests Table B.1Variation in Low-Amplitude Shear Wave Velocity, Low-Amplitude Shear Modulus, Low-Amplitude
Material Damping Ratio and Estimated Void Ratio with Isotropic Confining Pressure from RC Tests
of Specimen CC B301-UD10

Isotropic Confining Pressure, σ_{o}		Low-Amplitude Shear Modulus, G _{max}		Low-Amplitude Shear Wave Velocity, Vs	Low-Amplitude Material Damping Ratio, Dmin	Estimated Void Ratio, e	
(psi)	(psf)	(kPa)	(ksf)	(MPa)	(fps)	(%)	
3.0	432	21	825	40	475	2.53	0.895
6.0	864	41	972	47	514	2.41	0.888
12.0	1728	83	1212	58	572	2.18	0.874
24.1	3470	166	1643	79	661	1.88	0.846
48.1	6926	331	2303	111	775	1.32	0.814

Table B.2Variation in Shear Modulus and Material Damping Ratio with Shearing Strain from RC Tests of
Specimen CC B301-UD10; Isoptropic Confining Pressure, $\sigma_o=12$ psi (1.7 ksf = 83 kPa)

Peak Shearing Strain, %	Shear Modulus, G, ksf	Normalized Shear Modulus, G/G _{max}	Average ⁺ Shearing Strain, %	Material Damping Ratio ^x , D, %
9.80E-05	1213	1.00	9.80E-05	1.87
2.01E-04	1213	1.00	2.01E-04	1.86
4.96E-04	1213	1.00	4.96E-04	1.98
1.33E-03	1205	0.99	1.33E-03	2.17
3.18E-03	1198	0.99	2.73E-03	2.48
7.88E-03	1146	0.95	6.92E-03	3.11
1.85E-02	1039	0.86	1.43E-02	3.90
4.53E-02	860	0.71	3.27E-02	5.86
1.20E-01	646	0.53	7.64E-02	8.96

⁺ Average Shearing Strain from the First Three Cycles of the Free Vibration Decay Curve [×] Average Damping Ratio from the First Three Cycles of the Free Vibration Decay Curve Table B.3Variation in Shear Modulus, Normalized Shear Modulus and Material Damping Ratio with Shearing
Strain from TS Tests of Specimen CC B301-UD10; Isotropic Confining Pressure, σ_o = 12 psi (1.7
ksf = 83 kPa)

	Fir	rst Cycle		Tenth Cycle			
Peak	Shear	Normalized	Material	Peak	Shear	Normalized	Material
Shearing	Modulus,	Shear Modulus,	Damping	Shearing	Modulus,	Shear Modulus,	Damping
Strain, %	G, ksf	G/G _{max}	Ratio, D, %	Strain, %	G, ksf	G/G _{max}	Ratio, D, %
3.09E-04	1109	1.00	1.90	3.13E-04	1095	1.00	1.69
6.03E-04	1109	1.00	1.94	6.05E-04	1095	1.00	2.14
9.31E-04	1109	1.00	2.09	9.60E-04	1095	1.00	2.23
1.89E-03	1109	1.00	2.46	1.89E-03	1095	1.00	2.34
3.88E-03	1092	0.99	2.93	3.92E-03	1082	0.99	2.75
9.62E-03	965	0.87	3.61	9.60E-03	967	0.88	3.48
2.18E-02	851	0.77	4.92	2.23E-02	833	0.76	5.07
6.48E-02	614	0.55	8.05	6.67E-02	597	0.55	8.00

Table B.4 Variation in Shear Modulus and Material Damping Ratio with Shearing Strain from RC Tests of Specimen CC B301-UD10; Isoptropic Confining Pressure, σ_o = 48.1 psi (6.9 ksf = 331 kPa)

Peak Shearing Strain, %	Shear Modulus, G, ksf	Normalized Shear Modulus, G/G _{max}	Average ⁺ Shearing Strain, %	Material Damping Ratio ^x , D, %
1.30E-04	2359	1.00	1.30E-04	1.24
2.19E-04	2359	1.00	2.19E-04	1.24
3.95E-04	2359	1.00	3.95E-04	1.24
7.64E-04	2359	1.00	7.64E-04	1.24
1.50E-03	2359	1.00	1.36E-03	1.41
2.91E-03	2340	0.99	2.52E-03	1.56
5.67E-03	2304	0.98	4.86E-03	2.05
2.14E-02	2197	0.93	1.84E-02	2.87
3.97E-02	2007	0.85	3.29E-02	3.49
7.56E-02	1746	0.74	5.79E-02	4.18
1.58E-01	1418	0.60	1.09E-01	5.65
3.79E-01	1079	0.46	2.41E-01	7.73
8.81E-01	773	0.33	5.04E-01	10.75

⁺ Average Shearing Strain from the First Three Cycles of the Free Vibration Decay Curve [×] Average Damping Ratio from the First Three Cycles of the Free Vibration Decay Curve

Table B.5Variation in Shear Modulus, Normalized Shear Modulus and Material Damping Ratio
with Shearing Strain from TS Tests of Specimen CC B301-UD10; Isotropic Confining
Pressure, σ_0 =48.1 psi (6.9 ksf = 331 kPa)

	First	Cycle		Tenth Cycle			
Peak	Shear	Normalized	Material	Peak	Shear	Normalized	Material
Shearing	Modulus,	Shear	Damping	Shearing	Modulus,	Shear	Damping
Strain, %	G, ksf	Modulus,	Ratio, D,	Strain, %	G, ksf	Modulus,	Ratio, D, %
3.03E-04	2320	1.00	1.58	3.16E-04	2290	1.00	1.70
8.75E-04	2320	1.00	1.13	8.78E-04	2290	1.00	1.47
1.74E-03	2320	1.00	1.48	1.75E-03	2290	1.00	1.18
3.54E-03	2320	1.00	1.69	3.54E-03	2290	1.00	1.91
9.67E-03	2125	0.92	2.69	9.65E-03	2130	0.93	2.61
2.14E-02	1923	0.83	3.63	2.17E-02	1893	0.83	3.67
5.55E-02	1482	0.64	6.04	5.72E-02	1438	0.63	6.16



APPENDIX C

CC B305-UD17 Clayey SAND (SC), contains shells, gray* (LL=72, PL=29, PI=50; Gs=2.71)*

Borehole B-305 Sample UD17 Sample Depth = 39.5 to 41.5 ft RCTS Test Depth = 41.0 ft Total Unit Weight = 117.2 lb/ft³ Water Content = 34.7 % Estimated In-Situ Ko = 0.5* Estimated In-Situ Ko = 0.5*

*Data supplied by Schnabel Engineering, Inc.

FUGRO JOB #: 0401-1661 Testing Station: RC7



Figure C.1 Variation in Low-Amplitude Shear Modulus with Magnitude and Duration of Isotropic Confining Pressure from Resonant Column Tests



Figure C.2 Variation in Low-Amplitude Material Damping Ratio with Magnitude and Duration of Isotropic Confining Pressure from Resonant Column Tests



Figure C.3 Variation in Estimated Void Ratio with Magnitude and Duration of Isotropic Confining Pressure from Resonant Column Tests



Figure C.4 Variation in Low-Amplitude Shear Wave Velocity with Isotropic Confining Pressure from Resonant Column Tests



Figure C.5 Variation in Low-Amplitude Shear Modulus with Isotropic Confining Pressure from Resonant Column Tests



Figure C.6 Variation in Low-Amplitude Material Damping Ratio with Isotropic Confining Pressure from Resonant Column Tests







Figure C.8 Comparison of the Variation in Shear Modulus with Shearing Strain and Isotropic Confining Pressure from the Resonant Column Tests



Figure C.9 Comparison of the Variation in Normalized Shear Modulus with Shearing Strain and Isotropic Confining Pressure from the Resonant Column Tests



Figure C.10 Comparison of the Variation in Material Damping Ratio with Shearing Strain and Isotropic Confining Pressure from the Resonant Column Tests



Figure C.11 Comparison of the Variation in Shear Modulus with Shearing Strain at an Isotropic Confining Pressure of 20.7 psi from the Combined RCTS Tests



Figure C.12 Comparison of the Variation in Normalized Shear Modulus with Shearing Strain at an Isotropic Confining Pressure of 20.7 psi from the Combined RCTS Tests



Figure C.13 Comparison of the Variation in Material Damping Ratio with Shearing Strain at an Isotropic Confining Pressure of 20.7 psi from the Combined RCTS Tests



Figure C.14 Comparison of the Variation in Shear Modulus with Loading Frequency at an Isotropic Confining Pressure of 20.7 psi from the Combined RCTS Tests



Figure C.15 Comparison of the Variation in Material Damping Ratio with Loading Frequency at an Isotropic Confining Pressure of 12.0 psi from the Combined RCTS Tests

NOTE: Figures C.16 through C.20 are NOT available¹.

¹ The noise experienced in performing the torsional shear test diminished the usefulness of the presentation of the combined resonant column and torsional shear data. Therefore, those figures (i.e., the data) are not presented.

Table C.1Variation in Low-Amplitude Shear Wave Velocity, Low-Amplitude Shear Modulus, Low-Amplitude
Material Damping Ratio and Estimated Void Ratio with Isotropic Confining Pressure from RC Tests
of Specimen CC B305-UD17

Isotropic Confining Pressure, $\sigma_{\!o}$		Low-Amplitude Shear Modulus, G _{max}		Low-Amplitude Shear Wave Velocity, Vs	Low-Amplitude Material Damping Ratio, Dmin	Estimated Void Ratio, e	
(psi)	(psf)	(kPa)	(ksf)	(MPa)	(fps)	(%)	
5.2	749	36	1425	68	624	1.59	0.944
10.3	1483	71	1574	76	656	1.48	0.941
20.7	2981	143	1931	93	725	1.43	0.932
41.4	5962	285	2580	124	833	1.19	0.913
82.8	11923	570	3178	153	918	0.72	0.883

Table C.2Variation in Shear Modulus and Material Damping Ratio with Shearing Strain from RC Tests of
Specimen CC B305-UD17; Isoptropic Confining Pressure, σ_0 =20.7 psi (3.0 ksf = 143 kPa)

Peak Shearing Strain, %	Shear Modulus, G, ksf	Normalized Shear Modulus, G/G _{max}	Average ⁺ Shearing Strain, %	Material Damping Ratio ^x , D, %
2.73E-04	1945	1.00	2.73E-04	1.59
5.73E-04	1945	1.00	5.73E-04	1.59
1.15E-03	1945	1.00	1.15E-03	1.59
2.31E-03	1938	1.00	1.98E-03	1.64
8.85E-03	1896	0.98	7.44E-03	1.74
1.67E-02	1835	0.94	1.41E-02	1.86
3.07E-02	1715	0.88	2.65E-02	2.01
5.65E-02	1562	0.80	4.73E-02	2.41
1.10E-01	1346	0.69	8.51E-02	3.35
2.41E-01	1052	0.54	1.75E-01	4.95
6.32E-01	740	0.38	3.83E-01	8.54

⁺ Average Shearing Strain from the First Three Cycles of the Free Vibration Decay Curve [×] Average Damping Ratio from the First Three Cycles of the Free Vibration Decay Curve

Table C.3	Variation in Shear Modulus, Normalized Shear Modulus and Material Damping Ratio with Shearing Strain from TS Tests of Specimen CC B305-UD17; Isotropic Confining Pressure, σ_0 = 20.7 psi (3.0 ksf = 143 kPa)	

	Fir	rst Cycle		Tenth Cycle			
Peak	Shear	Normalized	Material	Peak	Shear	Normalized	Material
Shearing	Modulus,	Shear Modulus,	Damping	Shearing	Modulus,	Shear Modulus,	Damping
Strain, %	G, ksf	G/G _{max}	Ratio, D, %	Strain, %	G, ksf	G/G _{max}	Ratio, D, %
5.00E-04	1912	1.00	1.51	4.98E-04	1894	1.00	1.35
9.81E-04	1912	1.00	1.34	1.00E-03	1894	1.00	1.29
1.99E-03	1912	1.00	1.61	2.00E-03	1894	1.00	1.41
4.09E-03	1851	0.97	1.53	4.08E-03	1857	0.98	1.55
9.66E-03	1681	0.88	2.26	9.63E-03	1687	0.89	2.26
2.14E-02	1515	0.79	3.60	2.18E-02	1492	0.79	3.72
5.52E-02	1178	0.62	5.65	5.68E-02	1145	0.60	5.67

.

Table C.4Variation in Shear Modulus and Material Damping Ratio with Shearing Strain from RC Tests
of Specimen CC B305-UD17; Isoptropic Confining Pressure, $\sigma_o = 82.8$ psi (11.9 ksf = 570 kPa)

Peak Shearing Strain, %	Shear Modulus, G, ksf	Normalized Shear Modulus, G/G _{max}	Average ⁺ Shearing Strain, %	Material Damping Ratio ^x , D, %
6.65E-04	3290	1.00	6.65E-04	0.78
1.29E-03	3290	1.00	1.29E-03	0.77
2.44E-03	3290	1.00	2.15E-03	0.88
4.90E-03	3262	0.99	4.47E-03	0.89
9.52E-03	3214	0.98	8.50E-03	0.93
1.78E-02	3120	0.95	1.64E-02	1.15
3.19E-02	2958	0.90	2.86E-02	1.44
5.75E-02	2682	0.82	4.96E-02	1.91
1.05E-01	2355	0.72	8.84E-02	2.68
2.17E-01	1863	0.57	1.74E-01	3.93
5.90E-01	1256	0.38	4.24E-01	6.15

⁺ Average Shearing Strain from the First Three Cycles of the Free Vibration Decay Curve [×] Average Damping Ratio from the First Three Cycles of the Free Vibration Decay Curve Table C.5Variation in Shear Modulus, Normalized Shear Modulus and Material Damping Ratio
with Shearing Strain from TS Tests of Specimen CC B305-UD17; Isotropic Confining
Pressure, σ_0 =82.8 psi (11.9 ksf = 570 kPa)

	First	Cycle		Tenth Cycle			
Peak	Shear	Normalized	Material	Peak	Shear	Normalized	Material
Shearing	Modulus,	Shear	Damping	Shearing	Modulus,	Shear	Damping
Strain, %	G, ksf	Modulus,	Ratio, D,	Strain, %	G, ksf	Modulus,	Ratio, D, %
*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*

Results are not available to establish well defined patterns.



APPENDIX D

CC B404-UD14 POORLY GRADED SAND (SP-SM), with silt* with shells, gray* (Non-Plastic; Gs=2.68)*

Borehole B-404 Sample UD14 Sample Depth = 52.0 to 53.6 ft RCTS Test Depth = 53.2 ft Total Unit Weight = 117.6 lb/ft³ Water Content = 27.7 % Estimated In-Situ Ko = 0.5* Estimated In-Situ Ko = 0.5*

*Data supplied by Schnabel Engineering, Inc.

FUGRO JOB #: 0401-1661 Testing Station: RC7


Figure D.1 Variation in Low-Amplitude Shear Modulus with Magnitude and Duration of Isotropic Confining Pressure from Resonant Column Tests



Figure D.2 Variation in Low-Amplitude Material Damping Ratio with Magnitude and Duration of Isotropic Confining Pressure from Resonant Column Tests



Figure D.3 Variation in Estimated Void Ratio with Magnitude and Duration of Isotropic Confining Pressure from Resonant Column Tests



Figure D.4 Variation in Low-Amplitude Shear Wave Velocity with Isotropic Confining Pressure from Resonant Column Tests



Figure D.5 Variation in Low-Amplitude Shear Modulus with Isotropic Confining Pressure from Resonant Column Tests



Figure D.6 Variation in Low-Amplitude Material Damping Ratio with Isotropic Confining Pressure from Resonant Column Tests







Figure D.8 Comparison of the Variation in Shear Modulus with Shearing Strain and Isotropic Confining Pressure from the Resonant Column Tests



Figure D.9 Comparison of the Variation in Normalized Shear Modulus with Shearing Strain and Isotropic Confining Pressure from the Resonant Column Tests



Figure D.10 Comparison of the Variation in Material Damping Ratio with Shearing Strain and Isotropic Confining Pressure from the Resonant Column Tests



Figure D.11 Comparison of the Variation in Shear Modulus with Shearing Strain at an Isotropic Confining Pressure of 21.9 psi from the Combined RCTS Tests



Figure D.12 Comparison of the Variation in Normalized Shear Modulus with Shearing Strain at an Isotropic Confining Pressure of 21.9 psi from the Combined RCTS Tests



Figure D.13 Comparison of the Variation in Material Damping Ratio with Shearing Strain at an Isotropic Confining Pressure of 21.9 psi from the Combined RCTS Tests



Figure D.14 Comparison of the Variation in Shear Modulus with Loading Frequency at an Isotropic Confining Pressure of 21.9 psi from the Combined RCTS Tests



Figure D.15 Comparison of the Variation in Material Damping Ratio with Loading Frequency at an Isotropic Confining Pressure of 21.9 psi from the Combined RCTS Tests



Figure D.16 Comparison of the Variation in Shear Modulus with Shearing Strain at an Isotropic Confining Pressure of 87.6 psi from the Combined RCTS Tests



Figure D.17 Comparison of the Variation in Normalized Shear Modulus with Shearing Strain at an Isotropic Confining Pressure of 87.6 psi from the Combined RCTS Tests



Figure D.18 Comparison of the Variation in Material Damping Ratio with Shearing Strain at an Isotropic Confining Pressure of 87.6 psi from the Combined RCTS Tests



Figure D.19 Comparison of the Variation in Shear Modulus with Loading Frequency at an Isotropic Confining Pressure of 87.6 psi from the Combined RCTS Tests



Figure D.20 Comparison of the Variation in Material Damping Ratio with Loading Frequency at an Isotropic Confining Pressure of 87.6 psi from the Combined RCTS Tests Table D.1Variation in Low-Amplitude Shear Wave Velocity, Low-Amplitude Shear Modulus, Low-Amplitude
Material Damping Ratio and Estimated Void Ratio with Isotropic Confining Pressure from RC Tests
of Specimen CC B404-UD14

Isotropic Confining Pressure, σ_o		Low-Amplitude Shear Modulus, G _{max}		Low-Amplitude Shear Wave Velocity, Vs	Low-Amplitude Material Damping Ratio, Dmin	Estimated Void Ratio, e	
(psi)	(psf)	(kPa)	(ksf)	(MPa)	(fps)	(%)	
5.5	792	38	1081	52	533	1.53	0.725
10.9	1570	75	1505	72	628	1.24	0.723
21.9	3154	151	2126	102	746	0.99	0.719
43.8	6307	302	3781	181	991	0.81	0.707
87.6	12614	604	4999	240	1137	0.57	0.697

Variation in Shear Modulus and Material Damping Ratio with Shearing Strain from RC Tests of Table D.2 Specimen CC B404-UD14; Isoptropic Confining Pressure, σ_0 =21.9 psi (3.2 ksf = 151 kPa)

Peak Shearing Strain, %	Shear Modulus, G, ksf	Normalized Shear Modulus, G/G _{max}	Average [⁺] Shearing Strain, %	Material Damping Ratio ^x , D, %
3.41E-04	2137	1.00	3.41E-04	0.93
6.94E-04	2137	1.00	6.94E-04	0.94
1.37E-03	2137	1.00	1.37E-03	0.96
2.63E-03	2137	1.00	2.63E-03	0.93
4.94E-03	2070	0.97	4.41E-03	1.04
9.13E-03	1999	0.94	8.01E-03	1.26
1.67E-02	1896	0.89	1.43E-02	1.72
3.06E-02	1779	0.83	2.51E-02	2.39
5.61E-02	1618	0.76	4.48E-02	3.09
9.74E-02	1435	0.67	7.22E-02	4.35
1.73E-01	1198	0.56	1.22E-01	5.28
3.48E-01	945	0.44	2.35E-01	6.48
5.34E-01	815	0.38	3.43E-01	7.68

⁺ Average Shearing Strain from the First Three Cycles of the Free Vibration Decay Curve * Average Damping Ratio from the First Three Cycles of the Free Vibration Decay Curve

Table D.3Variation in Shear Modulus, Normalized Shear Modulus and Material Damping Ratio with Shearing
Strain from TS Tests of Specimen CC B404-UD14; Isotropic Confining Pressure, σ_0 = 21.9 psi (3.2
ksf = 151 kPa)

First Cycle				Tenth Cycle				
Peak	Shear	Normalized	Material	Peak	Shear	Normalized	Material	
Shearing	Modulus,	Shear Modulus,	Damping	Shearing	Modulus,	Shear Modulus,	Damping	
Strain, %	G, ksf	G/G _{max}	Ratio, D, %	Strain, %	G, ksf	G/G _{max}	Ratio, D, %	
3.32E-04	2286	1.00	1.05	2.94E-04	2270	1.00	0.97	
5.81E-04	2286	1.00	1.28	6.02E-04	2270	1.00	0.79	
1.01E-03	2286	1.00	0.77	1.04E-03	2270	1.00	0.67	
1.98E-03	2286	1.00	1.07	2.05E-03	2270	1.00	1.15	
4.10E-03	2286	1.00	1.59	4.10E-03	2270	1.00	1.48	
9.55E-03	2111	0.92	2.23	9.58E-03	2104	0.93	2.28	
2.04E-02	1973	0.86	3.52	2.05E-02	1962	0.86	3.53	
5.09E-02	1584	0.69	6.25	5.10E-02	1580	0.70	6.06	

Table D.4Variation in Shear Modulus and Material Damping Ratio with Shearing Strain from RC Tests
of Specimen CC B404-UD14; Isoptropic Confining Pressure, σ_o = 87.6 psi (12.6 ksf = 604
kPa)

Peak Shearing Strain, %	Shear Modulus, G, ksf	Normalized Shear Modulus, G/G _{max}	Average ⁺ Shearing Strain, %	Material Damping Ratio ^x , D, %
2.57E-04	5044	1.00	2.57E-04	0.74
5.10E-04	5044	1.00	5.10E-04	0.66
1.05E-03	5024	1.00	1.05E-03	0.78
3.91E-03	4954	0.98	3.64E-03	0.71
7.29E-03	4849	0.96	6.85E-03	0.81
1.33E-02	4712	0.93	1.22E-02	0.89
2.35E-02	4543	0.90	2.12E-02	1.17
4.13E-02	4251	0.84	3.59E-02	1.72
7.11E-02	3846	0.76	6.00E-02	2.32
1.21E-01	3381	0.67	1.00E-01	2.90
2.11E-01	2861	0.57	1.70E-01	3.65
3.67E-01	2425	0.48	2.84E-01	4.84

⁺ Average Shearing Strain from the First Three Cycles of the Free Vibration Decay Curve [×] Average Damping Ratio from the First Three Cycles of the Free Vibration Decay Curve Table D.5Variation in Shear Modulus, Normalized Shear Modulus and Material Damping Ratio
with Shearing Strain from TS Tests of Specimen CC B404-UD14; Isotropic Confining
Pressure, σ_0 =87.6 psi (12.6 ksf = 604 kPa)

	First	: Cycle		Tenth Cycle			
Peak	Shear	Normalized	Material	Peak	Shear	Normalized	Material
Shearing	Modulus,	Shear	Damping	Shearing	Modulus,	Shear	Damping
Strain, %	G, ksf	Modulus,	Ratio, D,	Strain, %	G, ksf	Modulus,	Ratio, D, %
9.36E-04	5051	1.00	0.79	9.44E-04	5078	1.01	0.57
1.93E-03	5051	1.00	0.90	1.89E-03	5078	1.01	0.89
3.80E-03	5051	1.00	0.77	3.84E-03	5004	0.99	0.69
9.97E-03	4811	0.95	1.25	9.92E-03	4835	0.96	1.39
2.08E-02	4619	0.92	1.95	2.08E-02	4614	0.91	1.89
3.88E-02	4332	0.86	3.10	3.88E-02	4339	0.86	2.95



APPENDIX E

CC B401-UD31 SANDY FAT CLAY (CH), gray* (LL=80, PL=31, PI=49; Gs=2.63)*

Borehole B-401 Sample UD31 Sample Depth = 138.5 to 140.5 ft RCTS Test Depth = 140.0 ft Total Unit Weight = 104.1 lb/ft³ Water Content = 44.1 % Estimated In-Situ Ko = 0.5* Estimated In-Situ Ko = 0.5*

*Data supplied by Schnabel Engineering, Inc.

FUGRO JOB #: 0401-1661 Testing Station: RC7



Figure E.1 Variation in Low-Amplitude Shear Modulus with Magnitude and Duration of Isotropic Confining Pressure from Resonant Column Tests



Figure E.2 Variation in Low-Amplitude Material Damping Ratio with Magnitude and Duration of Isotropic Confining Pressure from Resonant Column Tests



Figure E.3 Variation in Estimated Void Ratio with Magnitude and Duration of Isotropic Confining Pressure from Resonant Column Tests



Figure E.4 Variation in Low-Amplitude Shear Wave Velocity with Isotropic Confining Pressure from Resonant Column Tests



Figure E.5 Variation in Low-Amplitude Shear Modulus with Isotropic Confining Pressure from Resonant Column Tests



Figure E.6 Variation in Low-Amplitude Material Damping Ratio with Isotropic Confining Pressure from Resonant Column Tests







Figure E.8 Comparison of the Variation in Shear Modulus with Shearing Strain and Isotropic Confining Pressure from the Resonant Column Tests



Figure E.9 Comparison of the Variation in Normalized Shear Modulus with Shearing Strain and Isotropic Confining Pressure from the Resonant Column Tests


Figure E.10 Comparison of the Variation in Material Damping Ratio with Shearing Strain and Isotropic Confining Pressure from the Resonant Column Tests



Figure E.11 Comparison of the Variation in Shear Modulus with Shearing Strain at an Isotropic Confining Pressure of 46.6 psi from the Combined RCTS Tests



Figure E.12 Comparison of the Variation in Normalized Shear Modulus with Shearing Strain at an Isotropic Confining Pressure of 46.6 psi from the Combined RCTS Tests



Figure E.13 Comparison of the Variation in Material Damping Ratio with Shearing Strain at an Isotropic Confining Pressure of 46.6 psi from the Combined RCTS Tests



Figure E.14 Comparison of the Variation in Shear Modulus with Loading Frequency at an Isotropic Confining Pressure of 46.6 psi from the Combined RCTS Tests



Figure E.15 Comparison of the Variation in Material Damping Ratio with Loading Frequency at an Isotropic Confining Pressure of 46.6 psi from the Combined RCTS Tests



Figure E.16 Comparison of the Variation in Shear Modulus with Shearing Strain at an Isotropic Confining Pressure of 186.3 psi from the Combined RCTS Tests



Figure E.17 Comparison of the Variation in Normalized Shear Modulus with Shearing Strain at an Isotropic Confining Pressure of 186.3 psi from the Combined RCTS Tests



Figure E.18 Comparison of the Variation in Material Damping Ratio with Shearing Strain at an Isotropic Confining Pressure of 186.3 psi from the Combined RCTS Tests



Figure E.19 Comparison of the Variation in Shear Modulus with Loading Frequency at an Isotropic Confining Pressure of 186.3 psi from the Combined RCTS Tests



Figure E.20 Comparison of the Variation in Material Damping Ratio with Loading Frequency at an Isotropic Confining Pressure of 186.3 psi from the Combined RCTS Tests Table E.1Variation in Low-Amplitude Shear Wave Velocity, Low-Amplitude Shear Modulus, Low-Amplitude
Material Damping Ratio and Estimated Void Ratio with Isotropic Confining Pressure from RC Tests
of Specimen CC B401-UD31

Isotropic Confining Pressure, σ_{o}		Low-Amplitude Shear Modulus, G _{max}		Low-Amplitude Shear Wave Velocity, Vs	Low-Amplitude Material Damping Ratio, Dmin	Estimated Void Ratio, e	
(psi)	(psf)	(kPa)	(ksf)	(MPa)	(fps)	(%)	
11.6	1670	80	2018	97	785	1.36	1.302
23.3	3355	161	2302	110	836	1.16	1.294
46.6	6710	321	2738	131	910	1.07	1.280
93.1	13406	641	3478	167	1020	0.83	1.257
186.3	26827	1284	4208	202	1115	0.73	1.228

Table E.2 Variation in Shear Modulus and Material Damping Ratio with Shearing Strain from RC Tests of Specimen CC B401-UD31; Isoptropic Confining Pressure, σ_0 =46.6 psi (6.7 ksf = 321 kPa)

Peak Shearing Strain, %	Shear Modulus, G, ksf	Normalized Shear Modulus, G/G _{max}	Average ⁺ Shearing Strain, %	Material Damping Ratio ^x , D, %
3.93E-04	2722	1.00	3.93E-04	1.24
6.95E-04	2722	1.00	6.95E-04	1.21
1.23E-03	2722	1.00	1.23E-03	1.27
2.15E-03	2722	1.00	2.15E-03	1.31
4.16E-03	2722	1.00	3.66E-03	1.35
9.87E-03	2722	1.00	8.68E-03	1.64
2.04E-02	2662	0.98	1.78E-02	1.91
3.91E-02	2486	0.91	3.24E-02	2.31
7.42E-02	2245	0.82	6.01E-02	2.99
1.54E-01	1907	0.70	1.14E-01	4.32
3.07E-01	1578	0.58	2.15E-01	5.67
4.91E-01	1365	0.50	3.19E-01	7.02

⁺ Average Shearing Strain from the First Three Cycles of the Free Vibration Decay Curve [×] Average Damping Ratio from the First Three Cycles of the Free Vibration Decay Curve Table E.3Variation in Shear Modulus, Normalized Shear Modulus and Material Damping Ratio with Shearing
Strain from TS Tests of Specimen CC B401-UD31; Isotropic Confining Pressure, σ_0 = 46.6 psi (6.7
ksf =321 kPa)

	Fir	st Cycle		Tenth Cycle			
Peak	Shear	Normalized	Material	Peak	Shear	Normalized	Material
Shearing	Modulus,	Shear Modulus,	Damping	Shearing	Modulus,	Shear Modulus,	Damping
Strain, %	G, ksf	G/G _{max}	Ratio, D, %	Strain, %	G, ksf	G/G _{max}	Ratio, D, %
5.40E-04	2687	0.98	0.71	5.77E-04	2633	1.00	0.80
1.09E-03	2692	0.99	1.05	1.12E-03	2633	1.00	0.97
2.14E-03	2733	1.00	1.01	2.14E-03	2633	1.00	0.89
4.33E-03	2701	0.99	1.04	4.37E-03	2633	1.00	0.88

Table E.4Variation in Shear Modulus and Material Damping Ratio with Shearing Strain from RC Tests
of Specimen CC B401-UD31; Isoptropic Confining Pressure, σ_0 = 186.3 psi (26.8 ksf = 1284
kPa)

Peak Shearing Strain, %	Shear Modulus, G, ksf	Normalized Shear Modulus, G/G _{max}	Average ⁺ Shearing Strain, %	Material Damping Ratio ^x , D, %
5.11E-04	4244	1.00	5.11E-04	1.17
1.06E-03	4244	1.00	1.06E-03	1.18
2.12E-03	4244	1.00	2.12E-03	1.16
4.21E-03	4244	1.00	4.21E-03	1.16
8.30E-03	4211	0.99	7.30E-03	1.36
1.59E-02	4146	0.97	1.41E-02	1.55
2.90E-02	4018	0.94	2.55E-02	1.82
5.14E-02	3799	0.89	4.42E-02	2.25
9.11E-02	3497	0.82	7.38E-02	2.79
1.69E-01	3094	0.73	1.32E-01	3.43
3.45E-01	2563	0.60	2.48E-01	5.02
6.57E-01	2073	0.49	4.47E-01	6.25

⁺ Average Shearing Strain from the First Three Cycles of the Free Vibration Decay Curve [×] Average Damping Ratio from the First Three Cycles of the Free Vibration Decay Curve

Table E.5Variation in Shear Modulus, Normalized Shear Modulus and Material Damping Ratio
with Shearing Strain from TS Tests of Specimen CC B401-UD31; Isotropic Confining
Pressure, σ_0 =186.3 psi (26.8 ksf = 1284 kPa)

	First	t Cycle		Tenth Cycle			
. Peak	Shear	Normalized	Material	Peak	Shear	Normalized	Material
Shearing	Modulus,	Shear	Damping	Shearing	Modulus,	Shear	Damping
Strain, %	G, ksf	Modulus,	Ratio, D,	Strain, %	G, ksf	Modulus,	Ratio, D, %
3.38E-03	3989	0.99	1.23	3.35E-03	4021	1.00	1.30
6.72E-03	4014	1.00	1.26	6.74E-03	3999	0.99	1.58
1.01E-02	4007	1.00	1.55	1.01E-02	4007	1.00	1.62
2.16E-02	3825	0.95	1.89	2.17E-02	3807	0.95	1.83



APPENDIX F

CC B401-UD67 Silty SAND (SM), brown* (LL=52, PL=39, PI=13; Gs=2.78)*

Borehole B-401 Sample UD67 Sample Depth = 348.5 to 350.5 ft RCTS Test Depth = 349.0 ft Total Unit Weight = 116.4 lb/ft³ Water Content = 35.6 % Estimated In-Situ Ko = 0.5* Estimated In-Situ Ko = 113.9 psi*

*Data supplied by Schnabel Engineering, Inc.

FUGRO JOB #: 0401-1661 Testing Station: RC7



Figure F.1 Variation in Low-Amplitude Shear Modulus with Magnitude and Duration of Isotropic Confining Pressure from Resonant Column Tests



Figure F.2 Variation in Low-Amplitude Material Damping Ratio with Magnitude and Duration of Isotropic Confining Pressure from Resonant Column Tests



Figure F.3 Variation in Estimated Void Ratio with Magnitude and Duration of Isotropic Confining Pressure from Resonant Column Tests



Figure F.4 Variation in Low-Amplitude Shear Wave Velocity with Isotropic Confining Pressure from Resonant Column Tests



Figure F.5 Variation in Low-Amplitude Shear Modulus with Isotropic Confining Pressure from Resonant Column Tests



Figure F.6 Variation in Low-Amplitude Material Damping Ratio with Isotropic Confining Pressure from Resonant Column Tests



Figure F.7 Variation in Estimated Void Ratio with Isotropic Confining Pressure from Resonant Column Tests



Figure F.8 Comparison of the Variation in Shear Modulus with Shearing Strain and Isotropic Confining Pressure from the Resonant Column Tests



Figure F.9 Comparison of the Variation in Normalized Shear Modulus with Shearing Strain and Isotropic Confining Pressure from the Resonant Column Tests



Figure F.10 Comparison of the Variation in Material Damping Ratio with Shearing Strain and Isotropic Confining Pressure from the Resonant Column Tests



Figure F.11 Comparison of the Variation in Shear Modulus with Shearing Strain at an Isotropic Confining Pressure of 113.9 psi from the Combined RCTS Tests



Figure F.12 Comparison of the Variation in Normalized Shear Modulus with Shearing Strain at an Isotropic Confining Pressure of 113.9 psi from the Combined RCTS Tests



Figure F.13 Comparison of the Variation in Material Damping Ratio with Shearing Strain at an Isotropic Confining Pressure of 113.9 psi from the Combined RCTS Tests



Figure F.14 Comparison of the Variation in Shear Modulus with Loading Frequency at an Isotropic Confining Pressure of 113.9 psi from the Combined RCTS Tests



Figure F.15 Comparison of the Variation in Material Damping Ratio with Loading Frequency at an Isotropic Confining Pressure of 113.9 psi from the Combined RCTS Tests NOTE: Figures F.16 through F.20 are NOT available¹.

¹ Figures F.16 through F.20 are not provided because testing at higher pressure(s) was adversely affected by high straining at 113.9 psi.

Table F.1Variation in Low-Amplitude Shear Wave Velocity, Low-Amplitude Shear Modulus, Low-Amplitude
Material Damping Ratio and Estimated Void Ratio with Isotropic Confining Pressure from RC Tests
of Specimen CC B401-UD67

Isotropic Confining Pressure, σ_{o}		Low-Amplitude Shear Modulus, G _{max}		Low-Amplitude Shear Wave Velocity, Vs	Low-Amplitude Material Damping Ratio, Dmin	Estimated Void Ratio, e	
(psi)	(psf)	(kPa)	(ksf)	(MPa)	(fps)	(%)	
28.5	4104	196	2793	134	874	3.34	0.942
56.9	8194	392	3798	182	1014	3.25	0.921
113.9	16402	785	5447	261	1202	3.15	0.885

Variation in Shear Modulus and Material Damping Ratio with Shearing Strain from RC Tests of Table F.2 Specimen CC B401-UD67; Isoptropic Confining Pressure, σ_0 =113.9 psi (16.4 ksf = 785 kPa)

Peak Shearing Strain, %	Shear Modulus, G, ksf	Normalized Shear Modulus, G/G _{max}	Average ⁺ Shearing Strain, %	Material Damping Ratio ^x , D, %
4.00E-05	5584	1.00	4.00E-05	2.98
8.00E-05	5584	1.00	8.00E-05	3.01
1.58E-04	5584	1.00	1.58E-04	3.07
3.15E-04	5584	1.00	3.15E-04	3.11
6.52E-04	5584	1.00	6.52E-04	3.27
1.31E-03	5556	0.99	1.05E-03	3.38
2.59E-03	5520	0.99	2.07E-03	3.60
5.09E-03	5414	0.97	4.12E-03	3.81
9.84E-03	5240	0.94	7.48E-03	4.03
1.87E-02	4967	0.89	1.39E-02	4.55
3.59E-02	4508	0.81	2.66E-02	5.01
7.02E-02	3972	0.71	4.91E-02	5.99
1.42E-01	3365	0.60	9.24E-02	7.70

⁺ Average Shearing Strain from the First Three Cycles of the Free Vibration Decay Curve ^x Average Damping Ratio from the First Three Cycles of the Free Vibration Decay Curve
Table F.3Variation in Shear Modulus, Normalized Shear Modulus and Material Damping Ratio with Shearing
Strain from TS Tests of Specimen CC B401-UD67; Isotropic Confining Pressure, σ_0 = 113.9 psi
(16.4 ksf = 785 kPa)

First Cycle				Tenth Cycle				
Peak	Shear	Normalized	Material	Peak Shear Normalized		Normalized	Material	
Shearing	Modulus,	Shear Modulus,	Damping	Shearing	Modulus,	Shear Modulus,	Damping	
Strain, %	G, ksf	G/G _{max}	Ratio, D, %	Strain, %	G, ksf	G/G _{max}	Ratio, D, %	
6.31E-04	5606	1.00	0.79	6.36E-04	5621	1.00	0.98	
1.07E-03	5606	1.00	0.52	1.06E-03	5621	1.00	1.00	
2.15E-03	5592	1.00	0.82	2.13E-03	5621	1.00	0.72	
4.34E-03	5545	0.99	1.20	4.34E-03	5535	0.98	0.75	
1.05E-02	5232	0.93	1.83	1.04E-02	5257	0.94	1.80	
2.22E-02	4936	0.88	2.49	2.24E-02	4901	0.87	2.50	
3.92E-02	4523	0.81	3.31	3.91E-02	4532	0.81	3.24	

Table F.4Variation in Shear Modulus and Material Damping Ratio with Shearing Strain from RC Tests
of Specimen CC B401-UD67; Isoptropic Confining Pressure, σ_0 = 455.6 psi (65.6 ksf = 3139
kPa)

Peak Shearing Strain, %	Shear Modulus, G, ksf	Normalized Shear Modulus, G/G _{max}	Average ⁺ Shearing Strain, %	Material Damping Ratio ^x , D, %
			·	

⁺ Average Shearing Strain from the First Three Cycles of the Free Vibration Decay Curve [×] Average Damping Ratio from the First Three Cycles of the Free Vibration Decay Curve Table F.5Variation in Shear Modulus, Normalized Shear Modulus and Material Damping Ratio
with Shearing Strain from TS Tests of Specimen CC B401-UD67; Isotropic Confining
Pressure, σ_o =455.6 psi (65.6 ksf = 3139 kPa)

First Cycle				Tenth Cycle			
Peak	Shear	Normalized	Material	rial Peak Shear Normalized M			
Shearing	Modulus,	Shear	Damping	Shearing	Modulus,	Shear	Damping
Strain, %	G, ksf	Modulus,	Ratio, D,	Strain, % G, ksf Modulus, Ratio			Ratio, D, %



APPENDIX G

CC B401-UD48 ELASTIC SILT (MH), with sand, green* (LL=139, PL=88, PI=51; Gs=2.48)*

Borehole B-401 Sample UD48 Sample Depth = 228.5 to 229.6 ft RCTS Test Depth = 229.0 ft Total Unit Weight = 98.2 lb/ft³ Water Content = 58.6 % Estimated In-Situ Ko = 0.5* Estimated In-Situ Ko = 0.5*

*Data supplied by Schnabel Engineering, Inc.

FUGRO JOB #: 0401-1661 Testing Station: RC7



Figure G.1 Variation in Low-Amplitude Shear Modulus with Magnitude and Duration of Isotropic Confining Pressure from Resonant Column Tests



Figure G.2 Variation in Low-Amplitude Material Damping Ratio with Magnitude and Duration of Isotropic Confining Pressure from Resonant Column Tests



Figure G.3 Variation in Estimated Void Ratio with Magnitude and Duration of Isotropic Confining Pressure from Resonant Column Tests







Figure G.5 Variation in Low-Amplitude Shear Modulus with Isotropic Confining Pressure from Resonant Column Tests



Figure G.6 Variation in Low-Amplitude Material Damping Ratio with Isotropic Confining Pressure from Resonant Column Tests



Figure G.7 Variation in Estimated Void Ratio with Isotropic Confining Pressure from Resonant Column Tests



Figure G.8 Comparison of the Variation in Shear Modulus with Shearing Strain and Isotropic Confining Pressure from the Resonant Column Tests



Figure G.9 Comparison of the Variation in Normalized Shear Modulus with Shearing Strain and Isotropic Confining Pressure from the Resonant Column Tests



Figure G.10 Comparison of the Variation in Material Damping Ratio with Shearing Strain and Isotropic Confining Pressure from the Resonant Column Tests



Figure G.11 Comparison of the Variation in Shear Modulus with Shearing Strain at an Isotropic Confining Pressure of 70.3 psi from the Combined RCTS Tests



Figure G.12 Comparison of the Variation in Normalized Shear Modulus with Shearing Strain at an Isotropic Confining Pressure of 70.3 psi from the Combined RCTS Tests



Figure G.13 Comparison of the Variation in Material Damping Ratio with Shearing Strain at an Isotropic Confining Pressure of 70.3 psi from the Combined RCTS Tests



Figure G.14 Comparison of the Variation in Shear Modulus with Loading Frequency at an Isotropic Confining Pressure of 70.3 psi from the Combined RCTS Tests



Figure G.15 Comparison of the Variation in Material Damping Ratio with Loading Frequency at an Isotropic Confining Pressure of 70.3 psi from the Combined RCTS Tests



Figure G.16 Comparison of the Variation in Shear Modulus with Shearing Strain at an Isotropic Confining Pressure of 281.3 psi from the Combined RCTS Tests



Figure G.17 Comparison of the Variation in Normalized Shear Modulus with Shearing Strain at an Isotropic Confining Pressure of 281.3 psi from the Combined RCTS Tests



Figure G.18 Comparison of the Variation in Material Damping Ratio with Shearing Strain at an Isotropic Confining Pressure of 281.3 psi from the Combined RCTS Tests



Figure G.19 Comparison of the Variation in Shear Modulus with Loading Frequency at an Isotropic Confining Pressure of 281.3 psi from the Combined RCTS Tests



Figure G.20 Comparison of the Variation in Material Damping Ratio with Loading Frequency at an Isotropic Confining Pressure of 281.3 psi from the Combined RCTS Tests Table G.1Variation in Low-Amplitude Shear Wave Velocity, Low-Amplitude Shear Modulus, Low-Amplitude
Material Damping Ratio and Estimated Void Ratio with Isotropic Confining Pressure from RC Tests
of Specimen CC B401-UD48

Isotropic Confining Pressure, σ_o		Low-Ampli Modulu	tude Shear ıs, G _{max}	Low-Amplitude Shear Wave Velocity, Vs	Low-Amplitude Material Damping Ratio, Dmin	Estimated Void Ratio, e	
(psi)	(psf)	(kPa)	(ksf)	(MPa)	(fps)	(%)	
17.6	2534 ⁻	121	2471	119	897	1.02	1.706
35.2	5069	243	2936	141	976	0.83	1.697
70.3	10123	484	3615	174	1080	0.75	1.682
140.6	20246	969	4239	203	1165	0.69	1.659
281.3	40507	1938	4906	235	1234	0.59	1.599

Table G.2Variation in Shear Modulus and Material Damping Ratio with Shearing Strain from RC Tests of
Specimen CC B401-UD48; Isoptropic Confining Pressure, $\sigma_0=70.3$ psi (10.1 ksf = 484 kPa)

Peak Shearing Strain, %	Shear Modulus, G, ksf	Normalized Shear Modulus, G/G _{max}	Average ⁺ Shearing Strain, %	Material Damping Ratio ^x , D, %
1.88E-04	3628	1.00	1.88E-04	0.98
3.83E-04	3628	1.00	3.83E-04	0.98
8.18E-04	3628	1.00	8.18E-04	0.95
1.62E-03	3628	1.00	1.44E-03	0.92
3.22E-03	3628	1.00	2.96E-03	0.92
6.24E-03	3628	1.00	5.68E-03	0.94
1.20E-02	3570	0.98	1.08E-02	0.96
2.19E-02	3483	0.96	1.95E-02	1.12
3.86E-02	3342	0.92	3.39E-02	1.31
6.82E-02	3122	0.86	5.87E-02	1.73
1.24E-01	2807	0.77	1.04E-01	2.32
2.34E-01	2437	0.67	1.87E-01	3.22
4.69E-01	1981	0.55	3.38E-01	5.08

⁺ Average Shearing Strain from the First Three Cycles of the Free Vibration Decay Curve [×] Average Damping Ratio from the First Three Cycles of the Free Vibration Decay Curve

Table G.3Variation in Shear Modulus, Normalized Shear Modulus and Material Damping Ratio with Shearing
Strain from TS Tests of Specimen CC B401-UD48; Isotropic Confining Pressure, σ_0 =70.3 psi (10.1
ksf = 484 kPa)

First Cycle				Tenth Cycle				
Peak	Shear	Normalized	Material	Peak	Shear	Normalized	Material	
Shearing	Modulus,	Shear Modulus,	Damping	Shearing	Modulus,	Shear Modulus,	Damping	
Strain, %	G, ksf	G/G _{max}	Ratio, D, %	Strain, %	G, ksf	G/G _{max}	Ratio, D, %	
1.03E-03	3434	1.00	0.74	1.00E-03	3458	1.00	0.66	
2.02E-03	3434	1.00	0.67	2.04E-03	3458	1.00	0.65	
4.11E-03	3434	1.00	0.66	4.09E-03	3458	1.00	0.65	
1.06E-02	3300	0.96	1.04	1.07E-02	3292	0.95	1.02	
2.25E-02	3117	0.91	1.73	2.27E-02	3097	0.90	1.52	
5.01E-02	2805	0.82	2.70	5.05E-02	2787	0.81	2.66	

Table G.4Variation in Shear Modulus and Material Damping Ratio with Shearing Strain from RC Tests
of Specimen CC B401-UD48; Isoptropic Confining Pressure, σ_0 = 281.3 psi (40.5 ksf = 1938
kPa)

Peak	Shear Modulus	Normalized Shear	Average ⁺	Material Damping
Strain, %	G, ksf	Modulus, G/G _{max}	Strain, %	Ratio ^x , D, %
1.31E-04	4908	1.00	1.31E-04	0.83
2.63E-04	4908	1.00	2.63E-04	0.83
5.21E-04	4908	1.00	5.21E-04	0.83
1.08E-03	4908	1.00	1.08E-03	0.83
2.15E-03	4908	1.00	1.98E-03	0.80
4.26E-03	4908	1.00	3.88E-03	0.81
8.33E-03	4874	0.99	7.50E-03	0.82
1.59E-02	4840	0.99	1.44E-02	0.82
2.94E-02	4738	0.97	2.70E-02	0.96
5.27E-02	4537	0.92	4.75E-02	1.10
9.31E-02	4244	0.86	8.19E-02	1.41
1.67E-01	3838	0.78	1.44E-01	2.03
3.15E-01	3328	0.68	2.55E-01	3.09
6.23E-01	2685	0.55	5.23E-01	4.70

⁺ Average Shearing Strain from the First Three Cycles of the Free Vibration Decay Curve [×] Average Damping Ratio from the First Three Cycles of the Free Vibration Decay Curve

Table G.5Variation in Shear Modulus, Normalized Shear Modulus and Material Damping Ratio
with Shearing Strain from TS Tests of Specimen CC B401-UD48; Isotropic Confining
Pressure, σ_o =281.3 psi (40.5 ksf = 1938 kPa)

First Cycle					Ten	th Cycle	
Peak	Shear	Normalized	Material	Peak	Shear	Normalized	Material
Shearing	Modulus,	Shear	Damping	Shearing	Modulus,	Shear	Damping
Strain, %	G, ksf	Modulus,	Ratio, D,	Strain, %	G, ksf	Modulus,	Ratio, D, %
				9.41E-04	4644	1.00	0.62
				1.85E-03	4644	1.00	0.79
3.72E-03	4670	1.00	0.66	3.76E-03	4644	1.00	0.71
1.02E-02	4619	0.99	0.97	1.02E-02	4609	0.99	1.03
2.09E-02	4506	0.96	1.22	2.10E-02	4490	0.97	1.20
4.14E-02	4292	0.92	1.77	4.14E-02	4299	0.93	1.76



APPENDIX H

CC B301& 401Mixture Silty SAND (SM), dark gray* (LL=40, PL=36, PI=4; Gs=2.86)*

Borehole B-301&-401 Reconstituted Specimen Sample Depth = 359 to 385 ft RCTS Test Depth = 359 to 385 ft Total Unit Weight = 116.4 lb/ft³ Water Content = 34.4 % Estimated In-Situ Ko = 0.5* Estimated In-Situ Ko = 120.4 psi*

*Data supplied by Schnabel Engineering, Inc.

FUGRO JOB #: 0401-1661 Testing Station: RC7



Figure H.1 Variation in Low-Amplitude Shear Modulus with Magnitude and Duration of Isotropic Confining Pressure from Resonant Column Tests



Figure H.2 Variation in Low-Amplitude Material Damping Ratio with Magnitude and Duration of Isotropic Confining Pressure from Resonant Column Tests



Figure H.3 Variation in Estimated Void Ratio with Magnitude and Duration of Isotropic Confining Pressure from Resonant Column Tests



Figure H.4 Variation in Low-Amplitude Shear Wave Velocity with Isotropic Confining Pressure from Resonant Column Tests


Figure H.5 Variation in Low-Amplitude Shear Modulus with Isotropic Confining Pressure from Resonant Column Tests

> . .



Figure H.6 Variation in Low-Amplitude Material Damping Ratio with Isotropic Confining Pressure from Resonant Column Tests



Figure H.7 Variation in Estimated Void Ratio with Isotropic Confining Pressure from Resonant Column Tests



Figure H.8 Comparison of the Variation in Shear Modulus with Shearing Strain and Isotropic Confining Pressure from the Resonant Column Tests



Figure H.9 Comparison of the Variation in Normalized Shear Modulus with Shearing Strain and Isotropic Confining Pressure from the Resonant Column Tests



Figure H.10 Comparison of the Variation in Material Damping Ratio with Shearing Strain and Isotropic Confining Pressure from the Resonant Column Tests



Figure H.11 Comparison of the Variation in Shear Modulus with Shearing Strain at an Isotropic Confining Pressure of 120.4 psi from the Combined RCTS Tests



Figure H.12 Comparison of the Variation in Normalized Shear Modulus with Shearing Strain at an Isotropic Confining Pressure of 120.4 psi from the Combined RCTS Tests



Figure H.13 Comparison of the Variation in Material Damping Ratio with Shearing Strain at an Isotropic Confining Pressure of 120.4 psi from the Combined RCTS Tests



Figure H.14 Comparison of the Variation in Shear Modulus with Loading Frequency at an Isotropic Confining Pressure of 120.4 psi from the Combined RCTS Tests



Figure H.15 Comparison of the Variation in Material Damping Ratio with Loading Frequency at an Isotropic Confining Pressure of 120.4 psi from the Combined RCTS Tests NOTE: Figures H.16 through H.20 are NOT available.

Table H.1Variation in Low-Amplitude Shear Wave Velocity, Low-Amplitude Shear Modulus, Low-Amplitude
Material Damping Ratio and Estimated Void Ratio with Isotropic Confining Pressure from RC Tests
of Specimen CC B301& 401Mixture

.

Isotropic Confining Pressure, σ_o		Low-Amplitude Shear Modulus, G _{max}		Low-Amplitude Shear Wave Velocity, Vs	Low-Amplitude Material Damping Ratio, Dmin	Estimated Void Ratio, e	
(psi)	(psf)	(kPa)	(ksf)	(MPa)	(fps)	(%)	
30.1	4334	207	2820	135	917	3.21	1.098
60.2	8669	415	4386	211	1133	2.83	1.059
120.4	17338	830	6846	329	1396	2.48	1.005
240.7	34661	1658	11012	529	1739		0.934
455.0	65520	3135	17374	834	2135		0.847

Table H.2Variation in Shear Modulus and Material Damping Ratio with Shearing Strain from RC Tests of
Specimen CC B301& 401Mixture; Isoptropic Confining Pressure, σ_0 =120.4 psi (17.3 ksf = 830 kPa)

Peak Shearing Strain, %	Shear Modulus, G, ksf	Normalized Shear Modulus, G/G _{max}	Average ⁺ Shearing Strain, %	Material Damping Ratio ^x , D, %
1.08E-04	6943	1.00	1.08E-04	2.78
2.15E-04	6943	1.00	2.15E-04	2.78
4.28E-04	6943	1.00	4.28E-04	2.88
8.78E-04	6943	1.00	8.78E-04	2.94
1.75E-03	6867	0.99	1.47E-03	2.96
3.45E-03	6753	0.97	2.72E-03	3.33
6.70E-03	6528	0.94	5.23E-03	3.96
1.17E-02	6194	0.89	8.44E-03	4.47
2.51E-02	5447	0.78	1.84E-02	5.74
5.10E-02	4510	0.65	3.36E-02	6.86
1.04E-01	3844	0.55	6.55E-02	8.19

⁺ Average Shearing Strain from the First Three Cycles of the Free Vibration Decay Curve [×] Average Damping Ratio from the First Three Cycles of the Free Vibration Decay Curve

Table H.3Variation in Shear Modulus, Normalized Shear Modulus and Material Damping Ratio with Shearing
Strain from TS Tests of Specimen CC B301& 401Mixture; Isotropic Confining Pressure, σ_0 =120.4
psi (17.3 ksf = 830 kPa)

First Cycle				Tenth Cycle				
Peak	Shear	Normalized	Material	Peak	Shear	Normalized	Material	
Shearing	Modulus,	Shear Modulus,	Damping	Shearing	Modulus,	Shear Modulus,	Damping	
Strain, %	G, ksf	G/G _{max}	Ratio, D, %	Strain, %	G, ksf	G/G _{max}	Ratio, D, %	
4.95E-04	6530	1.00	1.42	4.97E-04	6587	0.99	1.16	
9.93E-04	6530	1.00	1.37	9.72E-04	6667	1.00	0.94	
1.98E-03	6529	1.00	1.11	1.95E-03	6623	0.99	1.05	
3.99E-03	6483	0.99	1.59	4.03E-03	6424	0.96	1.69	
1.01E-02	6066	0.93	2.16	1.01E-02	6079	0.91	2.04	
2.17E-02	5665	0.87	3.03	2.19E-02	5625	0.84	2.99	

Table H.4Variation in Shear Modulus and Material Damping Ratio with Shearing Strain from RC Tests
of Specimen CC B301& 401Mixture; Isoptropic Confining Pressure, σ_0 = 455 psi (65.5 ksf =
3135 kPa)

Peak Shearing Strain, %	Shear Modulus, G, ksf	Normalized Shear Modulus, G/G _{max}	Average ⁺ Shearing Strain, %	Material Damping Ratio ^x , D, %

⁺ Average Shearing Strain from the First Three Cycles of the Free Vibration Decay Curve [×] Average Damping Ratio from the First Three Cycles of the Free Vibration Decay Curve Table H.5Variation in Shear Modulus, Normalized Shear Modulus and Material Damping Ratio
with Shearing Strain from TS Tests of Specimen CC B301& 401Mixture; Isotropic
Confining Pressure, σ_o =455 psi (65.5 ksf = 3135 kPa)

First Cycle				Tenth Cycle				
Peak	Shear	Normalized	Material	Peak	Shear	Normalized	Material	
Shearing	Modulus,	Shear	Damping	Shearing	Modulus,	Shear	Damping	
Strain, %	G, ksf	Modulus,	Ratio, D,	Strain, %	G, ksf	Modulus,	Ratio, D, %	

