

**DRAFT DATA REPORT Rev 0
GEOTECHNICAL EXPLORATION AND TESTING**

**EXELON TEXAS COL PROJECT
VICTORIA COUNTY, TEXAS
POWER BLOCK**

July 10, 2008

**VOLUME 4
Appendix F – RCTS Data**

Prepared By:

**MACTEC Engineering and Consulting, Inc.
Raleigh, North Carolina**

MACTEC Project No. 6468-07-1777

Prepared For:

**Bechtel Power Corporation
Subcontract No. 25352-102-HC4-CY00-00001**

CONTENTS

Appendix A – B2269 - UD15
Appendix B – B2182 - UD3
Appendix C – B2182 – UD32
Appendix D – B2182 – UD18
Appendix E – B2182 – UD9
Appendix F – B2274 – UD 19
Appendix G – B2274 – UD23
Appendix H – B2269 – UD19
Appendix I – B2174 – UD8
Appendix J – B2174 – UD6
Appendix K – B2174 – UD28
Appendix L – B2174 – UD 31
Appendix M – B2174 – UD30
Appendix N – B2182 – UD14
Appendix O – B2274 – UD24

Test Completed at University of Texas

Appendix A – B2181 – UD24

FUGRO CONSULTANTS, INC.



February 18, 2008

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

Ms. Siesta Williams
MACTEC
3301 Atlantic Avenue
Raleigh, NC 27604

RE: One (1) Report For The EXELON COL Project

Dear Ms. Williams:

Fugro has completed one (1) RCTS test, which is B2269-UD15, for the EXELON project. Fugro has incorporated, as needed, Dr. Kenneth Stokoe's comments into the final report. The final report and the associated RCTS Test Approval by Dr. Kenneth Stokoe have been attached.

Please let us know if you have questions. Thanks.

Very truly yours,

Fugro Consultants, Inc.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Meng Jiewu".

Jiewu Meng, PhD, P.E.
Project Engineer

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Bill DeGroff".

Bill DeGroff, P.E.
Laboratory Department Manager

Enclosures

Cc: Kathryn White, in PDF



RCTS TEST APROVAL

PROJECT SITE/NAME	EXELON
-------------------	--------

Test ID	Sample ID	Depth B.S. (Ft)	Approved By (Initials)	Date
RCTS#A	B2269-UD15	216	<i>[Signature]</i>	

One RCTS test for the site referenced above was tested, and one report was prepared, by Fugro Consultants, Inc.

I have reviewed the data and associated results listed above and found them to be reasonable.

Approved By:

[Signature]

Dr. Kenneth Stokoe

④ minor suggested changes
as noted on several
figs.

APPENDIX A

Specimen EXELON B2269-UD15
(Index Properties Not Available)

Borehole B2269

Sample UD15

Depth = 216.2 ft (65.9 m)

Total Unit Weight = 122.7 lb/ft³

Water Content = 13.9 %

Estimated In-Situ K_o = 0.5

Estimated In-Situ Mean Effective
Stress = 77 psi

FUGRO JOB #: 0401-08-1686
Testing Station: RC9




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 77 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 77 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 77 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 77 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 77 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 308 psi from the Combined RCTS Tests




Figure A.17 Comparison of the Variation in Normalized Shear Modulus with Shearing Strain at an Isotropic Confining Pressure of 308 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 308 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 308 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 308 psi from the Combined RCTS Tests

Table A.1 Variation 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 EXELON B2269-UD15

Isotropic Confining Pressure, σ_o			Low-Amplitude Shear Modulus, G_{max}		Low-Amplitude Shear Wave Velocity, V_s	Low-Amplitude Material Damping Ratio, D_{min}	Estimated Void Ratio, e
(psi)	(psf)	(kPa)	(ksf)	(MPa)	(fps)	(%)	
19	2736	131	2073	99	737	3.45	0.56
39	5616	269	3177	153	911	3.05	0.56
77	11088	531	4783	230	1114	2.79	0.55
154	22176	1061	7436	357	1384	2.46	0.54
308	44352	2122	11011	529	1676	2.29	0.52

Table A.2 Variation in Shear Modulus and Material Damping Ratio with Shearing Strain from RC Tests of Specimen EXELON B2269-UD15; Isotropic Confining Pressure, $\sigma_o=77$ psi (11.1 ksf = 531 kPa)

Peak Shearing Strain, %	Shear Modulus, G, ksf	Normalized Shear Modulus, G/G_{max}	Average ⁺ Shearing Strain, %	Material Damping Ratio ^x , D, %
1.50E-04	4984	1.00	1.50E-04	2.74
3.00E-04	4984	1.00	3.00E-04	2.77
6.19E-04	4984	1.00	6.19E-04	2.88
1.24E-03	4907	0.98	1.03E-03	3.02
2.43E-03	4830	0.97	1.99E-03	3.20
4.85E-03	4640	0.93	3.93E-03	3.46
9.59E-03	4417	0.89	7.57E-03	3.92
1.82E-02	4176	0.84	1.38E-02	4.46
3.83E-02	3601	0.72	2.80E-02	5.32
7.52E-02	3017	0.61	5.19E-02	6.55

⁺ 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 A.3 Variation in Shear Modulus, Normalized Shear Modulus and Material Damping Ratio with Shearing Strain from TS Tests of Specimen EXELON B2269-UD15; Isotropic Confining Pressure, $\sigma_o = 77$ psi (11.1 ksf = 531 kPa)

First Cycle				Tenth Cycle			
Peak Shearing Strain, %	Shear Modulus, G, ksf	Normalized Shear Modulus, G/G_{max}	Material Damping Ratio, D, %	Peak Shearing Strain, %	Shear Modulus, G, ksf	Normalized Shear Modulus, G/G_{max}	Material Damping Ratio, D, %
9.94E-03	3714	0.89	2.15	9.96E-03	3707	0.89	2.12
1.89E-02	3547	0.85	2.81	1.89E-02	3533	0.84	2.89

Table A.4 Variation in Shear Modulus and Material Damping Ratio with Shearing Strain from RC Tests of Specimen EXELON B2269-UD15; Isotropic Confining Pressure, $\sigma_c = 308$ psi (44.4 ksf = 2122 kPa)

Peak Shearing Strain, %	Shear Modulus, G, ksf	Normalized Shear Modulus, G/G_{max}	Average ⁺ Shearing Strain, %	Material Damping Ratio ^x , D, %
5.10E-05	11419	1.00	5.10E-05	2.27
1.01E-04	11419	1.00	1.01E-04	2.30
2.01E-04	11419	1.00	2.01E-04	2.32
3.98E-04	11369	1.00	3.98E-04	2.39
8.20E-04	11320	0.99	8.20E-04	2.44
1.61E-03	11222	0.98	1.37E-03	2.48
3.16E-03	10978	0.96	2.69E-03	2.61
6.20E-03	10743	0.94	5.15E-03	2.94
1.24E-02	10104	0.88	1.02E-02	3.33
2.42E-02	9246	0.81	1.91E-02	3.74

⁺ 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 A.5 Variation in Shear Modulus, Normalized Shear Modulus and Material Damping Ratio with Shearing Strain from TS Tests of Specimen EXELON B2269-UD15; Isotropic Confining Pressure, $\sigma_o=308$ psi (44.4 ksf = 2122 kPa)

First Cycle				Tenth Cycle			
Peak Shearing Strain, %	Shear Modulus, G, ksf	Normalized Shear Modulus, G/G_{max}	Material Damping Ratio, D, %	Peak Shearing Strain, %	Shear Modulus, G, ksf	Normalized Shear Modulus, G/G_{max}	Material Damping Ratio, D, %
9.95E-03	9724	0.88	1.70	9.94E-03	9734	0.88	1.65



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

March 24, 2008

Ms. Siesta Williams
MACTEC
3301 Atlantic Avenue
Raleigh, NC 27604

RE: Five (5) Reports For The EXELON COL Project

Dear Ms. Williams:

Fugro has completed five (5) RCTS tests, which are B2182-UD3, B2182-UD32, B2182-UD18, B2182-UD9, and B2274-UD14, for the EXELON project. Fugro has incorporated, as needed, Dr. Kenneth Stokoe's comments into the final reports. The final reports and the associated RCTS Test Approvals by Dr. Kenneth Stokoe have been attached.

Please let us know if you have questions. Thanks.

Very truly yours,

Fugro Consultants, Inc.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Meng", with a long horizontal stroke extending to the right.

Jiewu Meng, PhD, P.E.
Project Engineer

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Bill DeGroff", with a stylized, cursive-like script.

Bill DeGroff, P.E.
Laboratory Department Manager

Enclosures

Cc: Kathryn White, in PDF



KIS

RCTS TEST APPROVAL

PROJECT SITE/NAME	EXELON
-------------------	--------

Test ID	Sample ID	Depth B.S. (Ft)	Approved By (Initials)	Date
RCTS#B	B2182-UD3	18	LMS ⊕	14 Mar '08

One RCTS test for the site referenced above was tested, and one report was prepared, by Fugro Consultants, Inc.

I have reviewed the data and associated results listed above and found them to be reasonable.

Approved By:

K. H. Stokoe

Dr. Kenneth Stokoe

⊕ simply comments (not any suggested modifications) on

9/

RCTS TEST APPROVAL

PROJECT SITE/NAME	EXELON
--------------------------	---------------

Test ID	Sample ID	Depth B.S. (Ft)	Approved By (Initials)	Date
RCTS#C	B2182-UD32	352.7	<i>LHS</i> ⊕	15 Mar '08

One RCTS test for the site referenced above was tested, and one report was prepared, by Fugro Consultants, Inc.

I have reviewed the data and associated results listed above and found them to be reasonable.

Approved By:

K. H. Stokoe

Dr. Kenneth Stokoe

⊕ see comments and minor suggestions
in several figures.

S/

RCTS TEST APPROVAL


PROJECT SITE/NAME	EXELON
-------------------	--------

Test ID	Sample ID	Depth B.S. (Ft)	Approved By (Initials)	Date
RCTS#D	B2182-UD18	220.5	RHS ⁺	15 Mar '08

One RCTS test for the site referenced above was tested, and one report was prepared, by Fugro Consultants, Inc.

I have reviewed the data and associated results listed above and found them to be reasonable.

Approved By:



Dr. Kenneth Stokoe

⁺ See minor comments on several figures.

1/15

RCTS TEST APPROVAL

PROJECT SITE/NAME	EXELON
-------------------	--------

Test ID	Sample ID	Depth B.S. (Ft)	Approved By (Initials)	Date
RCTS#E	B2182-UD9	85.8	KHS ⊕	16 Mar '08
RCTS#F	B2274-UD14	267.5	KHS ⊕	16 Mar '08

Two RCTS tests for the site referenced above were tested, and two reports were prepared, by Fugro Consultants, Inc.

I have reviewed the data and associated results listed above and found them to be reasonable.

Approved By:

K. H. Stokoe

Dr. Kenneth Stokoe

⊕ see comments and suggested modifications on one or two figures

APPENDIX B

Specimen EXELON B2182-UD3
(Index Properties Not Available)

Borehole B2182

Sample UD3

Depth = 17.7 ft (5.4 m)

Total Unit Weight = 125.3 lb/ft³

Water Content = 21.6 %

Estimated In-Situ K_o = 0.5

Estimated In-Situ Mean Effective
Stress = 9 psi

FUGRO JOB #: 0401-1686
Testing Station: RC9




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 9 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 9 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 9 psi from the Combined RCTS Tests