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## 1. EXISTING CONDITIONS

### 1.1 Background

Valuation Map V-13WV/23 (16279) is dated June 30, 1916. The Changes/Additions/ Retirements table on this map is empty. According to the Schedule of Property, parcels for the tunnel were acquired in 1907. A Norfolk Southern tunnel inspection sheet reports that the tunnel was built in 1912. Additional information on this tunnel was obtained from various sources such as topographic maps, aerial photos, inspection reports, track charts, and field investigations that were performed on March 16, June 9, and June 13, 2005.

### 1.2 General Area

The tunnel is located in a sparsely populated area with good access to the east portal from US Rt. 52. A railroad access road off of the highway is adequate for bringing equipment to a small staging area near the east portal. Access from the west side is not practical, with a railroad bridge over Elkhorn Creek only 140' west of the west portal. This bridge is approximately 116’ long. US Rt. 52 crosses over the tunnel. Equipment can readily get onto the tracks from areas close to the tunnel.

### 1.3 Structural Conditions

Huger Main \#2 Tunnel is one of a pair of twin tunnels along with Huger Main \#1 Tunnel. Each tunnel is a concrete-lined single-width tunnel for one track. The tunnel is $362^{\prime}$ long with a nominal width of $16^{\prime}$. There are two locations where there are significant spalls in the concrete liner and water is leaking through.

The bridge outside of the west portal of the tunnel was investigated on June 13, 2005. It is a 2span, 2-girder, timber deck bridge. Each span is simply supported. The two girders are built-up steel plate girders. The girders rest on bearings at the abutments and center pier. The four bearing heights vary from 18 " to 20 ". The bridge spans over a paved road, Elkhorn Creek, and a gravel road.

Ballast covers the top of the footing on both sides for most of the tunnel. A small portion of the tunnel invert material was excavated to fully expose the base of the tunnel liner footing. The footing thickness was found to be 16 ". The vertical distance from the top of rail to the base of the footing was measured at 46 ".

### 1.4 Track

The track is of conventional design with approximately 8 ' -6 " long wooden crossties at 19 " spacing and a stone ballast section. The rails are 132RE VE HT 1988 continuously welded rail.

### 1.5 Geotechnical

The tunnel is located in the Appalachian Plateaus Physiographic Province, a region characterized by deeply incised plateaus underlain by flat-lying sedimentary rock. The tunnel itself is lined and no rock was exposed. The description of the site geology at the tunnel is based on our observations of the rockmass at the portals and adjacent cuts and the 1968 West Virginia Geologic Map prepared by the West Virginia Geologic and Economic Survey.

The Huger Tunnels were excavated through medium- to thick-bedded sandstone of the Pocahontas Formation. Minor interbeds of shale, siltstone, and coal may also be present in this formation, but were not observed in the exposures. Bedding is sub-horizontal.

The rock quality designation, Q , at the portals was determined to be 17 . A Q rating between 10 and 40 is considered "Good" with 10 bordering on "Fair" and 40 bordering on "Very Good." A sample of rock was taken from the portal and tested.

The geoprobes indicate that the top of rock is located between 3.9' to 5.0' (averaging 4.6') below the top of ballast throughout the tunnel. Top of ballast is typically about $0.8^{\prime}$ below top of low rail. Geoprobes were also taken at $100^{\prime}$ increments for 1000 ' outside of the east portal. Each probe reached a depth of $5.0^{\prime}$ below the top of ballast without reaching refusal.

### 1.6 Clearances

The laser car measurements indicate that the existing tunnel has adequate horizontal clearance but there are encroachments at the 1 o'clock and 11 o'clock positions for the composite design template. Despite the Track Chart's reported 3.1 degree of curvature for the whole tunnel, the survey showed that a smaller amount of curvature exists, and only in the vicinity of the east portal. Therefore, based on the survey, a clearance template adjusted for a 1.6 degree of curvature was used for the first 100 feet of the tunnel and a clearance template for tangent track was used for the remainder of the tunnel. The encroachments vary from 3 " to 12 " and average about 8 ", with the greatest encroachment at the east portal where the clearance template was widened for curvature. See the Tunnel Clearance Cross Sections section of this report for an illustration of the clearance encroachments. The maximum vertical encroachments are summarized in the table below:

|  | Crown Encroachment <br> (radial inches) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Distance (ft) from <br> East Portal | Left Side | Right Side |
| 0 | 12 | 12 |
| 101 | 9 | 8 |
| 202 | 7 | 7 |
| 302 | 4 | 7 |
| 351 | 3 | 5 |

## 2. CLEARANCE IMPROVEMENT ALTERNATIVES

Given the magnitude of the clearance deficiency, there are three general alternatives that can be used to obtain the clearance; notching the lining, lowering the track, or undercutting the track. Combinations of the general methods with other improvements may be required to obtain a design that is cost effective and that can be constructed within reasonable track outages.

### 2.1 Notching the Crown

The modifications in the upper quadrants of the tunnel will not cut entirely through the liner at the 1 or 11 o'clock positions. Depending on the exact depth of the notch, minor or deep notching would be utilized through the tunnel on both sides. Deep notching requires installation of rock bolts prior to the notch being cut.

### 2.2 Track Lowering

The geoprobes indicate an elevation to refusal of $3.9^{\prime}$ to $5.0^{\prime}$ below the top of rail. Such a depth could allow for track lowering while retaining a standard ballast depth.

Excavation would involve removing the track and using conventional earth moving equipment to remove the ballast and subgrade materials. The entire operation would require approximately a 4-day outage and continuous work to remove the track, excavate the subgrade, and restore the track. The production rate would be limited by having to back the dump trucks down the tunnel. New drainage installation and subgrade stabilization could be accomplished from the subgrade directly. The resulting track structure would be completely new except for the rail.

The proximity of the bridge 150 ' to the west of the tunnel could cause difficulty in transitioning the lowered rail to match the existing rail elevations over a fairly short distance. If such grading is not possible, the track lowering method could also require bridge modifications or liner removal near the portal.

### 2.3 Track Undercutting

The geoprobes indicate an elevation to refusal of $3.9^{\prime}$ to $5.0^{\prime}$ below the top of rail. Such a depth could allow for track undercutting while retaining a standard ballast depth.

A mainline track undercutter with a conveyor and air dump cars could accomplish undercutting over the course of 1-2 days of 8 -hour work windows. An evaluation of typical undercutting equipment showed that the size of the equipment is compatible with undercutting in this tunnel. Using a work train engine to move the air-dump cars to the disposal site would allow the undercutter to remain setup with the bar under the track. The run-in and run-out of the undercut area would need to be surfaced daily to accommodate the trains.

One to two 2 days of prep work will be required to plug and spike the exiting ties to keep them from falling off of the rail behind the undercutter bar. Plate-boys with modifications to the jacks could be used to lift the track to allow geotextile to be installed under the skeletonized track.

The proximity of the bridge 150 ' to the west of the tunnel could cause difficulty in transitioning the lowered rail to match the existing rail elevations over a fairly short distance. If such grading is not possible, the track undercutting method could also require bridge modifications or liner removal near the portal.

## 3. PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE

The clearance can be best accomplished using the Track Undercutting methodology.
The only impediments to the undercutting procedure is the existing bridge at the west end of the tunnel. This bridge was raised on grillages to match the existing track profile at sometime in the past. The existing track alignment will be smoothed but no significant shifting is required.

### 3.1 Preliminary Design

The preliminary design combines undercutting and bridge modifications.

### 3.1.1 Bridge Modifications

The bridge modifications will be relatively minor, consisting of replacing the existing grillages with shorter grillages and replacing the backwall timber. The bridges will be jacked and the new grillages placed on the existing bridge seats.

### 3.1.2 Vertical Alignment

Due to the proximity of the bridge on the west side of the tunnel, the proposed undercutting operation was designed to restore a uniform track profile through the tunnel. Unlike the Huger Main \#1 Tunnel, the profile in the Huger Main \#2 Tunnel parallels the crown of the tunnel. The proposed profile extends the vertical tangent beyond the portals of the tunnels. Since the existing grade is relatively steep ( $-1.02 \%$ ), the vertical profile was compressed to reduce the depth of undercutting. The grade in the tunnel is $-0.99 \%$, the western vertical alignment merely extended the vertical tangent from the tunnel to a point where a single crest vertical curve is used to connect to the existing profile at the west side end of the existing bridge. This area was not surveyed, but the general arrangement is applicable to this methodology.

The undercutter will lower the track on the west side of the bridge to meet the new profile.

The vertical tangents are connected by vertical curves based on the new AREMA procedures. The new procedures do not use different rates of changes for crest and sag curves, resulting in vertical curves of similar lengths. All of the vertical curves exceed the minimum recommended lengths.

The undercutter is assumed to have air dump cars fitted with a conveyor system to remove the spoil from the tunnel. The material outside of the tunnel can be cast to the side, however proper grading is essential to prevent the material from being washed into the new tack structure.

### 3.1.3 Other Construction

Proper drainage is vital to maintaining the track structure. A new drainage system is proposed in the tunnel. This drain will carry any water in the tunnel out of the tunnel to surface drainage along the tracks.

Lowering the track will place it below the existing ground surface. To allow drainage from beneath the track structure, the ground surface adjacent to the track must be excavated to provide new longitudinal ditches along the track. Likewise, the existing material on the tunnel invert must be lowered to the bottom of the ballast section and sloped to the trench drain.

### 3.2 Schedule

The estimated schedule for completing improvements on this tunnel is seven (7) weeks from mobilization to demobilization.

### 3.3 Estimate

The total estimated cost for achieving clearance at this location is $\$ 1.15$ million (2005 rates) or $\$ 3,187$ per foot of tunnel. The work items include mobilization, surveying, rock dowels, deep notching, rock cut for drainage trench, tunnel drainage system, ballast cleaning, and demobilization. An allowance for grouting the invert void was also included. The total cost is made up of tunnel, track, signal and site work items at $\$ 744,406$, plus a $25 \%$ construction contingency, a $10 \%$ engineering allowance, and a $14 \%$ construction management allowance.
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Photo 1. Main \#2 east portal (Main \#1 is on left)


Photo 2. Main \#2, looking to the east from east of tunnel (Main \# 1 is on right)
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Photo 3. Main \#2 west portal (Main \#1 is on right)


Photo 4. Main \#2, looking west from west of tunnel (Main \#1 is on left)

Preliminary Engineering Phase Report MP N-395.56 - Huger Main \#2


Photo 5. Main \#2, looking west from middle of tunnel. Note leaking at construction joint.


Photo 6. Main \#2, looking east into tunnel from west portal.

## 8. ESTIMATE

Huger No. 2

| Tunnel Length | 362 | ft |
| ---: | :---: | :---: |
| Tunnel Width | 15.75 | ft |
| \# of Tracks | 1 |  |


| Contractor |  |  | Railroad |  |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Work Window | 10 | hrs | 10 | hrs |
| Setup \& Demobilization Allowance | 2 | hrs | 2 | hrs |
| Production Time | 8 | hrs | 8 | hrs |


|  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Tunnel Work Items |  |  |  |  |
| Mobilization | UOM | Quantity | Unit Rate | Total |
| Wall Installation | $\%$ | $5 \%$ |  | $\$ 11,431.82$ |
| Under Pinning | SF |  |  |  |
| Rock Cut Drainage Trench | LF | 362 | $\$ 506.83$ | $\$ 183,473.87$ |
| Tunnel Drainage | LF | 400 | $\$ 84.14$ | $\$ 33,657.60$ |
| Demobilization | LF | 400 | $\$ 20.55$ | $\$ 8,221.69$ |
|  | DY | 1 | $\$ 3,283.20$ | $\$ 3,283.20$ |


| Trackwork Items | UOM | Quantity | Unit Rate | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mobilization | DY | 1 | \$3,110.32 | \$3,110.32 |
| Surveying | DY | 4 | \$1,300.00 | \$5,200.00 |
| Track Preparation/Restoration | DY | 2 | \$3,431.32 | \$6,862.64 |
| Undercutting | PF | 5100 | \$15.31 | \$78,089.16 |
| Saw Cuts | EA | 6 | \$6,092.96 | \$36,557.76 |
| Panel Track | TF |  |  |  |
| Remove Track | TF |  |  |  |
| Field Welds | EA | 6 | \$2,698.37 | \$16,190.25 |
| Surfacing \& Lining | PF | 6000 | \$1.72 | \$10,304.06 |
| Ballasting Track | TN | 1900 | \$38.02 | \$72,231.32 |
| Equalizing rail | DY | 1 | \$6,701.14 | \$6,701.14 |
| Elastomeric Flangeway Crossing | EA |  |  |  |
| Demobilization | DY |  |  |  |
| Total Trackwork Items |  |  |  | \$235,246.66 |


|  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Signal Items | UOM | Quantity | Unit Rate | Total |
| Mobilization | DY |  |  |  |
| Relocate Cables / Track Leads | LF | 362 | $\$ 12.80$ | $\$ 4,632.59$ |
| Signal Location Modification | EA |  |  |  |
| New Cut Section | EA |  |  |  |
| Demobilization | DY |  |  |  |
| Total Signal Items |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | $\$ 4,632.59$ |  |


|  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bridge Items | UOM | Quantity | Unit Rate | Total |
| Mobilization | DY | 1 |  |  |
| Replace Bearings | EA | 8 | $\$ 21,041.00$ | $\$ 168,328.03$ |
| Replace Timbers on Deck | EA | 2 | $\$ 2,257.01$ | $\$ 4,514.02$ |
| Demobilization | DY | 1 |  |  |
| Total Bridge Items |  |  |  |  |


|  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Site Items | UOM | Quantity | Unit Rate | Total |
| Mobilization | DY | 1 | $\$ 2,483.60$ | $\$ 2,483.60$ |
| Erosion \& Sedimentation Control | EA | 1 | $\$ 11,958.80$ | $\$ 11,958.80$ |
| Site Grading | CY | 2400 | $\$ 20.52$ | $\$ 49,243.34$ |
| Total Site Items |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | $\$ 63,685.74$ |


|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Special Items | UOM | Quantity | Unit Rate | Total |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mobilization | DY |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Flagging | DY | 34 | $\$ 821.50$ | $\$ 27,931.00$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Temporary Bridges | EA |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Specialty Items |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\$ 27,931.00$ |


| Subtotal All Items |  | $\$ 744,406.21$ |
| ---: | :---: | :---: |
| Construction Contingency | $25 \%$ | $\$ 186,101.55$ |
| Engineering Allowance | $10 \%$ | $\$ 93,050.78$ |
| Construction Management Allowance | $14 \%$ | $\$ 130,271.09$ |
| Total |  | $\$ 1,153,829.63$ |

## 9. DRAWINGS





Notes:
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