



Illinois Department of
Natural Resources
Office of Water Resources

Project: _____
Job No.: _____
Sheet: _____ Of _____
Computed by: _____ Date: _____
Checked by: _____ Date: _____

Stratton Lock and Dam Life Extension Study

April 16, 2012
Public Presentation



Illinois Department of
Natural Resources
Office of Water Resources

Project: _____
Job No.: _____
Sheet: _____ Of _____
Computed by: _____ Date: _____
Checked by: _____ Date: _____





Goals and Objectives

- Provide new gate structure that has the same hydraulic capacity as existing structure but with improved winter operation characteristics
- Reduce waiting time for boats wanting to move through the locks



This Project Will Not:

- Eliminate need for winter drawdown
- Eliminate flooding in the Chain of lakes
- Eliminate flooding downstream of dam
- Eliminate waiting time for all boats going through lock



Illinois Department of
Natural Resources
Office of Water Resources

Project: _____
Job No.: _____
Sheet: _____ Of _____
Computed by: _____ Date: _____
Checked by: _____ Date: _____

--	--	--	--	--	--	--





Gate Concerns

- Gates constructed in 1939 and have reached end of serviceable life
- The gate section of this structure has significant concrete deterioration.





Gate Concerns

- The tops of the walls along the access steps on both the east and west sides have heavy spalling and loss of concrete.
- The upper walkway surface repair topping is heavily cracked and spalled.





Gate Concerns

- The steel gates are heavily corroded with visible steel delamination on the downstream side of the gates.
- The upstream sides of the exposed gates are heavily corroded in certain areas.





Illinois Department of
Natural Resources
Office of Water Resources

Project: _____

Job No.: _____

Sheet: _____

Computed by: _____

Checked by: _____

Of _____

Date: _____

Date: _____

Gate Concerns

Gates are difficult/hazardous to operate in winter





Illinois Department of
Natural Resources
Office of Water Resources

Project: _____
Job No.: _____
Sheet: _____ Of _____
Computed by: _____ Date: _____
Checked by: _____ Date: _____

Lock Concerns

The lock was opened for public use on June 1, 1960.

The lock is heavily used during its operation period, which can result in significant wait times during peak periods. These wait times have been known to be as high as four hours.




Illinois Department of
Natural Resources
Office of Water Resources

Project: _____
Job No.: _____
Sheet: _____ Of _____
Computed by: _____ Date: _____
Checked by: _____ Date: _____

Lock Capacity

Stratton Lock Boat Passage Distribution May 2000 through May 2010



- 10 boats/lock 1967 Report on Traffic Projection and Lock Sizing
- 6 boats/lock 2005 Anecdotal Lock Tender Report
- 4 boats/lock 2010 Anecdotal Lock Tender Report



Illinois Department of
Natural Resources
Office of Water Resources

Project: _____
Job No.: _____
Sheet: _____ Of _____
Computed by: _____ Date: _____
Checked by: _____ Date: _____

HNTB Report and Results

Stratton Lock and Dam Life Extension Reconnaissance Study
Summary Report, Prepared for the Illinois Department of Natural Resources,
Office of Water Resources - June 2005



Prepared by HNTB Corporation
111 North Canal Street
Chicago, Illinois 60606

HNTB

- **Recommended Lock Extension**
- **Recommended Over/Under Taintor Gates**



Design Team Members

- Hanson Professional Services
Gates Alternatives,
Geotechnical and Support
facilities
- Bergmann Associates
Lock Alternatives
- HDR
Site Power, Equipment
Operating Systems and Controls
- Office of Water Resources
Site Surveying, Hydraulics and
Permitting



Illinois Department of
Natural Resources
Office of Water Resources

Project: _____
Job No.: _____
Sheet: _____ Of _____
Computed by: _____ Date: _____
Checked by: _____ Date: _____

Open House

December 14, 2011

- Presented preliminary Design concepts
- Solicited comments

IL DNR Newsbits for December

IDNR to Host Open House on Stratton Lock and Dam Lock Expansion and Sluice Gate Structure Replacement: The IDNR will host an open house on Wednesday, Dec. 14 to display alternatives for lock expansion and sluice gate structure replacement at William G. Stratton Lock and Dam on the Fox River in McHenry. The open house will be held on Dec. 14 from 4-7 p.m. at the William G. Stratton Lock and Dam, 2910 W. State Park Road in McHenry.



Decision Matrix Process

- Numerically Directed Weighting System (iterative process)
 - Design Criteria
 - Constructability Criteria
 - Performance Criteria
 - Costs



Illinois Department of
Natural Resources
Office of Water Resources

Project: _____

Job No.: _____

Sheet: _____

Computed by: _____

Checked by: _____

Of _____

Date: _____

Date: _____

Gate Decision Criteria

- Construction Cost
- Fail Safe Capability
- Ability to be Remotely Controlled and Operated
- Ability to Operate the Gates in Manual Mode
- Routine Maintenance
- Hydraulic Efficiency
- Sediment/Debris Accumulation
- Constructability
- Reliability
- Public Safety
- Ice Considerations
- Bulkheads for Maintenance and Repair
- Permissibility
- Life Cycle Maintenance



Illinois Department of
Natural Resources
Office of Water Resources

Project: _____
Job No.: _____
Sheet: _____ Of _____
Computed by: _____ Date: _____
Checked by: _____ Date: _____

Gate alternatives

- Rehabilitation of Existing gates
- Over/Under Taintor Gates
- Roller Gates
- Torque Tube Gates

Sample Gate Decision Matrix

		Alternative X	
		Generic Gate Alternative	
Decision Criteria	Weighting Factor	Score	Weighted
Construction Cost	5	3	15
Fail Safe Capability	5	3	15
Ability to be Remotely Controlled and Operated	2	5	10
Ability to Operate the gates in manual mode	5	2	10
Routine Maintenance	4	4	16
Hydraulic Efficiency	5	2	10
Sediment/Debris Accumulation	3	2	6
Constructability	3	4	12
Reliability	5	1	5
Public Safety	4	2	8
Ice Considerations	5	3	15
Bulkheads for Maintenance and Repair	5	4	20
Permitability	1	4	4
Life Cycle Maintenance	3	2	6
Total Score			152
Total Score without Construction Cost			137

Weighting Factor is relative to Criteria
Score is relative to Alternatives



Illinois Department of
Natural Resources
Office of Water Resources

Project: _____

Job No.: _____

Sheet: _____

Computed by: _____


Checked by: _____

Of _____

Date: _____

Date: _____

Rehab of Existing Gates:



- Repair existing concrete substructure below elevation 740.00.
- Remove and replace concrete superstructure above elevation 740.00.
- Gate configuration: Five new 13 ft-9 in.- wide vertical roller type gates



Illinois Department of
Natural Resources
Office of Water Resources

Project: _____
Job No.: _____
Sheet: _____ Of _____
Computed by: _____ Date: _____
Checked by: _____ Date: _____

Rehab of Existing Gates: Pros, Cons, Costs

- Hydraulic efficiency is identical (or nearly identical) to existing gates.
- Permitting is simplified
- Additional investigation of substructure components is required.
- Increased potential for construction phase change orders due to nature of repair work.
- No improvement to debris management difficulty.
- No improvement to ice management.
- Anticipate additional future maintenance as compared against other alternatives.


\$6,640,000



Roller Gates: Pros, Cons, Costs

- Hydraulic efficiency is identical (or nearly identical) to existing gates.
- Common operating systems for gates simplifies inventory of spare parts.
- Improved gate sealing characteristics as compared with other alternatives.
- Gate operating machinery is exposed to the elements.
- No significant improvement in debris management opportunities.
- No improvement to ice management.

\$7,240,000




Project: _____
 Job No.: _____
 Sheet: _____ Of _____
 Computed by: _____ Date: _____
 Checked by: _____ Date: _____

Diagram illustrating the cross-section of a dam structure, showing various components and elevations:

- DOWNSTREAM ACCESS BRIDGE
- TOP OF STRUCTURE EL. 744.17
- TOP OF APRON EL. 727.72
- TOP OF STRUCTURE EL. 752.00
- PMF WATER EL. 749.26
- UPSTREAM DEWATERING BULKHEADS
- 100 YEAR HIGH WATER EL. 739.00
- TOP OF GATE EL. 733.22
- SILL EL. 730.97
- BOTT OF CHANNEL EL. 730.00
- FLOW
- 56'-8"

SECTION AT SUBMERSIBLE TAINTER GATE

[illegible]



Checked by:

Date:

[illegible]



Illinois Department of
Natural Resources
Office of Water Resources

Project: _____
Job No.: _____
Sheet: _____ Of _____
Computed by: _____ Date: _____
Checked by: _____ Date: _____

Marseilles Field Trip





Tainter Gates: Pros,

- Common operating systems for gates simplifies inventory of spare parts.
- A submersible gate will pass more ice than a nonsubmersible gate, given the same hydraulic conditions.
- Many gate freeze up problems are eliminated because the gate is kept under water.
- Can be enclosed upstream, downstream and on the sides (like the gates at Marseilles) to reduce the potential for ice and debris build-up
- Does not require gate slots, which can become plugged with ice or debris and can cause cavitation.



Tainter Gates: Cons, Costs

- Difficulty of sealing at gate sill..
- Imprecise elevation control.
- In winter, freezing of this leakage of water inside the gate skin adds to the weight of the gate structure.
- The side and bottom seals of tainter spillway gates may leak, causing spray resulting in ice build-up on the pier walls or the gates themselves, causing operations problems.
- During severe cold, the gates must be moved frequently or they will freeze in place.
- The gates must supply sufficient current in the pool upstream to draw the ice to the gate

\$6,600,000



Illinois Department of
Natural Resources
Office of Water Resources

Project: _____

Job No.: _____

Sheet: _____

Computed by: _____

Checked by: _____

Of _____

Date: _____

Date: _____

Coffeen Field trip





Torque Tube Gates: Pros

- Minimizes extent of operating equipment exposed to the elements.
- Improved debris passage characteristics via torque tube gate sections.
- Preferred for accurate control of reservoir levels
- Preferred when floating debris and/or ice have to be skimmed.
- Redundancy of operating systems via two hydraulic power units and two actuators per gate section.
- Gate type has a positive performance history as reported by two gate vendors and an owner of a similar that has been in operation for over 50 years.



Torque Tube Gates: Cons, Costs

- Hydraulic power units and operating machinery requires construction of vaults which may necessitate channel bank modifications to achieve the required effective width for stream flow.
- Redundancy is reduced due to three (versus four or five, as compared with other alternatives) gate sections.
- Complexity of sealing torque tube at vault entry points.
- If hydraulic operators fail, by design, the gate will lower which would initiate loss of pool upstream of the gates until the drop leaf bulkheads are lowered.

\$7,990,000



Illinois Department of
Natural Resources
Office of Water Resources

Project: _____

Job No.: _____

Sheet: _____

Computed by: _____

Checked by: _____

Of _____

Date: _____

Date: _____

Lock Decision Criteria

- Construction Cost
- Navigation During Construction
- Navigation in Final Condition
- Future Maintenance
- Operations During Construction
- Operations in Final Condition (labor required)
- Peak Usage Performance
- Off-Peak Performance
- System Redundancy
- Impacts on Other Users
- Operational Training



Lock alternatives

- Extension of Existing Lock
- New Lock on riverside of Existing Lock
- New Lock on land side of Existing Lock




Illinois Department of
Natural Resources
Office of Water Resources

Project: _____
Job No.: _____
Sheet: _____ Of _____
Computed by: _____ Date: _____
Checked by: _____ Date: _____

Sample Lock Decision Matrix


		Alternative X	
		Generic Lock	
Decision Criteria	Weighting Factor	Score	Weighted
Construction Cost	5	5	25
Navigation During Construction	4	1	4
Navigation in Final Condition	4	5	20
Future Maintenance	3	4	12
Operations During Construction	2	4	8
Operations in Final Condition (labor required)	4	5	20
Peak Usage Performance	5	4	20
Off-Peak Performance	2	4	8
System Redundancy	4	3	12
Impacts on Other Users	1	5	5
Operational Training	2	5	10
Total Score			144
Total Score without Construction Cost			119



Checked by:

Date:

Plan View of Lock Extension





Illinois Department of
Natural Resources
Office of Water Resources

Project: _____

Job No.: _____

Sheet: _____

Computed by: _____


Checked by: _____

Of _____

Date: _____

Date: _____

Plan View of Lock Extension





Lock Extension: Pros

- Access to opposite (east) wall not required for operation of expanded facility.
- Boaters are accustomed to operational procedures for single lock (lower user learning curve).
- Maintains existing gate control house.
- Pilot house structure not required.
- Lower operational and maintenance costs.
- Least amount of approach channel improvements required to facilitate alternative



Illinois Department of
Natural Resources
Office of Water Resources

Project: _____
Job No.: _____
Sheet: _____ Of _____
Computed by: _____ Date: _____
Checked by: _____ Date: _____

Lock Extension: Cons, Costs

- Highest risk of construction activity impeding or congesting traffic during boating season.
- Lowest increase in boater lockage capacity (225% increase for this alternative compared to 246% increase for other alternatives)
- Reduced facility redundancy. There would be no opportunity to continue lockages if the lock needed to be shut down for maintenance.

\$4,300,000



Illinois Department of
Natural Resources
Office of Water Resources

Project: _____

Job No.: _____

Sheet: _____

Computed by: _____

Checked by: _____

Of _____

Date: _____

Date: _____

Plan View of Riverside Lock





Illinois Department of
Natural Resources
Office of Water Resources

Project: _____

Job No.: _____

Sheet: _____

Computed by: _____


Checked by: _____

Of _____

Date: _____

Date: _____

Plan View of Riverside Lock





Riverside Lock: Pros


- Highest increase in boater lockage capacity.
(246% increase compared to 225% increase for lock extension)
- Lowest risk of construction activity impeding or congesting traffic during boating season.
- Best facility redundancy. One lock can remain operational if second lock requires maintenance.
- Maintains existing gate control house.



Riverside Lock: Cons, Cost

- Pilot house structure is required.
- Higher operational and maintenance costs, although operations can be reduced to only one lock during non-peak periods to reduce such expenses.
- Requires more approach excavations and more complex guidewall improvements for widened access channel.
- Requires more approach channel maintenance dredging.
- Construction access more difficult to and from island (river) side.
- More complex vessel traffic patterns for lockmaster to regulate

\$6,140,000



Checked by:

Date:

1	2	3	4	5	6
7	8	9	10	11	12
13	14	15	16	17	18
19	20	21	22	23	24
25	26	27	28	29	30
31	32	33	34	35	36
37	38	39	40	41	42
43	44	45	46	47	48
49	50	51	52	53	54
55	56	57	58	59	60
61	62	63	64	65	66
67	68	69	70	71	72
73	74	75	76	77	78
79	80	81	82	83	84
85	86	87	88	89	90
91	92	93	94	95	96
97	98	99	100	101	102
103	104	105	106	107	108
109	110	111	112	113	114
115	116	117	118	119	120
121	122	123	124	125	126
127	128	129	130	131	132
133	134	135	136	137	138
139	140	141	142	143	144
145	146	147	148	149	150
151	152	153	154	155	156
157	158	159	160	161	162
163	164	165	166	167	168
169	170	171	172	173	174
175	176	177	178	179	180
181	182	183	184	185	186
187	188	189	190	191	192
193	194	195	196	197	198
199	200	201	202	203	204
205	206	207	208	209	210
211	212	213	214	215	216
217	218	219	220	221	222
223	224	225	226	227	228
229	230	231	232	233	234
235	236	237	238	239	240
241	242	243	244	245	246
247	248	249	250	251	252
253	254	255	256	257	258
259	260	261	262	263	264
265	266	267	268	269	270
271	272	273	274	275	276
277	278	279	280	281	282
283	284	285	286	287	288
289	290	291	292	293	294
295	296	297	298	299	300
301	302	303	304	305	306
307	308	309	310	311	312
313	314	315	316	317	318
319	320	321	322	323	324
325	326	327	328	329	330
331	332	333	334	335	336
337	338	339	340	341	342
343	344	345	346	347	348
349	350	351	352	353	354
355	356	357	358	359	360
361	362	363	364	365	366
367	368	369	370	371	372
373	374	375	376	377	378
379	380	381	382	383	384
385	386	387	388	389	390
391	392	393	394	395	396
397	398	399	400	401	402
403	404	405	406	407	408
409	410	411	412	413	



Illinois Department of
Natural Resources
Office of Water Resources

Project: _____

Job No.: _____

Sheet: _____

Computed by: _____


Checked by: _____

Of _____

Date: _____

Date: _____

Plan View of Landside Lock





Land Side Lock: Pros

- Highest increase in boater lockage capacity.
(246% increase compared to 225% increase for lock extension)
- Lower risk of construction activity impeding or congesting traffic during boating season.
- Best facility redundancy. One lock can remain operational if second lock requires maintenance.
- Alignment able to connect with existing approach wall, which can remain undisturbed.
- Construction access easier from land side, not requiring much work across channel.



Land Side Lock: Cons, Costs

- Highest disturbance to existing landside site features and utilities, such as parking area, lock house, septic, and water. There is also potential for impacts wetland areas and the existing levee system. Land acquisition may also be required.
- Pilot house structure is required.
- Higher operational and maintenance costs, although operations can be reduced to only one lock during non-peak periods to reduce such expenses.
- Possible boat traffic interferences with sheriff's mooring area immediately upstream of lock.
- More complex vessel traffic patterns for lockmaster to regulate.

\$6,190,000




Illinois Department of
Natural Resources
Office of Water Resources

Project: _____
Job No.: _____
Sheet: _____ Of _____
Computed by: _____ Date: _____
Checked by: _____ Date: _____

Final Lock Decision Matrix

			Alternative 1 Lock Extension		Alternative 2A New Riverside Lock		Alternative 2B New Landside Lock	
Criteria		Weight	Score	Weighted	Score	Weighted	Score	Weighted
1	Construction Cost	5	5	25	3	15	3	15
2	Navigation During Construction	4	1	4	4	16	5	20
3	Navigation in Final Condition	4	5	20	3	12	3	12
4	Life Cycle & Future Maintenance	3	4	12	2	6	2	6
5	Operations During Construction	2	3	6	5	10	3	6
6	Operations in Final Condition	4	5	20	4	16	4	16
7	Peak Usage Performance	5	3	15	5	25	5	25
8	Off-Peak Performance	2	4	8	5	10	5	10
9	System Redundancy	4	3	12	5	20	5	20
10	Impact on Other Users	1	5	5	5	5	5	5
11	Operational Training	2	5	10	4	8	4	8
Total Score			137		143		143	
Total Score without Construction Cost (1) & Life Cycle Costs (4)			100		122		122	
Alt 2A / Alt 1 Ratio =		1.04	Based on Total Score					
Alt 2A / Alt 1 Ratio =		1.14	Based on Total Score without Construction Cost (1)					
Alt 2A / Alt 1 Ratio =		1.22	Based on Total Score without Construction Cost (1) & Life Cycle Costs (4)					



Project: _____
 Job No.: _____
 Sheet: _____ Of _____
 Computed by: _____ Date: _____
 Checked by: _____ Date: _____


[illegible]



Illinois Department of
Natural Resources
Office of Water Resources

Project: _____
Job No.: _____
Sheet: _____ Of _____
Computed by: _____ Date: _____
Checked by: _____ Date: _____

Gate Construction Sequence



Phase 1 is in magenta

Phase 2 is in green




Illinois Department of
Natural Resources
Office of Water Resources

Project: _____
Job No.: _____
Sheet: _____ Of _____
Computed by: _____ Date: _____
Checked by: _____ Date: _____

Lock Construction Sequence


Stages 1-3 during first non-boating season

Lock Construction Sequence




- | | |
|---|--|
| 1A-Install upper dewatering bulkhead | |
| 1B-Install cofferdam wall for lower monolith | |
| 1C-Install earthen stability berm | |
| 1D-Dewater existing lock & lower forebay area | |

Lock Construction Sequence



Lock Construction Sequence



- 3A-Install emptying port
- 3B-Install filling port
- 3C-Backfill lower forebay area
- 3D-Rewater existing and extended lock area
- 3E-Remove upper dewatering bulkhead
- 3F-Remove portion of lower cofferdam




Illinois Department of
Natural Resources
Office of Water Resources

Project: _____
Job No.: _____
Sheet: _____ Of _____
Computed by: _____ Date: _____
Checked by: _____ Date: _____

Lock Construction Sequence

Stages 4-5A during boating season

Lock Construction Sequence



- 4A-Install intake gatewell cofferdam
- 4B-Install remainder of filling port
- 4C-Construct intake gatewell
- 4D-Remove intake gatewell cofferdam
- 4E-Remove existing lock wingwall tieback system
- 5A-Install extension wall tieback system




Illinois Department of
Natural Resources
Office of Water Resources

Project: _____
Job No.: _____
Sheet: _____ Of _____
Computed by: _____ Date: _____
Checked by: _____ Date: _____

Lock Construction Sequence

Stages 5B-5F during second
non-boating season

Lock Construction Sequence



STAGE 5

- 5B-Install dewatering bulkheads & dewater lock
- 5C-Relocate Lower miter gate to new monolith
- 5D-Complete approach dredging, stone protection and fender system
- 5E-Rewater locks and remove bulkheads
- 5F-Commission Extended lock



Illinois Department of
Natural Resources
Office of Water Resources

Project: _____
Job No.: _____
Sheet: _____ Of _____
Computed by: _____ Date: _____
Checked by: _____ Date: _____

Next Steps

- Complete construction documents (plans and specifications) for gates and lock
- Submit permit applications to Corps, IEPA, OWR and others
- Advertise for bids using IDOT system
- Determine if funding is available to support both lock and gates construction
- Award contract(s)



Illinois Department of
Natural Resources
Office of Water Resources

Project: _____
Job No.: _____
Sheet: _____ Of _____
Computed by: _____ Date: _____
Checked by: _____ Date: _____

Public Questions

Stratton Operations Web Site

<http://dnr.state.il.us/owr/StrattonOperations.htm>