

RECLAMATION

Managing Water in the West

Restoration of the Salton Sea

Volume 2: Embankment Designs and Optimization Study

Part 1 of 2

**U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Reclamation
Lower Colorado Region
Boulder City, Nevada**

May 2007



The mission of the Department of the Interior is to protect and provide access to our Nation's natural and cultural heritage and honor our trust responsibilities to Indian tribes and our commitments to island communities.

The mission of the Bureau of Reclamation is to manage, develop, and protect water and related resources in an environmentally and economically sound manner in the interest of the American public.

RECLAMATION

Managing Water in the West

Restoration of the Salton Sea

Volume 2: Embankment Designs and Optimization Study

Part 1 of 2

**U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Reclamation
Lower Colorado Region
Boulder City, Nevada**

May 2007



Errata Sheet

(May 10, 2007)

1. Chapter 3 of this report titled: “Volume 2: Embankment Designs and Optimization Study” includes a description of Alternative No.1: Mid-Sea Dam with North Marine Lake. Alternative No. 1 was proposed by the Salton Sea Authority (SSA). The mid-Sea embankment location of this alternative was originally proposed by the SSA to be located approximately 1.5 miles south of the position shown in Figure 3.1. The SSA proposed the new location to allow for enhanced capabilities to manage for future salinity concentrations in the north marine lake. At the time Kleinfelder conducted their work, the new alignment was not yet proposed by the Salton Sea Authority. Therefore, all cost quantities and cost estimates developed by Kleinfelder and presented in “Volume 2: Embankment Designs and Optimization Study” are based on the original alignment proposed by the Salton Sea Authority. The Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation) revised embankment quantities and costs for Alternative No.1 to reflect the new alignment. All costs and analyses presented in “Volume 1: Evaluation of Alternatives” are based on this new dam alignment.
2. Table 8.1 of this report: “Volume 2: Embankment Designs and Optimization Study” provides a summary of estimated construction costs for the embankment elements of the Restoration alternatives. This table reports a cost of \$0 for Alternative 3C: Concentric Lakes Alternative with Geotubes. The costs of this alternative are not \$0. Kleinfelder’s task order did not include a requirement for making an estimate of costs for this alternative. Cost estimates for Alternative 3 using Geotubes were developed by Reclamation and reported in “Volume 1: Evaluation of Alternatives” as Table 7.3.
3. Table 8.1 of this report : “Volume 2: Embankment Designs and Optimization Study” mistakenly presents total project costs, annual risk costs, annual OME&R costs, and present values as \$0 for each alternative. Kleinfelder was not responsible for developing these costs and mistakenly reported them as zero. Kleinfelder was responsible for developing quantities and costs for the embankment portions of the alternatives (except for Alternative No.3 with Geotubes). Reclamation developed complete cost estimates for the alternatives. Tables 7.1, 7.2, 7.3, and 7.4 of the report titled “Volume 1: Evaluation of Alternatives” present Reclamation’s complete alternative cost estimates.

Table of Contents

1.0	Introduction	1
1.1	Study Location.....	1
1.2	Study Purpose and Objectives	2
1.3	Scope of Work.....	3
1.4	Authorization	4
1.5	Project Personnel	4
2.0	Executive Summary	7
3.0	Restoration Alternatives.....	11
3.1	General.....	11
3.2	Alternative No. 1 — Mid-Sea Dam/North Marine Lake (Salton Sea Authority Alternative).....	11
3.3	Alternative No. 2 — Mid-Sea Barrier/South Marine Lake.	13
3.4	Alternative No. 3 — Concentric Lakes Dikes	14
3.5	Alternative No. 4 — North-Sea Dam/Marine Lake	16
3.6	Alternative No. 5 — Habitat Enhancement Without Marine Lake.....	17
3.7	Risk Reductions Summary	17
4.0	Evaluation of Mid-Sea Dam and Barrier Options.	19
4.1	General.....	19
4.1.1	Appraisal Level Study Results.....	19
4.1.2	Geologic and Seismic Setting.....	20
4.1.3	Available Geotechnical Information.....	21
4.1.4	Design Criteria and Considerations	22
4.2	Formulation, Evaluation, and Decision Process for Section of Preferred Configuration of Required Embankments	24
4.3	Evaluation of Construction Material Sources	28
4.4	Stability and Seepage Analyses Results.....	30
4.4.1	Seepage Analyses.....	30
4.4.2	Stability Analyses	31
4.5	Deformation Analysis Results.....	33
4.6	Option A — Sand Dam with Stone Columns	34
4.7	Option B — Rockfill Dam with Jet Grouted Foundation	36
4.8	Option C — Modified Rock Notches Dam with Minimum Filters	37

4.9 Option D — Modified Rock Notches Dam with
Maximum Seismic Filters.....39

4.10 Mid-Sea Barrier41

4.11 Evaluation and Selection of Preferred Dam and Dike
Configurations43

**5.0 Optimized South- and North-Sea Dams, Perimeter
Dikes, Concentric Lakes Dikes, and Habitat Pond
Embankments Cross-Sections51**

5.1 General.....51

5.2 South- and North-Sea Dams51

 5.2.1 South-Sea Dam 51

 5.2.2 North-Sea Dam 53

5.3 Perimeter and Concentric Lakes Dikes55

5.4 Habitat Pond Embankments57

6.0 Results of Risk Analyses.....59

6.1 Methodology.....59

6.2 Alternatives and Embankments Evaluated.....60

6.3 Potential Failure Modes.....60

6.4 Estimation of Annual Probability of Failure and Loss of
Life.....63

6.5 Compilation of Highest Annual Probability of Failure and
Loss-of-Life for Each Restoration Alternative.....72

6.6 Adaptations to Design Concepts Resulting from Initial
Risk Analysis Results74

6.7 Discussion of Risk and Cost of Replacement75

7.0 Project Constructability77

7.1 General.....77

 7.1.1 Introduction and Scope77

 7.1.2 Project Alternatives.....77

7.2 Embankment Materials.....77

 7.2.1 Dredging77

 7.2.2 Type A Sand/Gravel78

 7.2.3 Type B Sand/Gravel.....78

 7.2.4 Filter and Drain Materials.....78

 7.2.5 Riprap.....78

 7.2.6 Stone Columns78

 7.2.7 Soil-Cement-Bentonite Slurry Wall.....79

 7.2.8 Wick Drains79

 7.2.9 Habitat Pond Embankments.....79

7.3	Material Sources	80
7.3.1	Coolidge Mountain / API Pits.....	80
7.3.2	Eagle Mountain / Kaiser Ventures.....	80
7.4	Construction Materials and Methods	81
7.4.1	Quarry Stone	81
7.4.2	Alluvial Soil Sources	81
7.4.3	Screening and Crushing	82
7.4.4	Sorting.....	82
7.4.5	Waste Materials	82
7.4.6	Transport and Placement.....	82
7.4.7	Dredging	83
7.4.8	Foundation Treatment.....	83
7.4.9	Foundation Excavation	84
7.4.10	Stone Columns	84
7.4.11	Soil-Cement-Bentonite Slurry Walls	84
7.5	Schedule and Project Duration	84
7.6	Contracting Methods and Packaging.....	84
7.7	Project Risks	85
8.0	Construction Cost Estimates	87
8.1	Introduction	87
8.2	Embankment Elements and Construction Requirements	87
8.3	Cost Estimate Model Development.....	88
8.4	Unit Prices	88
8.4.1	Fixed Direct Costs.....	89
8.4.2	Variable Direct Costs.....	89
8.4.3	Total Direct Unit Costs	89
8.4.4	Indirect Costs	89
8.4.5	Markup and Profit.....	90
8.4.6	Unit Price Escalation.....	90
8.4.7	Production Rates and Constraints	90
8.5	Quantity Estimates.....	90
8.6	Summary of Estimated Costs	91
9.0	Conclusions and Recommendations.....	93
9.1	Preferred Embankment Dam Configurations.....	93
9.2	Deformation Analysis Results.....	95
9.3	Risk Analysis Results	96
9.4	Construction Materials and Cost Estimates	97
10.0	References	99

List of Tables

Table 3.1	Summary of Anticipated Maximum Section Attributes Mid-Sea, South-Sea and Perimeter Dike Embankments
Table 3.2	Summary of Project Alternatives
Table 4.1	Summary of Computed Slope Stability Factors of Safety for Embankment Configuration Options A through E.
Table 4.2	Summary of Cross-Section Costs – Option A Sand Dam with Stone Columns
Table 4.3	Summary of Cross-Section Costs – Option B Rockfill Dam with Jet Grouted Foundation
Table 4.4	Summary of Cross-Section Costs – Option C Modified Rock Notches Dam with Minimum Filters
Table 4.5	Summary of Cross-Section Costs – Option D Modified Rock Notches with Maximum Seismic Filters
Table 4.6	Summary of Comparative Analysis Results, Mid-Sea Dam Configuration Options
Table 6.1	Summary of Risk Estimates for all Embankment Structures
Table 6.2	Summary of Mean Risk Estimates – Mid-Sea Dam Option A, Sand Dam with Stone Columns
Table 6.3	Summary of Mean Risk Estimates – Mid-Sea Dam Option D, Rock Notches with Maximum Seismic Filters
Table 6.4	Summary of Mean risk Estimates, Mid-Sea Barrier
Table 6.5	Summary of Mean Risk Estimates, Perimeter Dike
Table 6.6	Summary of Mean Risk Estimates, South-Sea Dam
Table 6.7	Summary of Mean Risk Estimates, North-Sea Dam
Table 6.8	Summary of Mean Risk Estimates, Concentric Lakes Dikes
Table 6.9	Summary of Mean Risk Estimates, Habitat Ponds
Table 6.10	Summary of Alternative Risks – With Liquefaction Within the Upper Stiff Lacustrine Deposit
Table 8.1	Summary of Estimated Construction Costs – Embankment Elements Only
Table 9.1	LOL Estimates for Project Structures

List of Figures

Figure 1.1	Project Location Map
Figure 1.2	Principal Geographic Features Surrounding the Salton Sea
Figure 1.3	Geologic Features Legend
Figure 3.1	Alternative No. 1 – Mid-Sea Dam/North Marine Lake (Salton Sea Authority Alternative)
Figure 3.2	Alternative No. 2 – Mid-Sea Barrier/South Marine Lake
Figure 3.3	Alternative No. 3 – Concentric Lakes Dikes
Figure 3.4	Alternative No. 4 – North Sea Dam/Marine Lake

Figure 3.5	Alternative No. 5 – Habitat Enhancement without Marine Lake
Figure 4.1	Reclamation Preferred Mid-Sea Dam Configuration – Appraisal Study
Figure 4.2	Reclamation Preferred Mid-Sea Barrier Configuration – Appraisal Study
Figure 4.3	Reclamation Preferred Lakes Dike Configuration – Appraisal Study
Figure 4.4	Reclamation Preferred Habitat Pond Embankment Configuration – Appraisal Study
Figure 4.5	Location of 2004 Explorations Relative to Alternatives 1, 2 and 4 Embankments
Figure 4.6	Location of 2004 Explorations Relative to Alternative 3 Embankments
Figure 4.7a	Geologic Cross Section A-A’
Figure 4.7b	Geologic Cross Section B-B’
Figure 4.7c	Geologic Cross Section C-C’
Figure 4.7d	Geologic Cross Section D-D’
Figure 4.7e	Geologic Cross Section E-E’
Figure 4.8	Summary of Deformation Analysis Results
Figure 4.9	Predicted Crest Deformation of the mid-Sea Dam from Parametric Evaluation
Figure 4.10	Option A – “Optimized” Sand Dam with Stone Columns
Figure 4.11	Option B – Rockfill Dam with Jet Grouted Foundation
Figure 4.12	Option C – Modified Rock Notches Dam with Minimum Filters
Figure 4.13	Option D – Modified Rock Notches Dam with Maximum Seismic Filters
Figure 4.14	“Optimized” Mid-Sea Sand Barrier Dam With and Without Stone Columns
Figure 5.1	“Optimized” South-Sea Sand Dam with Stone Columns
Figure 5.2	“Optimized” North-Sea Dam with Stone Columns
Figure 5.3	“Optimized” Perimeter and Concentric Lakes Sand Dams (Dikes) with Stone Columns
Figure 5.4	“Optimized” Habitat Pond Embankment Configuration
Figure 6.1	f-N Diagram Portraying Risks for Restoration Alternative No. 1 - Mid-Sea Dam/North Marine Lake (Salton Sea Authority Alternative)
Figure 6.2	f-N Diagram Portraying Risks for Restoration Alternative No. 2 - Mid-Sea Barrier/South Marine Lake
Figure 6.3	f-N Diagram Portraying Risks for Restoration Alternative No. 3 – Concentric Lakes Dikes
Figure 6.4	f-N Diagram Portraying Risks for Restoration Alternative No. 4 – North Sea Dam/Marine Lake
Figure 6.5	f-N Diagram Portraying Risks for Restoration Alternative No. 5 - Habitat Enhancement without Marine Lake

List of Appendices

- Appendix 2A Evaluation of Construction Material Sources
- Appendix 2B Seepage and Stability Analysis
- Appendix 2C Deformation Analyses
- Appendix 2D Risk Analysis
- Appendix 2E Optimization Seepage and Stability Analyses
- Appendix 2F Construction Cost Estimates