

**GEOTECHNICAL INVESTIGATION OF ROAD FROM
JHARIKAS TO BHOIGAR, HASSANABDAL,
DISTRICT ATTOCK.**



By

**MUHAMMAD AHSAN ALI
MUHAMMAD SAJJAD
SHEIKH HAMZA ASGHAR**

**Department of Earth and Environmental Sciences
Bahria University, Islamabad**

2017

**GEOTECHNICAL INVESTIGATION OF ROAD FROM
JHARIKAS TO BHOIGAR, HASSANABDAL,
DISTRICT ATTOCK.**



A thesis submitted to Bahria University Islamabad, in partial fulfillment of the requirement for the degree of BS in Geology

MUHAMMAD AHSAN ALI

MUHAMMAD SAJJAD

SHEIKH HAMZA ASGHAR

Department of Earth and Environmental Sciences

Bahria University, Islamabad

2017

ABSTRACT

Geotechnical investigation of road from Jharikas to Bhoigar, district Attock was carried out to know the suitability of Soil, Aggregate, Concrete and Asphalt being used. Subgrade material falls in Class A4, for sub base dismantled material is used and on testing it showed that it belongs to A3 class and is good for subbase. The PI values for sub grade is 8.41% while above layers are non-plastic. The Maximum Dry Density (MDD) for sub grade was 2.074gm/cc at 9.75% moisture content. The sub base containing 2.266gm/cc density with 6.75% Optimum Moisture Content. Water bound macadam contains 2.336gm/cc density with 4.30% Optimum Moisture Content (OMC). Using Lab Density, CBR value was calculated for subgrade is 38% and for sub base is 72.50%. The lab density and field density values were utilized to check field compaction of layers. From Sandcone Replacement Method the compaction achieved for each layer was greater than 95%. Aggregates used in water bound macadam is mostly Margalla Hill Limestone. The specific gravity for these aggregates after oven dry were 2.584. The bulk saturated surface dry aggregate has specific gravity of 2.620 while apparent specific gravity of these aggregates was calculated 2.679. The water absorption was 1.379%. The Loss Angeles abrasion values of Margalla Hill Limestone aggregate calculated is 27.7%. The Sand Equivalent values for Water Bound Macadam (WBM) is 35.4. From various test procedures, the density of layer about 2.339 having flow of 10.5mm with bitumen by weight of 3.93% in 1446.4 grams of aggregate. The compaction of asphalt is 96.6%. All the results obtained were according to AASHTO standards suitable to be used in the construction of this road.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We are grateful to the Allah Almighty for the good health and wellbeing that were necessary to complete this thesis.

We are grateful to Mustafa Yar, Senior Lecturer, Department of Earth and Environmental Sciences. We extremely thankful and indebted to him for sharing expertise, and sincere and valuable guidance and encouragement extended to us. We are also thankful to Faraz Ahmed, Site Inspector NESPAK for helping and sharing information of sites. We are also thankful to NESPAK Laboratory team for guiding and supporting during our thesis work.

We wish to express our sincere thanks to Dr. Tahseenullah Khan, Head of Department Earth and Environmental Sciences Bahria University, Islamabad for providing us with all the necessary facilities for the research. We take this opportunity to express gratitude to all of the Department faculty members for their help and support. We are also thanks our parents for the unceasing encouragement, support and attention.

CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT	i
ACKNOWLEDGMENT	ii
CONTENTS	iii
FIGURES	viii
TABLES	x

CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION

1.1. Study Area	1
1.2. Location and Accessibility	1
1.3. Purpose of Project	2
1.4. Methodology	2
1.5. Purpose of Geotechnical Investigation	3
2.1. Layer Design	4
2.2. Plum Wall Design	5
2.3. Pipe Culvert Design	7
2.4. Road Layout	8
3.1. Sieve Analysis	10
3.1.1. Application	10
3.1.3. Procedure	11
3.1.4. Precautions	12
3.1.5. Calculations	12
3.1.6. Limitations	12
3.2. Atterberg Limits	13
3.2.1. Liquid Limit	14

3.2.2.	Plastic Limit	18
3.2.3.	Calculations	19
3.2.4.	Plasticity Index	20
3.2.5.	Limitations	20
3.3.	Field Density Test	20
3.3.1.	Speedy Moisture Test	20
3.3.2.	Relative Density Test	23
3.3.3.	Sandcone Replacement Method	25
3.4.	Modified Proctor Test	30
3.4.1.	Application	30
3.4.2.	Apparatus	30
3.4.3.	Procedure	30
3.4.4.	Precautions	32
3.4.5.	Calculation	32
3.4.6.	Limitations	33
3.5.	California Bearing Ratio	33
3.5.1.	Application	33
3.5.2.	Apparatus	33
3.5.3.	Procedure	34
3.5.4.	Precautions	36
3.5.5.	Calculations	36
3.5.6.	Limitations	37
4.1.	Los Angeles Abrasion Test	38
4.1.1.	Applications	38
4.1.2.	Apparatus	38
4.1.3.	Procedure	39
4.1.4.	Calculations	40

4.2.	Sand Equivalent Test	40
4.2.1.	Application	40
4.2.2.	Apparatus	40
4.2.3.	Procedure	41
4.2.4.	Precautions	43
4.2.5.	Calculations	43
4.3.	Specific Gravity Test	43
4.3.1.	Application	43
4.3.2.	Apparatus	43
4.3.3.	Procedure	43
4.3.4.	Precautions	44
4.3.5.	Calculations	44
4.4.	Soundness Test	45
4.4.1.	Applications	45
4.4.2.	Apparatus	45
4.4.3.	Procedure	46
4.4.4.	Precautions	47
4.4.5.	Calculations	48
5.1.	Marshall Test	49
5.1.1.	Application	49
5.1.2.	Apparatus	49
5.1.3.	Procedure	50
5.1.4.	Precautions	51
5.1.5.	Calculations	51
5.2.	Bitumen Extraction Test	51
5.2.1.	Application	52
5.2.2.	Apparatus	52

5.2.3. Procedure	52
5.2.4. Calculations	53
5.3. Asphalt Compaction Test	53
5.3.1. Applications	53
5.3.2. Apparatus	53
5.3.3. Procedure	53
5.3.4. Precautions	54
5.3.5. Calculations	54
6.1. Slump Test	56
6.1.1. Application	56
6.1.2. Apparatus	56
6.1.3. Procedure	56
6.1.4. Precautions	57
6.2. Compressive Strength Test	57
6.2.1. Application	58
6.2.2. Apparatus	58
6.2.3. Procedure	58
6.2.4. Precautions	58
6.2.5. Calculations	59
7.1. Sieve Analysis	60
7.2. Atterberg Limit	64
7.3. Field Density Test	68
7.4. Modified Proctor Test	71
7.5. California Bearing Ratio	75
7.6. Los Angeles Abrasion Test	82
7.7. Sand Equivalent Test	83
7.8. Specific Gravity Test	84

7.9.	Soundness Test	85
7.10.	Marshall Test	87
7.11.	Bitumen Extraction Test	89
7.12.	Asphalt Compaction Test	91
7.13.	Slump Test	92
7.14.	Compression Strength Test	92
	CONCLUSIONS	98
	RECOMMADATIONS	99
	REFERENCES	100

FIGURES

	Page
Figure 1.1. Location Accessibility Map via GT road and Karakoram Highway	2
Figure 1.2. Workflow for methodology of Geotechnical Investigation.	3
Figure 3.1. Cross section of road approved by NHA.	5
Figure 3.2. Cross section of Plumb Wall approved by NHA.	6
Figure 3.3. Cross Section of Plum Wall.	7
Figure 3.4. Culvert cross section approved by NHA.	8
Figure 3.5. NHA Approved Layout Map for placing Concrete and Asphalt.	9
Figure 4.1. Sieves used for coarse grained particles and fine grained particles	11
Figure 4.2. Soil states based on soil behavior with change in water content.	13
Figure 4.3. Casagrande Apparatus containing sample of subgrade.	15
Figure 4.4. Addition of distilled water in subgrade sample.	16
Figure 4.5. With help of grove cutter 2mm cut marked on subgrade sample.	16
Figure 4.6. Sample is taken out where 2mm grove is filled.	17
Figure 4.7. Sample taken out for determination of dry unit weight.	17
Figure 4.8. The thread of 3mm is formed of Subgrade material.	19
Figure 4.9. Speedy Moisture Apparatus.	21
Figure 4.10. Placing of sample and closing of bottle.	22
Figure 4.11. Pouring of Calcium Chloride.	22
Figure 4.12. Lawerncepur Sand filled in Sandcone Jar.	23
Figure 4.13. Sandcone Replacement Method on Sub Base Layer.	26
Figure 4.14. Cone calibration done before test by Site Inspector.	27
Figure 4.15. Excavated test hole of Subgrade.	27
Figure 4.16. Excavated material transferred into plastic bag.	28
Figure 4.17. Weighing of Sandcone jar for determination of Residual Soil weight.	28
Figure 4.18. FigurBlows are performed on 3rd Layer.	31
Figure 4.19. Samples placed in Dry Owen for determination of Moisture Content	32
Figure 4.20. CBR Testing Machine.	35
Figure 4.21. Weight is put on Compacted Sub Grade Sample.	35
Figure 4.22. Soaking of Mould in Water Tank.	36
Figure 5.1. Loss Angeles Abrasion Machine.	39
Figure 5.2. ApparatuGraduated Cylinder, Flask, Weight Assembly and Spatula.	41

Figure 5.3.	Sodium Sulphate Solution and Container	46
Figure 6.1.	Marshall Test Machine.	50
Figure 6.2.	Thickness of Core is obtained by using Vernier Caliper.	54
Figure 6.3.	Core is immersed in water to obtain weight in water.	55
Figure 7.1.	Slump cone for material used in Plam Concrete Wall.	57
Figure 7.2.	Concrete Cube Filling at Site RD 204 to 228+10.	59
Figure 7.3.	Cube Testing in Compressive Strength Machine.	59
Figure 8.1.	Graph of JMF values obtained from Bitumen Extraction Test	90

TABLES

	Page
Table 3.1. NHA approved Thickness and Specification of Road Layers	4
Table 3.2. NHA approved Road Shoulder's width and specification	5
Table 3.3. Plum Concrete Wall NHA Specification.	6
Table 3.4. Pipe Culvert Design approved by NHA.	8
Table 4.1. Formulae applied during Atterberg Limit Test.	20
Table 4.2. Formulae for calculating Dry unit weight of Lawerencepur sand.	25
Table 8.1. Sieve Analysis Result of Sub Grade.	61
Table 8.2. Sieve Analysis Result of Sub Base.	62
Table 8.3. Sieve Analysis Result for Water Bound Macadam.	63
Table 8.4. Atterberg Limit Result of Sub Grade.	65
Table 8.5. Atterberg Limit Result of Sub Base.	66
Table 8.6. Atterberg Limit Result of Water Bound Macadam.	67
Table 8.7. FDT Result of Sub Grade.	68
Table 8.8. FDT Result of Sub Base.	69
Table 8.9. FDT Result of Water Bound Macadam.	70
Table 8.10. MDD Result for Sub Grade.	72
Table 8.11. MDD Result for Sub Base.	73
Table 8.12. MDD Result for Water Bound Macadam.	74
Table 8.13. CBR Value for Subgrade (Sheet 1).	76
Table 8.14. CBR Value for Sub Grade (Sheet 2).	77
Table 8.15. CBR Curves for Sub Grade (Sheet 3).	78
Table 8.16. CBR Values for Sub Base (Sheet 1).	79
Table 8.17. CBR Values for Sub Base (Sheet 2).	80
Table 8.18. CBR Curves for Sub Base (Sheet 3).	81
Table 8.19. Loss Angeles Abrasion Values for Sub Base.	82
Table 8.20. Sand Equivalent Test Value for Sub Base.	83
Table 8.21. Specific Gravity Values for Water Bound Macadam.	84
Table 8.22. Soundness Result Values of Margalla Limestone Aggregate.	85
Table 8.23. Soundness Result Values of Margalla Limestone Aggregate.	86
Table 8.24. Result obtained from Marshall Test of RD 65+00.	87
Table 8.25. Result obtained from Marshall Test of RD 71+20.	88

Table 8.26. Bitumen Extraction value for Asphalt Wearing	89
Table 8.27. Results of Core Compaction of RD 65+00.	91
Table 8.28. Compressive Strength Results of Rigid Pavement on RD 20to 60	93
Table 8.29. Compressive Strength Results of Rigid Pavement on RD 20 to 21	94
Table 8.30. Compressive Strength Results of Rigid Pavement on RD 204 to 228.	95
Table 8.31. Compressive Strength Results of Drain Wall on RD 128 to130.	96
Table 8.32. Compressive Strength Results of Plum Wall on RD 62 to 85LS	97