Specific Accreditation Guidance

Infrastructure and Asset Integrity

Technical issues in geotechnical testing

October 2019

Table of Contents

Technical issues in geotechnical testing

This document presents information on technical matters that commonly arise during NATA assessments in relation to the testing of soils and aggregates.

While it is hoped that the information will provide some useful insight for these technical matters, this document only serves as guidance and does not include accreditation criteria for geotechnical testing facilities.

This document is included as a reference in the NATA Accreditation Criteria (NAC) package for Infrastructure and Asset Integrity.

The following topics are considered:

1. test sieves;
2. oversize materials;
3. assignment of MDD and OMC;
4. one-for-one testing;
5. Level 1 earthworks testing (AS3798);
6. quality assurance activities for CBR testing;
7. seating loads for CBR testing;
8. reporting of bearing ratios for more than one penetration value;
9. spread of points when testing for liquid limit;
10. rounding of results;
11. verification of nuclear gauges following calibration.

1 Test sieves

Initial calibration of test sieves

The measurement of particle size using test sieves is required in a number of commonly used Australian Standards and state road authority methods, for example AS 1141, AS 1289, AS 2350, AS 2891, etc.

Some of these standards call for the use of test sieves as specified in AS 1152, which has now been withdrawn. Sieves complying with ISO 3310 Parts 1, 2 and 3 are considered to be acceptable alternatives to those specified in the superseded standard AS 1152.

Sieves need to be calibrated as the aperture openings have been shown to contribute significantly to the measurement uncertainty for particle size distribution tests and other tests where the amount retained or passing a sieve is critical to the test result, such as wet/dry strength tests.

In the case of washing sieves, calibration may be demonstrated by provision of a calibration report for the batch wire mesh from which the sieve was manufactured based on a further statement of conformity to the standard (stating the sieve was made from that batch of material).

If a facility chooses to calibrate sieves in-house then the process for doing so will be reviewed during a NATA assessment (refer *General Accreditation Criteria: Equipment assurance, in-house calibration and equipment verification*). In the case of fine woven wire sieves, such procedures could be based upon the approach detailed in Clause 5.4 of the *United Kingdom Accreditation Service Publication: Lab 22 – Traceability: Test Sieves*.

If in-house calibration is undertaken based on comparison with reference sieves, such reference sieves will first need to be calibrated and controls established to preserve the integrity of the reference sieves (as a guide, it can be expected that reference sieves will experience wear within 200 uses after which continued use as a reference sieve would be compromised).

Ongoing verification of sieves

As all sieves are subject to wear, verification is required at suitable intervals to ensure continued compliance. These intervals will depend upon the type of the sieve and the amount of use.

If at any time there are signs of wear or deterioration, the sieve should not be used until adequate checks have been made to confirm continued compliance with the requirements of the relevant standard.

2 Oversize materials

AS 1289.0 states in Section 5:

> *With the exception of a soil classifications test and some soil compaction and density tests, soils with a greater proportion of material than 20% retained on a 37.5 mm AS 1152 sieve cannot be usefully examined by the methods in AS 1289.*

The excepted soil classification test referred to here is AS 1289.3.6.1 and the excepted compaction and density tests are AS 1289.5.5.1 and AS 1289.5.3.5.

In general, test results obtained with the more oversize material than that stated in the test methods should be considered questionable in the absence of a robust validation process. In any case, such departures from the method would need to be reported, for example, by highlighting within the report that the method was being used outside its defined scope of applicability.

3 Assignment of maximum dry density (MDD) and optimum moisture content (OMC) values

AS 1289.5.4.1 allows assigned values of MDD and OMC to be used in the determination of the dry density ratio (DDR) and moisture ratio (MR).

Where the facility reporting the results is not responsible for the assigned values which contribute to the reported result, certain provisions are needed to retain integrity in the process. In particular, assigned values from a well-controlled production of crushed rock may be reported by one NATA accredited facility (LAB 1) and then used by another NATA accredited facility (LAB 2) for calculating DDR and MR based upon the field density and moisture content values determined by that facility (LAB 2), provided that:

a) adequate reference is made to the assigned value test report from LAB 1 (refer to *General Accreditation Criteria: ISO/IEC 17025 Standard Application Document, Clause 7.8.2.1*) and the date of report;

b) (i) the facility producing the assigned values (LAB 1) has a procedure for verifying the values are representative of the material supplied and compacted in place (i.e. tests on stockpiled material are not acceptable, unless required by the specification);

(ii) the facility using the assigned values (LAB 2) has a procedure in place to verify that the field tests pertain to the material for which the assigned values are reported and that the most recent assigned values are used.

4 One-for-one testing

AS 3798 and AS 1289.5.4.1 require for each field density site that is tested, that a laboratory compaction test be performed in order to determine the field density ratio. However, AS 1289 permits the use of less than one-for-one testing, such as the assignment of a laboratory maximum dry density, in circumstances where the material has been found to be consistent as defined in either AS 1289.5.4.2 or AS 1289.5.4.3.

In earthworks, the laboratory maximum dry density (MDD) may commonly vary from values of 1.90 t/m^3 to 2.20 t/m^3 due to the variability in the naturally occurring soils alone.

Where one-for-one testing is not applied strictly in accordance with the applicable Australian Standards, derived methods permitting this practice may not be able to be reasonably validated and the measurement uncertainty is unlikely to be amenable to reliable calculation. Therefore NATA accreditation is not offered for such activity and any such testing is regarded as outside the scope of accreditation.

5 Level 1 Earthworks Testing (AS 3798)

Results on activities not covered by a facility's scope of accreditation must be identified accordingly when included in endorsed reports which include results on other activities covered by the scope of accreditation. Refer to *General Accreditation Criteria: Use of the NATA emblem, NATA endorsement and references to accreditation*.

Where accreditation for inspection of earthworks testing to AS 3798 is not held under NATA's Inspection Program (ISO/IEC 17020), accreditation cannot be claimed for AS 3798.

6 Quality Assurance Activities for CBR testing

Acceptance of proficiency testing outcomes on the basis of z-score analysis alone may be problematic in the particular case of CBR testing, due to consistently wide z-score ranges quoted as satisfactory for various published CBR programs.

Facilities are encouraged to consider critically the results of their CBR program participation. Any deviation from the published program mean of a magnitude holding significance from an engineering perspective could be considered as warranting further investigation, regardless of participation that is deemed to be satisfactory on the basis of z-score analysis alone.

Such investigation might involve an initial determination whether the repeatability of the test by a single operator aligns with that achieved for the quoted homogeneity testing and whether the repeatability between operators in the facility fall within an appropriate range (typically not more than twice the range achieved in the homogeneity testing).

Possible sources of systematic error between one facility and another that may be worth investigating include:

- non-representative splitting of sub samples;
- variation in moulding moisture content;
- curing of samples before moulding and after the addition of moisture;
- method of compaction using full blows of the compaction hammer and achievement of layer heights within specification;
- distribution of hammer blows across the specimen (see MR (QLD) Method Q113A for a suitable pattern);
- time between removal from water bath and commencement of testing;
- reading of load ring and correct conversion of values to load;
- determination of curve offsets.

7 Seating loads for CBR testing

In order to achieve consistent readings when performing testing to AS 1289.6.1.1, seating loads of 50 N (for CBR values ≤ 30%) or 250 N (for CBR values > 30%) are considered to be the values inferred within the standard, rather than the ‘smallest possible load’.

8 Reporting of bearing ratios for more than one penetration value

AS 1289.6.1.1 Clause 10 (a) requires that only the greater bearing value calculated in Clause 9 (b) be reported as the CBR. In other words, the individual values for different penetrations are bearing ratios and not the CBR value. Therefore, when reporting results to AS 1289 6.1.1, the CBR value should be presented in a manner such that it cannot be confused with any other bearing ratio results that may also be reported.

9 Spread of points when testing for liquid limit

When testing the liquid limit of a soil to AS 1289.3.1.1 and AS 1289.3.9.1, the points selected should be as evenly spaced as is feasible. In particular, this is to avoid any possibility that multiple points might be inferred to represent ‘the same point’.

10 Rounding of results

As detailed in the General Accreditation Criteria: ISO/IEC 17025 Standard Application Document, Clause 7.8.1.2, rounding shall occur at the final report stage, unless otherwise required by the method. Rounding should be made to the level of precision specified in the reporting requirements of the method.

This principle would indicate that, when using data to make decisions during the tests (such as the selection of compaction mould size based on the amount of oversize materials, or deciding which portions of an aggregate are to be used for determining flakiness index), *unrounded figures should be used* unless otherwise specified.

Similarly, in cases where results, which have been rounded, are reported for one test method and then subsequently used as the basis for calculations as part of a different test method, the resulting test report should make clear that original unrounded results were either not used or were not available, unless the rounding protocols are specified within the test method itself.

11 Verification of nuclear gauges following calibration

When testing to AS 1289.5.8.1, or any other nuclear gauge method which relies upon internal gauge equations to produce test results, correct entry of the equations into the gauge microprocessor by the calibrating agency should be confirmed or subject to verification by the facility.

ISO/IEC 17025 Clause 6.4.4 states that “The laboratory shall verify that equipment conforms to specified requirements before being placed or returned into service.” This is especially pertinent since some calibration agencies do not update gauge equations as part of their calibration activities.

The facility’s secondary reference block can be used to obtain a density count at each depth for which the corresponding density can be calculated (according to the gauge equation stated in the calibration certificate) and compared with the displayed density reading at each depth. This will confirm that the gauge equation has been correctly entered into the gauge.

The same principle would apply to verifying the moisture equation.

Except in the case of brand new gauges, the density readings (and moisture readings, if applicable) described above are able to be compared with the secondary reference block readings taken prior to re-calibration, in order that any microprocessor anomaly which may have developed prior to re-calibration is identified (and the impact on previously conducted work assessed).

References

This section lists publications referenced in this document. The year of publication is not included as it is expected that only current versions of the references shall be used.

Standards

ISO/IEC 17025 General requirements for the competence of testing and calibration laboratories

NATA publications

NATA Accreditation Criteria (NAC) package for Infrastructure and Asset Integrity

General Accreditation Criteria ISO/IEC 17025 Standard Application Document

General Accreditation Criteria Equipment assurance, in-house calibration and equipment verification

General Accreditation Criteria Use of the NATA emblem, NATA endorsement and references to accreditation

Other publications

United Kingdom Accreditation Service Publication: Lab 22 – Traceability: Test Sieves

Amendment Table

The table below provides a summary of changes made to the document with this issue.

Section or Clause	Amendment
Whole document	Typographical errors corrected.
7	Typographical error corrected – units for seating loads changed from kN to N.