

Manual on **Subsurface** Investigations

2nd Edition • September 2022



Documents
Document Sharing Hub



1. Drilling on Steep Slope with Difficult Access Using Skid-Rig and Temporary Platform. Photo courtesy of Federal Highway Administration.
2. Determining Shear Strength of Soil Specimen Using Triaxial Testing. Photo courtesy of Federal Highway Administration.
3. Investigating Embankment Slope Failure. Photo courtesy of Federal Highway Administration.
4. Setting Up Electrical Resistivity Line and Electrodes. Photo courtesy of Federal Highway Administration.
5. Collecting Magnetic Survey Data. Photo courtesy of Federal Highway Administration.
6. Cone Penetration Testing (CPT). Photo courtesy of ConeTec.
7. Mud-Rotary Drilling. Photo courtesy of North Dakota Department of Transportation.

© 2022 by the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials.
All rights reserved. Duplication is a violation of applicable law.

Publ. Code: MSI-2

978-1-56051-790-0



Documents
Document Sharing Hub

2021–2022 Executive Committee

President: Shawn Wilson, Louisiana
Vice President: Roger Millar, Washington
Secretary/Treasurer: Russell McMurry, Georgia

Regional Representatives:

Region I	Marie Therese Dominguez, New York Nicole Majeski, Delaware
Region II	Brad White, Mississippi Vacant
Region III	Julie Lorenz, Kansas Jack Marchbanks, Ohio
Region IV	Joel Jundt, South Dakota Kristina Swallow, Nevada

Immediate Past President: Victoria Sheehan, New Hampshire
Executive Director: Jim Tymon, Washington, DC

2021–2022 Committee on Materials and Pavements

Chair

Mostafa Jamshidi
Nebraska DOT

Vice Chair

Curt Turgeon
Minnesota DOT

STATE DOT MEMBERS

Alabama DOT
Scott W. George
Steven Ingram
Kaye C. Davis

Alaska DOT&PF
Michael San Angelo
Jeff Currey
Andrew Pavey

Arizona DOT
Jesús A. Sandoval-Gil

Arkansas State HTD
Jon Annable

California DOT
Tim Greutert
Dulce Rufino Feldman
Sergio Aceves

Colorado DOT
Craig Wieden
Michael Stanford

Connecticut DOT
Robert G. Lauzon
John W. Henault

Delaware DOT
Jennifer Pinkerton
Robin Davis

District of Columbia DOT
Rezene Medhani
Jason Griffin

Florida DOT
Timothy Ruelke
Philip G. Davis
Mary Jane Hayden

Georgia DOT
Patrick Allen
Peter Wu
Neoma C. Walker

Hawaii DOT
Mung Fa Chung
Brian Ikehara

Idaho DOT
Chad W. Clawson
Mike Copeland

Illinois DOT
Brian Pfeifer
LaDonna Rowden
Andrew J. Stolba

Indiana DOT
Matthew Beeson
Jim Reilman

Iowa DOT
Jeff De Vries
Scott Schram
Chris Brakke

Kansas DOT
Richard A. Barezinsky
Greg Schieber

Kentucky TC
Allen H. Myers
Brandi R. Mitchell

Louisiana DOTD
Luanna Cambas
Jason K. Davis
Justin W. Morris

Maine DOT
Richard Bradbury
Casey B. Nash

Maryland SHA
Sejal Barot
Eric Frempong
Chung-Lung Wu



Massachusetts DOT

Mary Grieco
Clement Fung
Mark J. Brum
Ed J. Naras

Michigan DOT

Kevin Kennedy

Minnesota DOT

Curt Turgeon
Greg B. Ous

Mississippi DOT

William G. Sullivan

Missouri DOT

Brett Trautman
David D. Ahlvers
John Donahue

Montana DOT

Ross “Oak” Metcalfe
Jim Davies

Nebraska DOT

Brandon Blake Varilek
Moe Jamshidi
Wally J. Heyen

Nevada DOT

Changlin Pan

New Hampshire DOT

Joseph Blair

New Jersey DOT

Edward Inman

New Mexico DOT

Armando Armendariz
Rais Rizvi

New York DOT

Russell Thielke
Christopher Euler
F. Steven Heiser

North Carolina DOT

Todd Whittington
Christopher A. Peoples
Clark Morrison

North Dakota DOT

Matt Linneman
Tyler Wollmuth
Scott W. Wutzke

Ohio DOT

Dan Miller
Gary E. Angles
Patrick Bierl
Craig Landefeld

Oklahoma AOT

Matt Romero

Oregon DOT

Larry D. Ilg
Sean P. Parker

Pennsylvania DOT

Joseph S. Robinson
Timothy Ramirez

Rhode Island DOT

Jose S. Lima
Michael Byrne

South Carolina DOT

Merrill E. Zwanka
Temple Short

South Dakota DOT

Joe J. Feller
Darin Hodges

Tennessee DOT

Heather Hall
Danny L. Lane

Texas DOT

Ryan Barborak
Jenny Li
Enad Mahmoud

Utah DOT

William J. Lawrence
Robert Stewart
L. Scott Nussbaum

Vermont AOT

Mladen Gagulic
Aaron Schwartz
Ryan Darling

Virginia DOT

Charles A. Babish

Washington State DOT

Kurt Williams
Kim Schofield

West Virginia DOH

Ron Stanevich
Vincent Allison

Wisconsin DOT

Barry C. Paye

Wyoming DOT

Greg Milburn

ASSOCIATE MEMBERS— INTERNATIONAL

Ontario Ministry of Transportation
Anne Holt

Quebec Ministry of Transportation
Felix Doucet

ASSOCIATE MEMBERS— OTHER

Transportation Research Board
Dr. Amir N. Hanna

AASHTO

Casey Soneira
Mark Felag
Ryan Fragapane
Maria Knake
Brian Johnson
John Malusky

Ex Officio—FEDERAL HIGHWAYS ADMINISTRATION

Brian Fouch
Gina Ahlstrom

Technical Subcommittee: 1b: Geotechnical Exploration, Instrumentation, Stabilization, and Field Testing

Chair

Neoma Walker
Georgia DOT

Vice Chair

Matt Linneman
North Dakota DOT

STATE DOT MEMBERS

Alabama DOT
Kaye Davis
Scott George

Alaska DOT&PF
Daniel Gettman

Colorado DOT
Craig Wieden

Connecticut DOT
Leo Fontaine

Delaware DOT
Robin Davis

Florida DOT
David Horhota

Georgia DOT
Neoma Walker, Chair

Idaho TD
Mike Santi

Illinois DOT
Daniel Tobias

Indiana DOT
Nayyar Siddiki

Kansas DOT
Christopher Leibrock

Maryland DOT
Eric Frempong, PE
Sejal Barot

Mississippi DOT
William Sullivan

Missouri DOT
John Donahue

Nevada DOT
Changlin Pan

New Hampshire DOT
Joseph Blair

New York State DOT
F. Heiser

North Dakota DOT
Matt Linneman

Oklahoma DOT
Matt Romero

Oregon DOT
Sean Parker

Tennessee DOT
Travis Smith

Texas DOT
Roberto Trevino Flores

Utah DOT
L. Nussbaum

Virginia DOT
Charles Babish

West Virginia DOT
Ron Stanevich



Documents

Document Sharing Hub

vii

MANUAL ON SUBSURFACE INVESTIGATIONS, SECOND EDITION

© 2022 by the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials.

All rights reserved. Duplication is a violation of applicable law.

**ASSOCIATE MEMBERS—
INTERNATIONAL**

Ontario Ministry of Transportation
Anne Holt
Stephen Lee
Zhiyong Jiang

Quebec Ministry of Transportation
Felix Doucet

AASHTO

Casey Soneira
Matt Bluman
Brian Johnson
Gregory Uherek
Maria Knake
Pete Holter
Steven Lenker

**ASSOCIATE MEMBERS—
OTHER**

Federal Highways Administration
Benjamin Rivers

CONSULTANTS

*Construction Materials
Engineering Council*
David Savage

D B Consulting and Associates, LLC
Desna Bergold

GGFGA Engineering, LLC
Georgene Geary

INSTROTEK, INC.
Ali Regimand

Acknowledgments

The research presented in this report was conducted under National Cooperative Highway Research Program (NCHRP) 21-10 by Geosyntec Consultants, Inc. The principal investigators for the work were Mr. Njoroge Wainaina and Dr. Glenn J. Rix. The authors are grateful to the National Cooperative Highway Research Program of the National Academy of Sciences for their support. In particular, the authors would like to acknowledge the contributions and support provided by the NCHRP project managers, Mr. David Reynaud and Dr. Waseem Dekelbab, and the valuable guidance and peer review comments from the NCHRP project panel members.

List of Tables

Table 3-1.	Geologic and Man-Made Constraints	3-3
Table 3-2.	Performance Issues and Required Design Properties and Parameters	3-5
Table 3-3.	Documents and Sources of Available Information	3-6
Table 3-4.	Items that Need to Be Evaluated during Field Reconnaissance	3-8
Table 3-5.	Guidelines for Selecting Number of Investigation Locations and Depths of Investigation	3-11
Table 3-6.	Investigation Equipment and Their Applications	3-13
Table 3-7.	Summary of <i>In Situ</i> Tests and Associated Design Parameters	3-15
Table 3-8.	Sampling Equipment and Their Applications	3-17
Table 3-9.	Borehole Advancing Methods and Their Applications	3-18
Table 3-10.	Guidelines for Selecting Laboratory Tests	3-19
Table 4-1.	Matrix of Surface Geophysical Methods in Relation to Investigation Objectives	4-4
Table 4-2.	ASTM Guides and Standards for Surface Geophysical Investigations	4-4
Table 4-3.	Matrix of Borehole Geophysical Methods in Relation to Investigation Objectives	4-20
Table 4-4.	ASTM Guides for Borehole Geophysical Investigations	4-21
Table 5-1.	Rotary Drill Rigs	5-2
Table 5-2.	Standard Drill Rod Sizes	5-6
Table 5-3.	Core Sizes from WG Swivel Type Double-Tube Core Barrel	5-18
Table 5-4.	Basic Rock Types	5-21
Table 5-5.	Rated Quality of Rock Mass Based on RQD	5-22
Table 6-1.	Summary of Hammer Energy Measurements Using Automatic Hammers	6-5
Table 6-2.	SPT Correction Factors for Field Procedures	6-6
Table 6-3.	Types of Cone Penetrometers	6-12
Table 7-1.	Typical Water-Level Measurement Intervals for Observation Wells	7-10
Table 7-2.	Methods for Interpreting Pumping Tests	7-11
Table 8-1.	Specimen Quality Rating System Based on Vertical Strain	8-5
Table 8-2.	Specimen Quality Rating System Based on Change in Void Ratio	8-5
Table 8-3.	Relationship between Electric Resistivity and Corrosion Potential	8-9
Table 8-4.	AASHTO Soil Classification System	8-11
Table 8-5.	Unified Soil Classification System	8-13

Table 8-6.	Soil Constituents for Visual-Manual Procedure	8-14
Table 8-7.	Checklist for Visual-Manual Procedure.	8-15
Table 8-8.	Summary of Equipment and Procedures for Density Tests	8-18
Table A-1.	Attributes of Several Instruments Available for Measuring Deformation.	A-3
Table A-2.	Attributes of Several Instruments Available for Measuring Loads and Pressures	A-5
Table A-3.	Attributes of Several Instruments Available for Measuring Vibration	A-5
Table A-4.	Steps of Instrumentation System Design	A-6
Table D-1.	Example of Project Metadata	D-13
Table I-1.	Methods for Evaluating SBT from CPTs	I-6
Table I-2.	Soil Classification Using the DMT	I-9
Table I-3.	Relationships for Constrained Modulus from DMTs in Various Soil Types.	I-30
Table I-4.	Expressions for Estimating $G_{\max}$ from DMT Readings in Various Soil Types	I-31
Table J-1.	Primary Rock Types Classified by Geologic Origin and Mineral Grain Size	J-3
Table J-2.	Strength and Stiffness Properties of Select Intact Rocks Measured in Laboratory Tests	J-9
Table J-3.	Selected Guideline Values of Peak Friction Angles for Rocks, Joints, and Minerals	J-12
Table J-4.	Selected Guideline Values of Residual Friction Angles for Rock	J-12
Table J-5.	Assessment of Discontinuity Orientation for Tunneling in Fractured Rock	J-17
Table J-6.	RMR Parameter R_f Adjustment for Orientation of Discontinuities.	J-17
Table J-7.	Applicability of the Hoek-Brown Model for Intact and Fractured Rocks.	J-21
Table J-8.	Values of the Disturbance Factor D for GSI Rock Mass Quality System	J-22

List of Figures

Figure 4-1.	Typical Ranges of Compression (Top) and Shear Wave Velocity (Bottom)	4-5
Figure 4-2.	Example Seismic Refraction Tomography Test Results	4-7
Figure 4-3.	Estimated D8R Ripper Performance from Seismic Velocity.	4-8
Figure 4-4.	Seismic Reflection Section Showing Depth to Bedrock.	4-9
Figure 4-5.	Seismic Reflection Section Showing Sinkhole Locations	4-9
Figure 4-6.	Example Rayleigh-Wave Dispersion Curve.	4-10
Figure 4-7.	Example 2D Shear Wave Velocity Cross Section from MASW Test	4-11
Figure 4-8.	Typical Ranges of Electrical Resistivity.	4-12
Figure 4-9.	Example Electrical Resistivity Imaging Results.	4-13
Figure 4-10.	Example Terrain Conductivity Results	4-14
Figure 4-11.	Example GPR Results Showing Base of Fill Layer.	4-16
Figure 4-12.	Example GPR Results Showing Pavement Void Detection	4-16
Figure 4-13.	Example of a Microgravity Profile	4-18
Figure 4-14.	Example of a Microgravity Contour Map.	4-18
Figure 4-15.	Example Seismic Crosshole Data.	4-22
Figure 4-16.	Example Seismic Downhole Data.	4-23
Figure 4-17.	Example Mechanical Caliper, Natural Gamma, and Acoustic Televiwer Logs	4-25
Figure 4-18.	Example Interpretation of Acoustic Televiwer Log.	4-27
Figure 4-19.	Example Results from Seismic Logging.	4-29
Figure 5-1.	HSA Sampling Systems: Drill Rod (Left) and Wireline (Right)	5-5
Figure 5-2.	Rotary Drilling Techniques in Comparison with Other Borehole Methods	5-6
Figure 5-3.	Geometry of Split-Spoon Sampler	5-8
Figure 5-4.	Direct-Push Samples of Soil	5-9
Figure 5-5.	Example of Recovered Sonic Soil Samples.	5-10
Figure 5-6.	Consecutive Vibracore Samples Showing Changes in Stratigraphy	5-10
Figure 5-7.	Components of a Fixed-Piston Sampler.	5-12
Figure 5-8.	Osterberg Piston Sampler.	5-13
Figure 5-9.	Denison Triple-Tube Core Barrel Sampler	5-15
Figure 5-10.	Primary Types of Rock Core Barrels: (a) Single Tube; (b) Rigid Double Tube; (c) Swivel Double Tube; (d) Triple Tube	5-17

Figure 5-11. Recovered Rock Core in Gneissic Granite Bedrock	5-18
Figure 5-12. Example Engineering Boring Log	5-20
Figure 5-13. Evaluation of RQD from Recovered Core.	5-22
Figure 6-1. SPT Set-Up and Procedures	6-2
Figure 6-2. Example of SPT N -Values.	6-3
Figure 6-3. Comparison of (a) Uncorrected (N_m) and (b) Energy-Corrected (N_{60}) SPT Blow Counts.	6-4
Figure 6-4. VST or Field Van for Clays and Silts	6-7
Figure 6-5. Limit Equilibrium Solutions for Calculating Undrained Shear Strength of Rectangular and Tapered Vanes	6-7
Figure 6-6. EVST Results from Selected Depths in Clay Deposit	6-8
Figure 6-7. Example of EVST in Soft Clay	6-8
Figure 6-8. Basic Components and Procedures of the PMT.	6-9
Figure 6-9. Example PMT Pressure–Volume Curve	6-9
Figure 6-10. Basic Set-Up and Equipment for (Electric) CPT.	6-12
Figure 6-11. Common Piezocone Configurations for Pore Pressure Readings	6-13
Figure 6-12. Example Results from CPTu Showing (a) Total Cone Resistance, q_t , (b) Sleeve Friction, f_s , and (c) Pore Pressures, u_2	6-14
Figure 6-13. Example Piezo-Dissipation Tests from CPTu	6-15
Figure 6-14. SCPTu	6-16
Figure 6-15. Example SCPTu Soundings in Sediment.	6-17
Figure 6-16. Example Continuous-Interval SCPTu	6-17
Figure 6-17. DMT Procedures and Measurement Readings	6-18
Figure 6-18. Example DMT Measured Pressure Profiles.	6-19
Figure 6-19. Example DMT Index Profiles	6-19
Figure 6-20. Example PLT on Limestone	6-21
Figure 6-21. Cross Section of Flat Jack Set-Up per ASTM D4729	6-21
Figure 6-22. Rock Borehole Shear Test in Sandstone	6-22
Figure 7-1. Single-Level Monitoring Well.	7-6
Figure 7-2. Multilevel Monitoring Wells.	7-7
Figure 7-3. Example Potentiometric Surface Map	7-8
Figure 7-4. Example Results from Pumping Test in a Confined Aquifer	7-11
Figure 7-5. Example Results from Slug Test in an Unconfined Aquifer.	7-12

Figure 8-1.	Changes in Effective Stress during Drilling, Sampling, and Specimen Preparation.	8-3
Figure 8-2.	Example of X-Ray Radiography	8-5
Figure 8-3.	Example of Particle-Size Distribution Plot for a Well-Graded Sand	8-6
Figure 8-4.	Atterberg Limits	8-7
Figure 8-5.	AASHTO Plasticity Chart.	8-12
Figure 8-6.	Plasticity Chart	8-14
Figure 8-7.	Example of Compaction Curves	8-16
Figure 8-8.	Example Results from CRS Consolidation Test	8-19
Figure 8-9.	Example of Casagrande Procedure to Estimate Preconsolidation Pressure.	8-20
Figure 8-10.	Example DS Test Results	8-21
Figure 8-11.	(a) Schematic of Triaxial Apparatus and (b) Assumed Stress Conditions for Triaxial Compression	8-22
Figure 8-12.	Example CU Test Results.	8-24
Figure 8-13.	Example CD Test Results.	8-24
Figure 8-14.	Example DSS Test Results.	8-25
Figure 8-15.	Example Results from Resonant Column Test	8-27
Figure 8-16.	Example Results from a Cyclic DSS Test	8-29
Figure 8-17.	Schematic of the Resilient Modulus Equipment	8-30
Figure 8-18.	Example Results from DS Test on Rock with Discontinuities	8-33
Figure A-1.	An Installed Data Logger Monitoring Deformation, Settlement, and Pore Pressure along a State Highway Embankment.	A-9
Figure B-1.	Example of an Instrumented Embankment	B-2
Figure B-2.	Example Results from an Instrumented Embankment	B-2
Figure B-3.	Instruments Used for Monitoring Excavations, Dewatering, and Earth-Retaining Structures	B-3
Figure B-4.	Example of Instrumentation for Vibration Monitoring and Measured Response.	B-5
Figure B-5.	Example of Instrumentation for Tunnels	B-7
Figure C-1.	SE/IR Test Set-Up.	C-3
Figure C-2.	Set-Up for Dispersive Flexural Wave Test	C-3
Figure C-3.	Half-Cell Potential Test Set-Up	C-4
Figure C-4.	Ultraseismic Test Set-Up for Vertical Profiling	C-5
Figure C-5.	Set-Up for the Induction Field Test Method	C-8
Figure C-6.	Parallel Seismic Test Set-Up	C-9

Figure D-1.	Example of a Data Dictionary	D-7
Figure D-2.	Example of Data Schema to Show Primary Keys	D-9
Figure D-3.	Example Project Workflow Diagram	D-14
Figure D-4.	Concept for DIGGS Data Interchange	D-28
Figure I-1.	Example Subsurface Profile Developed from a 2D MASW Survey	I-3
Figure I-2.	Example Subsurface Profile Developed from Cone Resistances of Several CPT Records.	I-4
Figure I-3.	Example Subsurface Profile Developed from Soil Boring Records and SPT Values	I-5
Figure I-4.	Nine-Zone Soil Behavioral Chart for Conducting CPTs in Soils	I-6
Figure I-5.	Use of CPT Material Index I_c and Algorithms for Nine-Zone Soil Behavioral Chart.	I-7
Figure I-6.	Soil Unit Weight Relationship with Shear Wave Velocity	I-10
Figure I-7.	Soil Unit Weight Estimated from CPT Sleeve Friction	I-10
Figure I-8.	Soil Unit Weight Estimated from DMT Readings.	I-11
Figure I-9.	General Relationship for Effective Yield Stress and CPT Net Cone Resistance in Soils.	I-12
Figure I-10.	General Trend for Yield Stress Exponent and CPT Material Index	I-13
Figure I-11.	General Relationship for Effective Yield Stress and DMT Net Contact Pressure in Soils	I-14
Figure I-12.	General Relationship for Effective Yield Stress and Energy-Corrected SPT N_{60} Resistance in Soils	I-14
Figure I-13.	General Relationship for Effective Yield Stress and Shear Wave Velocity in Soils	I-15
Figure I-14.	Effective Friction Angle of Sands from CPT-Normalized Cone Resistance	I-16
Figure I-15.	Effective Stress Friction Angle of Clays from CPTu via NTH Solution.	I-17
Figure I-16.	Calibration of NTH Solution with Lab Triaxial and <i>In Situ</i> CPTu Data from 105 Clay Sites.	I-18
Figure I-17.	Effective Friction Angle of Sands from DMT Horizontal Stress Index	I-19
Figure I-18.	Calibration of NTH Solution with Lab Triaxial and <i>In Situ</i> DMT Data from 46 Clays	I-20
Figure I-19.	Empirical Relationship for Effective Friction Angle of Sands from Stress-Normalized SPT N_{60} Value Using Data from Undisturbed Sampling Techniques	I-21
Figure I-20.	Normalized Undrained Shear Strength Ratio versus OCR for Clays Tested in DSS Mode	I-22
Figure I-21.	Cone Bearing Factor N_{kt} for Obtaining Undrained Shear Strength in Clays.	I-23

Figure I-22.	Trends Reported between Undrained Shear Strength and SPT Resistance.	I-24
Figure I-23.	General Relationships between K_0 and OCR in Soils for Loading–Unloading.	I-26
Figure I-24.	Representative Stress–Strain–Strength Curve of Soil in Triaxial Compression Mode	I-27
Figure I-25.	Modulus Reduction Factor of Sands and Clays in Drained and Undrained Loading Expressed in Terms of Mobilized Strength	I-29
Figure I-26.	Dilatometer Modulus versus Net Cone Resistance for Different Soils	I-30
Figure I-27.	Estimate for V_s from SPT	I-31
Figure I-28.	Geologic-Specific Relationship between Equivalent Elastic Modulus and Energy-Corrected SPT N_{60} from DMTs and Foundation Performance.	I-32
Figure I-29.	Rigidity Index from Spherical Cavity Expansion (SCE-CSSM) in Terms of ϕ' and CPT Resistance.	I-33
Figure I-30.	Representative Monotonic Dissipation Record from CPT u_2 in Mud Island	I-34
Figure I-31.	Dissipation Time Factors from SCE-CSSM Solution at Different Degrees of Consolidation	I-35
Figure I-32.	Definitions of Monotonic versus Dilatory Type for Pore Pressure Response	I-35
Figure I-33.	Correction of Dilatory Dissipation Tests Using Square Root Time Plots to Get t_{50}	I-36
Figure I-34.	Dissipations from DMT A-Reading with Time	I-36
Figure I-35.	Interpreted Coefficient of Permeability from Monotonic t_{50} Dissipations in Soils	I-37
Figure I-36.	Coefficient of Permeability Expression from CPT Material Index in Soils.	I-38
Figure J-1.	Diversity of Rock Types Found in the Conterminous U.S.	J-2
Figure J-2.	Geologic Time Scale and Associated Age of Rocks	J-4
Figure J-3.	Specific Gravity of Solids of Common Rock Minerals	J-4
Figure J-4.	Unit Weight of Saturated Rock versus Porosity	J-5
Figure J-5.	Trend for Rock Unit Weight with <i>In Situ</i> Shear Wave Velocity.	J-6
Figure J-6.	Trends between Measured V_s and V_p for Various Types of Rocks	J-7
Figure J-7.	Measured Stress–Strain Response on Intact Gneissic Rock.	J-8
Figure J-8.	General Trends between Tensile and Compressive Strengths for Intact Rock According to Geologic Origin	J-10
Figure J-9.	General Interrelationships between Strength Parameters of Intact Rock.	J-11
Figure J-10.	Basic Components for RMR System.	J-14
Figure J-11.	New RMR Component $R_{23} = R_2 + R_3$ for Number of Discontinuities	J-16

Figure J-12. Depictions of Massive, Favorable, Unfavorable, and Highly Fractured Rock Mass Scenarios for Rock Slope Cuts	J-16
Figure J-13. Outline and Components of the Q Systems for RMR	J-18
Figure J-14. Chart for Assessing the GSI Rating and Quality of Rock Masses	J-19
Figure J-15. Correlative Trend for RMR in Terms of Shear Wave Velocity	J-20
Figure J-16. Example Calculations of Rock Mass Strength of Marble Using the Hoek-Brown Model	J-23
Figure J-17. Example Rock Mass Strength of Fractured Marble from Hoek-Brown Model to Determine c' and ϕ' Using (a) Mohr's Circles and (b) p' - q Space	J-24
Figure J-18. Rock Mass Modulus Estimated from the RMR and Q -Rating Systems.	J-25
Figure J-19. Allowable Bearing Stress for Foundations on Fractured Rock.	J-26
Figure J-20. Allowable Bearing Stress for Drilled Shaft Foundations ($L/d > 3$) on Rock	J-27
Figure J-21. Unit Side Resistance of Drilled Shaft Foundations Related to Rock Strength	J-28

Abstract

The primary purpose of geotechnical subsurface investigations in transportation projects is to collect data that will help transportation engineers and planners identify, assess, and address risks associated with subsurface conditions; select appropriate design parameters; and monitor performance during construction and operation phases of a project's life cycle. The results of the research performed for NCHRP Project 21-10 have resulted in a complete revision and update to the 1988 American Association of State Highway Transportation Officials (AASHTO) *Manual on Subsurface Investigation* that reflects the changes in the approaches and methods used for geotechnical site characterization that the geotechnical community has developed and adopted in the past 30 years. The updated manual provides information and guidelines to help geoprosessionals plan and execute a sound geotechnical site investigation program; use the results to develop a ground model for planning, design, construction, and asset management phases of a project; and report and document the results in a manner that facilitates peer review, communication with stakeholders, and potential future uses.



Summary

Subsurface investigation plays a critical role in all phases of transportation project development—planning, design, construction, and operations—as it provides information that is needed to ensure public safety and to make cost-effective decisions. For the past 30 years, transportation engineers and planners have relied on the AASHTO *Manual on Subsurface Investigation* (1988) to provide guidance on best practices for planning and conducting geotechnical subsurface investigations. However, in the past 30 years, significant advances have occurred in the geophysical, *in situ*, and laboratory methods used by geopprofessionals to conduct subsurface investigations. There are also new design approaches (e.g., load and resistance factor design, or LRFD) and project delivery methods (e.g., design–build) that impact subsurface investigations.

These changes in geotechnical practices, design approaches, and project delivery methods warrant an update to the AASHTO *Manual on Subsurface Investigations* to reflect the current state of the practice. The objective of the efforts to update the 1988 manual was to develop a concise, comprehensive document that will be invaluable for planning, executing, and using subsurface investigations and geotechnical characterizations for planning, designing, constructing, maintaining, and managing assets of transportation facilities.

The organization of the updated AASHTO *Manual on Subsurface Investigations* is described in Chapter 1.

The results of the research performed for NCHRP Project 21-10 have resulted in a complete revision and update to the 1988 AASHTO *Manual on Subsurface Investigation*. The updated manual defines a reasonable minimum standard of practice for modern geotechnical site investigations and will enable geopprofessionals to develop cost-effective geotechnical design and construction solutions while optimizing project life-cycle costs, ensuring public safety and environmental sustainability, minimizing contract disputes and cost overruns, and accelerating construction.

Table of Contents

List of Tables	xxiv
List of Figures	xxvi
Acknowledgments	xxxiii
Abstract.....	xxxv
Summary	xxxvii
1 Introduction	1-1
1.1 Purpose.....	1-1
1.2 Organization of the Manual	1-1
1.2.1 Planning the Investigation	1-2
1.2.2 Executing the Investigation	1-2
1.2.3 Reporting and Presenting the Results of the Investigation	1-3
1.2.4 Supplemental Investigative Information	1-4
1.2.5 Supplemental Administrative Information	1-4
1.2.6 Supplemental Interpretive Information: Interpreting the Results of the Investigation	1-5
1.3 Data Management and Data Interchange for Geotechnical and Geoenvironmental Specialists (DIGGS).....	1-6
1.3.1 Data Management.....	1-7
1.3.2 DIGGS	1-7
1.3.3 DIGGS, Electronic Design, and Future Workflow Interoperability	1-8
1.4 Key Complementary Resources	1-8
1.5 References	1-9
2 Geotechnical Uncertainty and Risk	2-1
2.1 Introduction	2-1
2.2 Uncertainty	2-1
2.3 Geotechnical Risks	2-2
2.3.1 Technical Risk	2-2
2.3.2 Financial Risk	2-2
2.3.3 Risk Mitigation	2-3
2.3.4 Geotechnical Risk for Design–Build Projects.....	2-4
2.4 Load and Resistance Factor Design (LRFD) and Subsurface Investigation	2-4
2.5 References	2-5



3	<i>Subsurface Investigation Processes</i>	3-1
3.1	Introduction	3-1
3.2	Types of Data Required for Subsurface Investigations	3-2
3.2.1	Subsurface Investigation Objectives	3-2
3.2.1.1	Project Planning Investigations	3-2
3.2.1.2	Design and Construction Investigations	3-4
3.2.1.3	Performance Monitoring during Construction and Operation	3-5
3.2.1.4	Forensic Evaluations	3-5
3.2.2	Review of Available Records	3-6
3.2.3	Site Reconnaissance	3-7
3.3	Developing a Subsurface Investigation Plan	3-9
3.3.1	Developing a Geophysical Testing Plan	3-9
3.3.2	Selecting the Number and Locations for <i>In Situ</i> Tests, Drilling, and Sampling	3-10
3.3.3	Determining the Minimum Depth of Investigation at Each Location	3-13
3.3.4	Determining the Required Types of Samples and Sampling Frequency	3-13
3.3.5	Developing an <i>In Situ</i> and Laboratory Testing Plan	3-14
3.3.5.1	<i>In Situ</i> Testing	3-14
3.3.5.2	Sampling Equipment and Methods	3-16
3.3.5.3	Laboratory Testing Program	3-18
3.3.6	Developing a Plan for Evaluating Groundwater Conditions	3-21
3.4	References	3-21
4	<i>Geophysical Investigations</i>	4-1
4.1	Introduction	4-1
4.2	Planning a Geophysical Investigation	4-3
4.3	Surface Geophysical Methods	4-3
4.3.1	Seismic Methods	4-4
4.3.1.1	Seismic Refraction and Reflection	4-6
4.3.1.2	Surface Wave Methods	4-10
4.3.2	Electrical and Electromagnetic Methods	4-11
4.3.2.1	Resistivity	4-12
4.3.2.2	Electromagnetic Methods	4-13
4.3.2.3	Ground-Penetrating Radar	4-15
4.3.3	Potential Field Methods	4-17
4.3.3.1	Microgravity	4-17
4.3.3.2	Magnetometry	4-19
4.3.3.3	Self-Potential	4-20
4.4	Borehole Geophysical Methods	4-20
4.4.1	Borehole-to-Borehole and Surface-to-Borehole Methods	4-21
4.4.1.1	Seismic Crosshole Method	4-21
4.4.1.2	Seismic Downhole Method	4-22
4.4.2	In-Hole Logging Methods	4-23
4.4.2.1	Mechanical Methods	4-24
4.4.2.2	Electrical and Electromagnetic Methods	4-24
4.4.2.3	Nuclear Methods	4-24
4.4.2.4	Optical and Acoustic Televiwer Methods	4-26
4.4.2.5	Seismic Methods	4-27
4.5	References	4-29



5	<i>Equipment for Sampling of Soil and Rock</i>	5-1
5.1	Introduction	5-1
5.2	Field Equipment	5-1
5.2.1	Drilling on Land	5-2
5.2.2	Drilling over Water	5-3
5.3	Borehole Advancement Methods	5-3
5.3.1	Manual Methods	5-3
5.3.2	Test Pits	5-4
5.3.3	Auger Drilling	5-4
5.3.3.1	Solid-Flight Augers	5-4
5.3.3.2	Hollow-Stem Augers	5-4
5.3.4	Rotary Drilling	5-5
5.3.5	Measuring While Drilling	5-6
5.4	Soil Sampling	5-8
5.4.1	Split-Spoon Sampling (Disturbed Samples)	5-8
5.4.2	Direct-Push Sampling (Disturbed Samples)	5-9
5.4.2.1	Continuous Hydraulic Push Samplers	5-9
5.4.2.2	Continuous Sonic Samplers	5-9
5.4.2.3	Vibracore Samplers	5-10
5.4.3	Thin-Walled Tube Sampling (Undisturbed Samples)	5-11
5.4.3.1	Shelby Tube Thin-Walled Open Sampler	5-11
5.4.3.2	Laval Sampler	5-11
5.4.3.3	Piston Samplers	5-11
5.4.3.4	Rotary Core Sampling	5-14
5.5	Rock Coring Methods	5-16
5.5.1	Core Bits	5-16
5.5.2	Core Barrel Types	5-16
5.5.2.1	Single-Tube Core Barrel	5-17
5.5.2.2	Double-Tube Core Barrel	5-17
5.5.3	Triple-Tube Core Barrel	5-18
5.5.4	Logging Borings	5-18
5.5.5	Soil Boring Logs	5-19
5.5.6	Logging Rock Core	5-21
5.5.7	Sample Protection	5-22
5.6	Boring Closure	5-23
5.7	References	5-23
6	<i>In Situ Testing of Soil and Rock</i>	6-1
6.1	Introduction	6-1
6.2	Borehole Test Methods	6-2
6.2.1	Standard Penetration Test	6-2
6.2.1.1	Correction Factors	6-3
6.2.1.2	Stress Normalization	6-6
6.2.2	Vane Shear Test	6-6
6.2.3	Pressuremeter Testing	6-9
6.2.3.1	Prebored Menard Pressuremeter	6-10
6.2.3.2	Prebored Monocell Pressuremeter	6-10
6.2.3.3	Self-Boring Pressuremeter	6-11



6.3	Direct-Push <i>In Situ</i> Test Methods for Soils	6-11
6.3.1	Cone Penetration Testing	6-11
6.3.1.1	Piezocone Penetration Testing.	6-13
6.3.1.2	Piezo-Dissipation Testing.	6-15
6.3.1.3	Seismic Piezocone Test.	6-15
6.3.2	Flat-Plate Dilatometer Test	6-18
6.3.3	Direct-Push Monocell Pressuremeter.	6-20
6.4	<i>In Situ</i> Tests for Rock	6-20
6.4.1	Plate Load Tests on Rock	6-20
6.4.2	Flat Jack Tests.	6-21
6.4.3	Rock Dilatometer.	6-22
6.4.4	Large-Field Direct Shear Test	6-22
6.4.5	Rock Borehole Shear Test.	6-22
6.4.6	Measurements for Rock Discontinuities.	6-23
6.5	References	6-23
7	<i>Hydrogeologic Characterization</i>	7-1
7.1	Introduction	7-1
7.2	Geology and Hydrogeology	7-1
7.3	Aquifer Characteristics.	7-2
7.3.1	Hydraulic Conductivity	7-2
7.3.2	Porosity.	7-2
7.3.3	Permeability.	7-3
7.3.4	Transmissivity	7-3
7.3.5	Storage Coefficient and Specific Yield	7-3
7.4	Aquitard Characteristics.	7-4
7.5	Direction and Gradient of Groundwater Flow	7-4
7.6	Groundwater Measurements	7-5
7.6.1	Methods for Groundwater Levels and Pressures.	7-5
7.6.1.1	Existing Information Sources	7-5
7.6.1.2	Geotechnical Borings	7-5
7.6.1.3	Monitoring Wells	7-5
7.6.1.4	Piezometers.	7-8
7.6.1.5	Geophysical Testing	7-9
7.6.2	Methods for Aquifer Characteristics	7-9
7.6.2.1	Pumping Tests	7-9
7.6.2.2	Slug Tests	7-11
7.6.2.3	Piezo-Dissipation Testing.	7-12
7.6.2.4	Packer Tests	7-12
7.7	References	7-13
8	<i>Laboratory Testing of Soil and Rock</i>	8-1
8.1	Introduction	8-1
8.2	Quality Assurance.	8-2
8.2.1	Sample Tracking	8-2
8.2.2	Sample Transportation, Storage, and Handling	8-2
8.2.3	Sample Disturbance	8-3
8.2.3.1	Changes in Stress State	8-3
8.2.3.2	Changes in Water Content and Void Ratio.	8-3

8.2.3.3	Changes in Soil Structure	8-4
8.2.3.4	Chemical Changes	8-4
8.2.3.5	Mixing and Segregation of Soil	8-4
8.2.4	Assessment of Sample Disturbance	8-4
8.2.4.1	X-Ray Radiography	8-4
8.2.4.2	Volume Change during Reconsolidation	8-5
8.3	Index Property Testing	8-6
8.3.1	Particle Size Distribution	8-6
8.3.2	Moisture Content.	8-7
8.3.3	Atterberg Limits	8-7
8.3.4	Unit Weight	8-8
8.3.5	Specific Gravity	8-9
8.3.6	Organic Content	8-9
8.3.7	Electrical Resistivity	8-9
8.3.8	pH Test.	8-10
8.4	Soil Classification	8-10
8.4.1	AASHTO Soil Classification System	8-10
8.4.2	Unified Soil Classification System	8-12
8.4.3	Visual-Manual Procedure	8-14
8.4.4	Additional Tests for Soil Classification	8-15
8.5	Compaction Tests	8-15
8.6	Hydraulic Conductivity.	8-16
8.6.1	Flexible-Wall Permeameter	8-17
8.6.2	Rigid-Wall, Compaction-Mold Permeameter	8-17
8.7	Consolidation.	8-18
8.8	Shear Strength	8-20
8.8.1	Miniature Vane Test	8-20
8.8.2	Direct Shear Test	8-21
8.8.3	Triaxial Tests.	8-21
8.8.3.1	Unconsolidated-Undrained Test	8-22
8.8.3.2	Consolidated-Undrained Test	8-23
8.8.3.3	Consolidated-Drained Test	8-24
8.8.4	Direct Simple Shear Test	8-25
8.8.5	Interpretation of Laboratory Strength Data	8-25
8.9	Dynamic Properties.	8-26
8.9.1	Resonant Column Test	8-26
8.9.2	Cyclic Triaxial Test	8-27
8.9.3	Cyclic Direct Simple Shear Test.	8-28
8.10	Laboratory Test Methods for Characterizing Subgrade Soils and Unbound Bases for Pavement Design	8-29
8.10.1	Resilient Modulus Test	8-29
8.10.2	California Bearing Ratio Test.	8-31
8.10.3	Resistance-Value Test.	8-31
8.11	Laboratory Tests for Rock.	8-31
8.11.1	Moisture Content.	8-32
8.11.2	Unit Weight	8-32
8.11.3	Slake Durability of Weak Rock.	8-32
8.11.4	Point-Load Strength Index	8-32

8.11.5	Direct Shear Test	8-33
8.11.6	Compressive Strength and Elastic Moduli of Intact Rock Core Specimens	8-33
8.11.7	Indirect Tensile Strength	8-34
8.12	References	8-34
9	<i>Compiling, Reporting, and Presenting Geotechnical Information</i>	9-1
9.1	Introduction	9-1
9.2	Uses of Geotechnical Information	9-1
9.3	Factual Information	9-2
9.3.1	Preexisting Data Resources	9-2
9.3.2	Remote Sensing Data	9-3
9.3.3	Geophysical Information	9-3
9.3.4	<i>In Situ</i> Testing	9-3
9.3.5	Hydrogeologic Information	9-3
9.3.6	Laboratory Testing	9-3
9.3.7	Construction-Phase Testing and Monitoring Results	9-3
9.4	Interpretive Information	9-4
9.4.1	Performance Criteria	9-4
9.4.2	Ground Model	9-4
9.4.3	Design Recommendations	9-5
9.4.4	Construction Considerations	9-7
9.4.5	Geotechnical Instrumentation and Monitoring	9-7
9.4.6	Limit-State Design Information for Foundations and Retaining Structures	9-7
9.4.6.1	Footings	9-7
9.4.6.2	Drilled Shafts and Piles	9-8
9.4.6.3	Earth-Retaining Structures	9-8
9.5	Geotechnical Reports	9-8
9.5.1	Uncertainty of Geotechnical Information	9-8
9.5.2	Geotechnical Reports for Conventional Project Delivery Method	9-9
9.5.2.1	Preliminary Geotechnical Reports	9-9
9.5.2.2	Final Geotechnical Report	9-10
9.5.3	Geotechnical Reports for Alternative Project Delivery Method	9-10
9.5.4	Geotechnical Data Reports	9-10
9.5.5	Geotechnical Baseline Report (GBR)	9-11
9.5.5.1	GBR Purpose	9-11
9.5.5.2	GBR Organization	9-11
9.5.5.3	GBR for Design–Bid–Build Contracts	9-12
9.5.5.4	GBR for Design–Build Contracts	9-12
9.5.6	Geotechnical Design Memoranda	9-12
9.6	Contractual Implications of Geotechnical Reports	9-13
9.6.1	Alternative Delivery Methods	9-13
9.6.1.1	Design–Bid–Build	9-13
9.6.1.2	CMAR	9-13
9.6.1.3	Design–Build	9-14
9.6.1.4	Negotiated General Contractor	9-14
9.6.2	Contractor Briefings	9-14
9.6.3	Legal Implications	9-14
9.6.4	Differing Site Conditions Clause	9-15
9.7	References	9-15



Appendix A. Geotechnical Instrumentation	A-1
A.1 Purpose of Geotechnical Instrumentation.	A-1
A.2 Potential Failure Mechanisms.	A-1
A.3 Instrumentation	A-2
A.3.1 Terminology	A-2
A.3.2 Measurement of Deformation	A-2
A.3.3 Measurement of Pore Pressure	A-4
A.3.4 Measurement of Load and Earth Pressure.	A-4
A.3.5 Measurement of Vibration.	A-4
A.4 Instrumentation System Design	A-5
A.5 Automated Data Collection	A-7
A.5.1 Advantages and Limitations of Automated Data Collection	A-8
A.5.2 Data Loggers	A-8
A.5.3 Data Transmission.	A-9
A.5.4 Data Storage.	A-9
A.6 Monitoring Data Management	A-9
A.6.1 Database Setup	A-10
A.6.2 Data Analysis	A-10
A.6.3 Data Presentation	A-10
A.6.4 Data Reporting.	A-10
A.7 References	A-10
Appendix B Applications of Geotechnical Instrumentation	B-1
B.1 Introduction	B-1
B.2 Embankments.	B-1
B.3 Excavations.	B-2
B.4 Dewatering Systems.	B-3
B.5 Earth-Retaining Structures.	B-4
B.6 Deep Foundations.	B-4
B.7 Grouting	B-6
B.8 Tunnels	B-6
B.9 Preconstruction Monitoring	B-7
B.10 Asset Management.	B-7
B.11 References	B-7
Appendix C. Evaluation of Existing Bridge Foundations for Reuse	C-1
C.1 Introduction	C-1
C.2 Assessing the Structural Condition of Existing Bridge Foundations	C-1
C.2.1 Available Records.	C-2
C.2.2 Geophysical Testing Methods	C-2
C.2.2.1 Sonic Echo/Impulse Response	C-2
C.2.2.2 Dispersive Flexural Wave Test	C-3
C.2.2.3 Half-Cell Potential Test	C-4
C.2.2.4 Ultraseismic Profiling.	C-4
C.2.3 Excavation	C-5
C.2.4 Concrete Core Drilling and Laboratory Testing.	C-5

C.3	Information Needed to Evaluate Load-Carrying Capacity	C-6
C.3.1	Available Records	C-6
C.3.1.1	Project Plans	C-6
C.3.1.2	Project Specifications	C-6
C.3.1.3	Geotechnical Reports	C-7
C.3.1.4	Construction Records	C-7
C.3.2	Geophysical Testing Methods	C-7
C.3.2.1	Induction Field Method	C-7
C.3.2.2	Parallel Seismic Method	C-8
C.3.3	Characterizing Foundation Materials	C-9
C.3.4	Load Tests	C-9
C.3.4.1	High-Strain Dynamic Load Tests	C-10
C.3.4.2	Static Load Tests	C-10
C.4	References	C-10
Appendix D.	Management of Geotechnical Data	D-1
D.1	Introduction	D-1
D.1.1	Objectives	D-1
D.1.1.1	Benefits of Effective Geotechnical Data Management	D-1
D.1.1.2	Components Required for Effective Geotechnical Data Management	D-2
D.1.1.3	Effective Data Management Strategies	D-3
D.1.2	Organization	D-3
D.2	Basic Features of a Geotechnical Data Management System	D-4
D.2.1	Tenets of Effective Data Management	D-4
D.2.1.1	Single Source for Data Storage	D-4
D.2.1.2	Data that Are Untouched by Human Hands after Entry	D-5
D.2.1.3	Use of Nonproprietary Data Software for Data Use	D-5
D.2.1.4	Spatial Consistency of Every Data Entry	D-5
D.2.1.5	Readily Transferable Data	D-6
D.2.1.6	Documentation of Specific Data Management Strategies	D-6
D.2.2	Data Organization	D-6
D.2.2.1	Data Organization	D-6
D.2.2.2	Introduction to Data Schema	D-8
D.2.2.3	Introduction to Parent–Child Relationships and Primary Keys	D-8
D.2.3	Data Collection	D-9
D.2.3.1	Efficient Data Collection	D-9
D.2.3.2	Forms-Based Data Collection	D-10
D.2.3.3	Automated Data Collection	D-10
D.2.4	Data Referencing	D-10
D.2.4.1	Introduction to Georeferencing	D-11
D.2.4.2	Different Coordinate Systems	D-11
D.2.5	Computing Infrastructure	D-12
D.2.5.1	Different Coordinate Systems	D-12
D.2.5.2	Calculations Stored in Database	D-13
D.3	Guidelines for Implementing a Geotechnical Data Management System	D-13
D.3.1	Project Database	D-13
D.3.1.1	Data Management Practices	D-14
D.3.1.2	User Considerations	D-14

D.3.2 Database Access and Use	D-15
D.3.2.1 Enterprise versus Desktop	D-15
D.3.2.2 Version Control	D-15
D.3.3 Data Validation	D-16
D.3.3.1 Data Dictionary	D-16
D.3.3.2 Acceptable Values	D-16
D.3.4 Data Visualization	D-16
D.3.4.1 End-User Considerations	D-16
D.3.4.2 Reports, Graphs, and Plots	D-17
D.4 Software Requirements for the Data Management System	D-17
D.4.1 Database Software	D-17
D.4.1.1 Software Identification	D-17
D.4.1.2 Advantages, Disadvantages, and Considerations	D-18
D.4.2 Application Software Used by the Database	D-19
D.4.2.1 Typical Software Identification	D-19
D.4.2.2 Advantages, Disadvantages, and Considerations	D-19
D.4.3 Web Viewing and Reporting Alternatives and Options	D-20
D.4.3.1 Coding Requirement	D-20
D.4.3.2 Advantages, Disadvantages, and Considerations	D-20
D.4.4 Geographic Information Systems	D-20
D.4.4.1 Software Identification	D-21
D.4.4.2 Advantages, Disadvantages, and Considerations	D-21
D.5 Data Sources Considered in a Geotechnical Data Management System	D-21
D.5.1 Traditional Project Information Inventories Maintained by Agencies	D-22
D.5.1.1 Field and Laboratory Test Results	D-22
D.5.1.2 Data from Geotechnical Instrumentation	D-22
D.5.1.3 Geohazards	D-22
D.5.1.4 Geotechnical Assets	D-22
D.5.2 Project Data from Nontraditional Sources	D-22
D.5.2.1 Construction Information	D-23
D.5.2.2 Performance Monitoring Information	D-22
D.5.2.3 Maintenance Records	D-23
D.5.3 Historical Information for Region	D-23
D.5.3.1 Geological Information	D-23
D.5.3.2 Hydrologic and Hydrogeologic Data	D-24
D.5.4 Research Data	D-24
D.5.4.1 Agency-Supported Research Findings	D-24
D.5.4.2 National Research Findings	D-24
D.5.5 Geoenvironmental Remediation	D-24
D.5.5.1 Monitoring Well Construction Records	D-25
D.5.5.2 Site-Specific Geologic Information	D-25
D.6 Business Processes Considered in a Geotechnical Data Management System	D-25
D.6.1 Data Collection and Management	D-25
D.6.1.1 Data Collection	D-25
D.6.1.2 Data Management	D-25
D.6.2 Data Analysis and Visualization	D-26
D.6.2.1 Data Analysis	D-26
D.6.2.2 Data Visualization	D-26

D.6.3	Integration of Data with Other Systems	D-26
D.6.3.1	Data Integration with Business Units	D-27
D.6.3.2	Data Integration with Other Technical Units	D-27
D.7	Data Interchange for Geotechnical and Geoenvironmental Specialists (DIGGS) Format.	D-27
D.7.1	Benefits of Using DIGGS.	D-27
D.7.1.1	Electronic Data Structure for Database Development.	D-28
D.7.1.2	User-Friendly Data Dictionary	D-28
D.7.1.3	Rules for Managing Metadata	D-29
D.7.1.4	Automatic Data Validation through Independent Software	D-29
D.7.1.5	Tools to Facilitate Data Input, Output, and Exchange	D-29
D.7.2	Requirement for DIGGS Sustainability	D-29
D.7.2.1	User-Friendly Data Input and Output	D-29
D.7.2.2	Sustainable Business Model	D-29
D.7.2.3	Required Use by Agencies	D-30
Appendix E.	Quality Assurance Systems	E-1
E.1	Introduction	E-1
E.2	Quality Assurance Plan Key Components	E-2
E.2.1	Introduction	E-3
E.2.2	Purpose	E-3
E.2.3	Quality Assurance/Quality Control Policy	E-3
E.2.4	Roles and Responsibilities	E-3
E.2.5	Quality Assurance/Quality Control Plan	E-3
E.2.5.1	Field Testing	E-4
E.2.5.2	Laboratory Testing	E-4
E.2.5.3	Instrumentation	E-4
E.2.6	Prequalification and Verification.	E-5
E.2.6.1	Field Testing	E-5
E.2.6.2	Laboratory Testing	E-5
E.2.6.3	Instrumentation	E-6
E.2.7	Policies and Procedures	E-6
E.2.8	Standards	E-6
E.2.9	Geotechnical Data Management	E-7
E.2.10	Quality Assurance Performance Monitoring and Improvement Process	E-7
E.3	References	E-8
Appendix F.	Health and Safety	F-1
F.1	Introduction	F-1
F.2	General Health and Safety Guidelines	F-2
F.3	Responsibilities.	F-2
F.4	Site Investigation Permit.	F-2
F.5	Administrative Requirements	F-2
F.5.1	OSHA Poster.	F-2
F.5.2	Personnel Safety Certificate	F-2
F.6	Site Inspection	F-2
F.6.1	Utilities and Overhead Utilities	F-3
F.6.2	Clearing the Work Area	F-3

F.7 Health and Safety Plan	F-3
F.7.1 General Safe Work Practices	F-4
F.7.2 Personal Protective Equipment	F-4
F.7.3 Cardiopulmonary Resuscitation and First Aid	F-5
F.7.4 Task Hazard Analysis	F-5
F.7.4.1 Traffic Hazard	F-5
F.7.4.2 Manual Materials Handling	F-6
F.7.4.3 Fire Hazard	F-7
F.7.4.4 Environmental Hazard	F-7
F.7.4.5 Heat and Cold Stress	F-8
F.7.4.5.1 Heat Stress Instruction	F-8
F.7.4.5.2 Heat Stress Breaks	F-8
F.7.4.5.3 Heat Stress Signs and Symptoms	F-9
F.7.4.5.4 Heat Stress Rest Schedule	F-9
F.7.4.5.5 Cold Stress Protective Clothing	F-9
F.7.4.5.6 Cold Stress Freezing Tissue	F-9
F.7.4.5.7 Cold Stress Exposed Skin	F-9
F.7.4.5.8 Cold Stress Work Warming Regimen	F-10
F.7.4.6 Rain and Lightning	F-10
F.7.4.6.1 Rain	F-10
F.7.4.6.2 Lightning	F-10
F.7.4.7 Chemical Hazard	F-10
F.7.4.8 Biological Hazards	F-11
F.7.5 Evacuation Plan	F-12
F.7.6 Emergency Action Planning and Prevention	F-13
F.7.7 Injury Action Planning and Prevention	F-13
F.7.8 Specific Considerations	F-14
F.7.8.1 Mobilizing Drill Rig	F-15
F.7.8.2 Drilling and Sampling	F-15
F.7.8.3 Drilling over Water	F-16
F.7.8.4 Hand Tools and Electrical Devices	F-17
F.8 On-Site Activities	F-17
F.8.1 Daily and Weekly Safety Briefing	F-17
F.8.2 Daily Equipment Inspection	F-18
F.8.3 Drill Rig Inspection Checklist	F-18
F.8.4 Stop Work Authority	F-18
F.8.5 Communication	F-18
F.8.6 Housekeeping	F-19
F.8.6.1 Personal Hygiene	F-19
F.8.6.2 Toilet Facilities	F-19
F.8.6.3 Sanitation	F-20
F.8.6.4 Additional Requirements	F-20
F.9 References	F-1
Appendix G. Contracting Subsurface Investigations	G-1
G.1 Introduction	G-2
G.2 Selecting Firms	G-2
G.2.1 Prequalification	G-2
G.2.2 Scope of Services	G-2

G.2.3	Requirements for Licensing and Registration	G-3
G.2.4	Permitted Roles of Subconsultants	G-3
G.2.5	Submittal Requirements for RFP or RFLOI	G-3
G.2.6	Selection Criteria and Selection Process	G-3
G.2.7	Submission Schedule and Important Dates	G-4
G.3	Contract	G-4
G.4	Work Order Assignment and Execution of Tasks	G-5
G.4.1	Scope of Work for On-Call Contracts	G-6
G.4.2	Scope of Work for Alternate Delivery Contracting Method	G-7
G.4.3	Quality Assurance/Quality Control	G-8
G.4.3.1	Role of the Private Engineering Firm in Quality Assurance/Quality Control Implementation	G-8
G.4.3.2	Role of the Agency in Quality Assurance/Quality Control Implementation	G-8
G.4.4	Contract Administration	G-8
G.4.4.1	Compensation	G-9
G.4.4.2	Invoicing	G-9
G.5	References	G-9
Appendix H. Technology Transfer Strategies		H-1
H.1	Introduction	H-1
H.2	Technical Manuals and Reports	H-1
H.2.1	Federal Highway Administration	H-1
H.2.1.1	Manuals and Guidelines	H-1
H.2.1.2	Geotechnical Engineering Circulars	H-2
H.2.2	Transportation Research Board	H-3
H.2.3	State Departments of Transportation	H-3
H.2.3.1	Alabama	H-3
H.2.3.2	Alaska	H-3
H.2.3.3	Arizona	H-3
H.2.3.4	Arkansas	H-3
H.2.3.5	California	H-3
H.2.3.6	Colorado	H-4
H.2.3.7	Connecticut	H-4
H.2.3.8	Delaware	H-4
H.2.3.9	District of Columbia	H-4
H.2.3.10	Florida	H-4
H.2.3.11	Georgia	H-4
H.2.3.12	Idaho	H-4
H.2.3.13	Illinois	H-4
H.2.3.14	Indiana	H-5
H.2.3.15	Iowa	H-5
H.2.3.16	Kansas	H-5
H.2.3.17	Kentucky	H-5
H.2.3.18	Maine	H-5
H.2.3.19	Maryland	H-5
H.2.3.20	Massachusetts	H-5
H.2.3.21	Michigan	H-5



H.2.3.22	Minnesota	H-5
H.2.3.23	Mississippi	H-5
H.2.3.24	Missouri	H-6
H.2.3.25	Montana	H-6
H.2.3.26	Nebraska	H-6
H.2.3.27	Nevada	H-6
H.2.3.28	New Hampshire	H-6
H.2.3.29	New Jersey	H-6
H.2.3.30	New Mexico	H-6
H.2.3.31	New York	H-7
H.2.3.32	North Carolina	H-7
H.2.3.33	North Dakota	H-7
H.2.3.34	Ohio	H-7
H.2.3.35	Oklahoma	H-7
H.2.3.36	Oregon	H-7
H.2.3.37	Pennsylvania	H-8
H.2.3.38	Rhode Island	H-8
H.2.3.39	South Carolina	H-8
H.2.3.40	South Dakota	H-8
H.2.3.41	Tennessee	H-8
H.2.3.42	Texas	H-8
H.2.3.43	Utah	H-8
H.2.3.44	Vermont	H-8
H.2.3.45	Virginia	H-9
H.2.3.46	Washington	H-9
H.2.3.47	West Virginia	H-9
H.2.3.48	Wisconsin	H-9
H.2.3.49	Wyoming	H-9
H.3	Standards and Guides	H-9
H.3.1	American Association of State Highway Transportation Officials	H-9
H.3.2	ASTM International	H-9
H.4	Geotechnical Websites	H-10
H.4.1	Federal Agencies and Organizations	H-10
H.4.2	State Departments of Transportation	H-10
H.4.3	Professional Organizations and Associations	H-11
H.5	Training	H-12
H.5.1	Classroom and Web-Based Training	H-12
H.5.2	Workshops and Conferences	H-12
Appendix I. Evaluation of Soil Properties		I-1
I.1	Introduction	I-1
I.2	Stratigraphy	I-3
I.2.1	Geophysical Methods	I-3
I.2.2	<i>In Situ</i> Tests	I-3
I.2.3	Soil Borings	I-4
I.3	Soil Classification	I-4
I.3.1	Soil Behavioral Type by Cone-Penetration Tests	I-5
I.3.2	Soil Classification by Flat Dilatometer Tests	I-8



I.4	Soil Unit Weight.	I-9
I.4.1	Unit Weight from Shear Wave Velocity	I-9
I.4.2	Unit Weight from Cone Penetration Tests	I-10
I.4.3	Unit Weight from Flat Dilatometer Tests.	I-11
I.5	Preconsolidation or Effective Yield Stress	I-11
I.5.1	Effective Yield Stress from Cone-Penetration Tests.	I-12
I.5.2	Effective Yield Stress from Flat Dilatometer Tests	I-13
I.5.3	Effective Yield Stress from Standard Penetration Tests	I-13
I.5.4	Effective Yield Stress from Shear Wave Velocity	I-15
I.6	Effective Stress Strength Parameters	I-15
I.6.1	Effective Strength Parameters from Cone-Penetration Tests	I-16
I.6.2	Effective Strength Parameters from Flat Dilatometer Tests.	I-18
I.6.3	Effective Strength Parameters from Standard Penetration Test	I-20
I.7	Total Stress Strength Parameters	I-21
I.7.1	Undrained Shear Strength from Critical State Soil Mechanics.	I-21
I.7.2	Undrained Shear Strength from Cone-Penetration Tests	I-22
I.7.3	Undrained Shear Strength from Flat Dilatometer Tests	I-23
I.7.4	Undrained Shear Strength from Standard Penetration Test	I-24
I.7.5	Undrained Shear Strength from Vane Shear Tests, Pressuremeter Tests, and Other Tests.	I-25
I.8	Lateral Stress State.	I-25
I.9	Modulus	I-26
I.9.1	Elastic Modulus from Shear Wave Velocity	I-27
I.9.2	Elastic Modulus from Cone Penetration Test	I-29
I.9.3	Elastic Modulus from Flat Dilatometer Tests.	I-30
I.9.4	Elastic Modulus from Standard Penetration Test	I-31
I.10	Rigidity Index.	I-32
I.11	Flow Parameters	I-33
I.11.1	Coefficient of Consolidation from Piezocone Dissipation Tests	I-34
I.11.2	Coefficient of Consolidation from Dilatometer Dissipation Tests	I-36
I.11.3	Hydraulic Conductivity from Piezocone Dissipation Tests	I-37
I.11.4	Hydraulic Conductivity Estimated from CPT Material Index.	I-37
I.12	Special Considerations.	I-38
I.13	References.	I-38
Appendix J. Evaluation of Rock Mass Properties		J-1
J.1	Introduction	J-1
J.2	Intact Rock Classification	J-2
J.3	Intact Rock Properties.	J-3
J.3.1	Specific Gravity of Solids	J-4
J.3.2	Unit Weight	J-5
J.3.3	Seismic Velocities.	J-6
J.3.4	Uniaxial Compressive Strength	J-7
J.3.5	Elastic Modulus of Intact Rock	J-8
J.3.6	Poisson's Ratio	J-8
J.3.7	Tensile Strength.	J-10
J.3.8	Shear Strength of Intact Rock.	J-10

J.4 Rock Mass Classification.	J-13
J.4.1 Rock Mass Rating	J-13
J.4.2 Norwegian Geotechnical Institute <i>Q</i> -Rating System for Rock Masses	J-17
J.4.3 Geological Strength Index.	J-18
J.4.4 Estimating Quality of Rock Mass from Seismic Velocity	J-19
J.5 Rock Mass Parameters	J-20
J.5.1 Rock Mass Strength.	J-21
J.5.1.1 Example Calculations for Rock Mass Strength of Fractured Marble	J-22
J.5.1.2 Equivalent Mohr-Coulomb Parameters for Fractured Marble	J-23
J.5.2 Rock Mass Modulus.	J-24
J.5.3 Foundation Bearing Resistances	J-25
J.5.4 Unit Side Resistance for Socketed Drilled Shafts	J-27
J.5.5 Rock Rippability and Earthwork Factor	J-28
J.5.6 Other Rock Parameters.	J-28
J.6 References	J-29

Chapter 1

Introduction

1.1 Purpose

The primary purpose of geotechnical subsurface investigations in transportation projects is to collect data that will help transportation engineers and planners identify, assess, and address risks associated with subsurface conditions; select appropriate design parameters; and monitor performance during construction and operation phases of an asset's life cycle. Geotechnical risks generally pose the greatest risk to transportation projects because adverse subsurface conditions can have significant impacts on public safety, project schedules, life-cycle costs, and environmental sustainability. A sound subsurface investigation program can mitigate these risks and yield significant dividends for state transportation agencies in terms of cost savings and timely completion of projects. Thus, it is prudent for transportation agencies to include geotechnical investigations as a part of their project development process.

This manual provides information and guidelines to help geoprofessionals (i.e., geotechnical engineers, geological engineers, geologists, and engineering geologists) plan and execute a sound geotechnical site investigation program; use the results to develop a ground model for planning, design, construction, and asset management phases of a project; and report and document the results in a manner that facilitates peer review, communication with stakeholders, and potential future uses.

1.2 Organization of the Manual

The organization of the manual mirrors how the subsurface investigations are typically performed:

- Planning the investigation (Chapters 2 and 3)
- Executing the investigation (Chapters 4 through 8)
- Reporting and presenting the results of the investigation (Chapter 9)

Supplemental information is presented in appendixes that are broadly grouped into three categories—investigative, administrative, and interpretive. Appendixes A through C contain information regarding investigations that are not typically conducted as part of the routine subsurface investigations but are conducted during either construction or operation to monitor performance and assess the condition of existing geotechnical features. Appendixes D through H contain information pertaining to administration

functions, such as geotechnical data management, quality assurance/quality control (QA/QC), and best practices for health and safety. Appendixes I and J contain example relationships of soil and rock, respectively, that can be used to assist in interpreting results from investigations. The following is a synopsis of the content included in each of the chapters and appendixes.

1.2.1 Planning the Investigation

Chapter 2 describes the two types of uncertainty related to subsurface conditions—natural variability and knowledge uncertainty—and summarizes the nature of the technical and financial risks associated with a subsurface investigation that inadequately recognizes and addresses these uncertainties. General strategies for conducting a sound subsurface investigation program are also provided. Special considerations for subsurface investigations performed for the AASHTO LRFD bridge design and design–building projects are also discussed.

Chapter 3 presents processes for developing the scope for the subsurface investigations related to planning, designing, constructing, and operating transportation facilities, including the following:

- Identifying the types of data required to address the anticipated geotechnical risks and performance issues
- Determining the required appropriate type of data
- Selecting the most appropriate investigation equipment for the anticipated site conditions
- Selecting the appropriate scope for geophysical testing and the appropriate geophysical methods
- Selecting the appropriate scope for *in situ* testing and the appropriate *in situ* tests
- Selecting the appropriate sampling equipment and borehole advancing methods for the anticipated subsurface conditions
- Selecting the appropriate type of measurements to evaluate groundwater conditions
- Selecting the appropriate scope for laboratory testing and the appropriate laboratory tests

1.2.2 Executing the Investigation

Chapter 4 provides an overview of surface and borehole geophysical methods based on measuring, analyzing, and interpreting seismic, electrical, electromagnetic, gravitational, and magnetic fields. Geophysical methods are often useful during the initial phases of a site investigation program to efficiently gain an understanding of the overall subsurface conditions, including stratigraphy and the location and size of potential anomalies. The locations of subsequent borings and soundings can then be optimized to investigate areas of concern identified from the geophysical surveys. Geophysical methods are also useful to estimate some engineering properties of subsurface materials directly.

Chapter 5 provides information on the variety of equipment, methods, and procedures available for drilling and sampling soil and rock to obtain disturbed and undisturbed samples:

- Field equipment
- Methods for advancing boreholes
- Soil sampling

- Rock coring methods
- Logging borings
- Boring closure

Chapter 6 includes information to aid geoprofessionals with evaluating the different *in situ* geotechnical tests commonly used for characterizing soil and rock and with selecting the appropriate *in situ* test(s) for an investigation. *In situ* tests can efficiently collect abundant data to help define subsurface stratigraphy, evaluate vertical and horizontal variability, and obtain geotechnical engineering parameters for analysis and design. The *in situ* tests presented in Chapter 6 for soils include the standard penetration test (SPT), cone penetration test (CPT), flat-plate dilatometer test (DMT), vane shear, and pressuremeter; and the *in situ* tests for rock are the plate load test (PLT, also known as plate jacking test), flat jacking test (FJT), rock dilatometer test, large-field direct shear (DS) test, rock borehole shear test, and borehole cameras.

Chapter 7 describes the methods available to perform a comprehensive hydrogeologic characterization to gather information on (1) geology and hydrogeology, (2) aquifer characteristics, (3) aquitard characteristics, and (4) the direction and gradient of groundwater flow. Methods for establishing groundwater levels and measuring pressure heads (e.g., monitoring wells, piezometers) and estimating aquifer characteristics (e.g., pumping tests, slug tests, packer tests) are presented.

Chapter 8 presents the laboratory testing methods commonly used to characterize soil and rock. The chapter provides references for pertinent AASHTO, ASTM International (ASTM), and other applicable standards for each of the tests discussed. The following topics are presented:

- QA (e.g., sample identification and tracking; transportation, storage, and handling of samples; assessment of sample disturbance)
- Index tests (e.g., particle size distribution, Atterberg limits, moisture content)
- Soil classification
- Performance tests on soil (e.g., compaction, hydraulic conductivity, one-dimensional [1D] consolidation, shear strength, dynamic properties)
- Performance tests for pavement design (e.g., resilient modulus, California Bearing Ratio [CBR])
- Tests on rock (e.g., slake durability, compressive strength, elastic moduli)

1.2.3 Reporting and Presenting the Results of the Investigation

Chapter 9 provides background on the characterization of geotechnical data as either factual or interpretative and typical uses of geotechnical information. The chapter also includes some guidance on compiling, preparing, and presenting geotechnical information. The following are specific topics presented:

- Presentation of factual information
- Presentation of interpretative information
- Geotechnical reports for conventional (i.e., design–bid–build) and alternative (design–build) project delivery methods
- Contractual implications of geotechnical reports

1.2.4 Supplemental Investigative Information

Appendix A contains the following information regarding geotechnical instrumentation to assist geoprofessionals in evaluating the potential effectiveness of an instrumentation program:

- Identifying potential failure modes where instrumentation may add significant value
- Making a preliminary selection of the appropriate types of instrumentation
- Acquiring a conceptual understanding of the steps involved in developing an instrumentation plan
- Evaluating, presenting, and managing the data obtained from instrumentation

Appendix B provides guidelines for implementing a geotechnical instrumentation program for embankments, deep foundations, excavations in soil and rock, dewatering, earth-retaining structures, tunnels, and grouting. Appendix B also highlights how geotechnical instrumentation can be used to resolve legal disputes and manage geotechnical assets.

Appendix C provides guidelines for characterizing the integrity of the existing bridge foundation elements (condition assessment) and assessing their load-carrying capacity.

1.2.5 Supplemental Administrative Information

Appendix D introduces basic geotechnical data management concepts and then advances to providing guidance for developing and implementing a standardized geotechnical data management system.

The following aspects of geotechnical data management systems are presented and described:

- Introduction
- Basic features
- Implementation guidelines
- Software requirements
- Data sources
- Business process considerations
- Data interchange for geotechnical and geoenvironmental specialist (DIGGS).

Appendix E establishes QA guidelines to define an agency's standards and quality management protocols during the subsurface investigation to ensure delivery of consistent and competent subsurface investigation products and services. The topics presented include the following:

- QA/QC policy
- Roles and responsibilities
- QA/QC plan
- Prequalification and verification
- Policies and procedures
- Standards

- Geotechnical data management
- Performance monitoring

Appendix F provides guidelines for planning and executing a subsurface investigation following commonly accepted safe operating practices to protect human health and the environment.

The topics discussed include the following:

- General health and safety guidelines
- Responsibilities
- Administrative requirements
- Site inspection
- Development of a health and safety plan
- On-site activities

Appendix G provides guidelines and best practices for contracting subsurface investigation services. The topics presented include the following:

- Prequalification of private engineering firms
- Development of scope of work
- QA/QC practices
- Contract administration

Appendix H summarizes the resources available to assist geoprofessionals plan and execute subsurface investigations, analyze and interpret subsurface investigation data, present subsurface information, and manage subsurface investigations. The following topics are presented:

- Technical manuals and reports
- Geotechnical websites
- Available training resources
- References

1.2.6 Supplemental Interpretive Information: Interpreting the Results of the Investigation

Appendix I provides guidance for interpreting soil properties derived from geophysical, *in situ*, and laboratory testing methods. The emphasis is on parameters commonly used in highway analysis and design:

- Soil classification
- Preconsolidation stress or effective yield stress (i.e., stress history)
- Effective-stress and total-stress shear strength parameters
- Lateral stress state
- Modulus

- Coefficient of consolidation
- Hydraulic conductivity

Appendix J provides guidance for interpreting the engineering properties of intact rock and rock masses. The specific topics presented include the following:

- Intact rock classification
- Intact rock properties (e.g., uniaxial compressive strength, shear strength)
- Rock mass classification (e.g., rock mass rating [RMR], Geological Strength Index [GSI])
- Rock mass properties (e.g., shear strength, foundation capacity)

1.3 Data Management and Data Interchange for Geotechnical and Geoenvironmental Specialists (DIGGS)

Geotechnical site characterization for roadways and highway transportation features has been traditionally performed using invasive methods, usually borehole drilling, as part of the preliminary design process for specific projects. Site exploration usually takes place after project scoping and prior to final design such that any favorable or unfavorable discoveries that differ from design assumptions can be accommodated.

Today, additional information is more widely available to supplement site characterization efforts; this information can be at the project, regional, or statewide scale. Information from previous site exploration programs for existing structures may be available in whole or in part. In addition, local soils and geological maps, well borings, regional hydrogeological maps, aerial photography, and LiDAR surveys are now more widely available and easier to access than they have been historically. Some of this information is in the form of immediately usable electronic data that can be processed and used as input for mapping, analysis, visualization, statistical study, and predictive modeling. Each additional resource can provide useful information for identifying and managing geotechnical risks. The increasing value of historic data, within transportation agencies, and data from additional data sources is rapidly becoming more appreciated as processes and systems are becoming more interconnected and geotechnical data sets are becoming more appreciated as a type of big data.

Because geologic processes are generally slow, historical geotechnical information at specific project sites are often directly applicable to subsequent reconstruction or expansion projects at the same site or nearby. Frequently, structures are rehabilitated in place, or they are expanded for extra traffic capacity in the same geotechnical conditions as the original structures. Often, previous investigation data provide useful supplemental information or provide additional insight into site stratigraphy or variability. Historic borings, soundings, or other information, such as foundation installation records, may allow scope reduction for a current investigation. At the very least, existing information can be used to develop an appropriate scope for new geotechnical investigations. If borings exist, relatively fast geophysical exploration methods or CPT soundings may be appropriate to provide additional information at reduced cost or in a reduced timeframe. The value of geotechnical data is becoming increasingly recognized and appreciated when compared to the time and cost of new investigations.

The amount and varying formats of additional geotechnical, and related, information present new challenges for geoprosessionals with respect to data quality, organization, exchange, storage, engineering review, and overall data management.

This manual provides guidance on conducting subsurface investigations in terms of planning and executing appropriate testing. Information related to reporting and presenting information can be found in the appendixes.

1.3.1 Data Management

Geotechnical data management is about more than ensuring that field and lab measurements are obtained following proper testing procedures. Measured values become the basis for design and are usually presented in a variety of formats for different purposes through the project life cycle.

Geotechnical and related site exploration information, such as that obtained from regional mapping efforts or historic construction records, has considerable project value. Unexpected geotechnical conditions can easily lead to project delays and cost escalation; because the geotechnical work occurs early in the project construction schedule, these impacts can easily propagate through the construction timeline. It is therefore important to acquire geotechnical data and manage them effectively to ensure that appropriate analysis is conducted, decisions are made, means and methods or performance requirements are established, and the appropriate information is provided to the right people at the right time. It is therefore important to have quality data management practices in place to support the subsurface investigation and reporting process.

Within a typical geotechnical process workflow, once a measurement or test record is acquired it may be used or processed multiple times, and manual intervention, such as the selection of conversion factors, or data entry and reentry into software programs, boring log databases, spreadsheets, and reports, is currently common. In addition to general inefficiency, manual data handling provides opportunities for transcription or other errors. As more data are acquired, particularly larger data sets, such as continuous 1D profiles and 2D and 3D data, there is an increasing demand for system interoperability and seamless data exchange.

1.3.2 DIGGS

The Data Interchange for Geotechnical and Geoenvironmental Specialists (DIGGS) protocol is an open-source, flexible and expandable, extensible markup language (XML) format with accompanying data dictionaries for exchanging geotechnical and environmental data. The American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE) Geo-Institute currently hosts the DIGGS website and supports the ongoing development of the geotechnical electronic data exchange standard. The XML structure defines the form and content of the data, data attributes, and data relationships. The XML format is used by the software community for data transfer; this format is more flexible than comma separated value (CSV) files, such as the Association of Geotechnical & Geoenvironmental Specialists (AGS) data format. The DIGGS data dictionary explains the meaning of the terms used in the data structure. DIGGS is a data transfer protocol and allows data to be exchanged in a common format, eliminating the barriers associated with both proprietary software (input and output files) and multiple formats used by agencies in their internal data structures (spreadsheets, databases, etc.).

The schema files, which are updated as new processes or tests are included to expand use cases, are developed by the DIGGS development community. Development work began as a Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Transportation Pooled Fund Study in 2004 and involved 12 state Departments of Transportation, FHWA, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS), and the UK Highway Agency. Current development, with an expanded development community, is through an online platform

for code development. DIGGS is not yet associated with the Open Geospatial Consortium. More information on the history and development of DIGGS is available online from the Geo-Institute.

In 2020, AASHTO created provisional standard PP 102. This standard adopts the DIGGS format for the purpose of transmitting data, in a defined and consistent format, for efficient data communication among computer software, applications, Geographic Information System (GIS) visualization platforms, and geotechnical data management systems.

PP 102 defines practice promoting consistency, completeness, and integrity of geotechnical data after data are generated and checked, maintaining data quality. More efficient programming, automation, data management and interchange, and workflow operations related to geotechnical investigations, testing, analyses, reporting, designs, bid-package preparation, and construction and performance monitoring are expected through the use of the standard, resulting in savings of time and cost, and risk reduction by minimizing communication errors associated with data entry or reproduction.

Use of the standard helps provide that geotechnical data can be easily acquired, exchanged, used, validated, stored, and otherwise managed throughout the geotechnical portion of the project, the overall project life cycle, and future projects. Adoption of the standard also provides that inbound data, internal data, and outbound data are uniform, consistent, and available in a consistent format for efficient use in project workflow.

1.3.3 DIGGS, Electronic Design, and Future Workflow Interoperability

Recognizing that future practice is beyond the scope of this document, the DIGGS framework provides both an immediate opportunity for geotechnical practitioners to efficiently exchange information with their colleagues as well as other project and organizational partners and the potential for future interoperability with systems that are currently in development. Although DIGGS is not yet tied to the Open Geospatial Consortium (OGC), integration with other systems is recognized as an important component to standardize the exchange of geospatial information with other platforms such as Building Information Modeling (BIM), and digital as-built information.

As an example of other related markup language use cases, GeoSciML is a model of geologic features commonly depicted in geological mapping. OGC is working on the development of a Model for Underground Data Definition and Integration (MUDDI). Although this effort currently focuses on depicting underground utilities for conflict avoidance and risk reduction, it is also focused on associated above-ground and underground characteristics and the maximum use of data from different data sources. Information on the OGC Underground Infrastructure Pilot: MUDDI Workshop is available online (OGC, n.d.).

Adopting DIGGS for geotechnical data interchange is a step toward more comprehensive data integration with larger project systems (CAD designs, 3D plans, BIM, digital plans, digital as-builts, and geospatial models) where including subsurface characterization can provide increased project value.

1.4 Key Complementary Resources

To complement the information in this manual, geoprofessionals responsible for planning and executing subsurface explorations, and using the results for planning, design, construction, and asset

management phases of a project, should consult the following complementary resources that also provide comprehensive information on geotechnical site characterization:

- R 13 (ASTM D420), Conducting Subsurface Investigations
- PP 102, Standard Practice for Digital Interchange of Geotechnical Data
- Article 10.4 of the *AASHTO LRFD Bridge Design Specifications* (AASHTO, 2020)
- Federal Highway Administration Geotechnical Engineering Circular No. 5 on Geotechnical Site Characterization (FHWA, 2017)
- The reference manuals for National Highway Institute (NHI) Course No. 132012 on Soils and Foundations (FHWA, 2006a, 2006b)
- The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) Engineer Manual No. 1110-1-1804 on Geotechnical Investigations (USACE, 2001)
- ASCE GI-DIGGS website (ASCE)

1.5 References

AASHTO Materials Standards:

- PP 102, Digital Interchange of Geotechnical Data
- R 13, Conducting Geotechnical Subsurface Investigations

AASHTO. *AASHTO LRFD Bridge Design Specifications*. 9th ed. LRFDBDS-9. American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials, Washington, DC, Article 10.4, 2020.

ASCE. Geo-Institute. DIGGS. Available from <https://geoinstitute.org/index.php/special-projects/diggs>.

FHWA. *Soils and Foundations*, Reference Manual – Volume I. NHI-06-088. Federal Highway Administration, U.S. Department of Transportation, Washington, DC, 2006a. Available from <https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/engineering/geotech/pubs/nhi06088.pdf>.

FHWA. *Soils and Foundations*, Reference Manual – Volume II. NHI-06-089. Federal Highway Administration, U.S. Department of Transportation, Washington, DC, 2006b. Available from <https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/engineering/geotech/pubs/nhi06089.pdf>.

FHWA. *Geotechnical Site Characterization*. Geotechnical Engineering Circular No. 5. NHI-16-072. Federal Highway Administration, U.S. Department of Transportation, Washington, DC, 2017.

Open Geospatial Consortium (OGC). Underground Infrastructure Pilot: MUDDI Workshop. Available from <https://www.ogc.org/projects/initiatives/ugipilot>.

USACE. *Geotechnical Investigations*. Engineer Manual 1110-1-1804. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Department of Defense, Washington, DC, 2001.

Chapter 2

Geotechnical Uncertainty and Risk

2.1 Introduction

For many civil infrastructure projects, uncertainties regarding subsurface soil and rock conditions are a significant contributor to the overall technical and financial risks for the project (National Research Council [NRC], 1984; Institution of Civil Engineers [ICE], 1991). The broad purpose of a subsurface investigation is to inform geotechnical engineers, contractors, and other professionals about soil and rock conditions to aid with identifying and mitigating the geotechnical-related risks (FHWA, 2017). The objective of the investigation is to gather sufficient information regarding subsurface conditions to reduce technical and financial risks due to subsurface conditions to a level that the stakeholders of the project find tolerable.

2.2 Uncertainty

The uncertainties related to subsurface conditions are typically divided into two categories: (1) natural or aleatory variability, and (2) knowledge or epistemic uncertainty (Baecher and Christian, 2003). Natural variability is the inherent randomness in geologic materials that manifests itself on both spatial and temporal scales. In principle, natural variability cannot be reduced; however, it can be estimated more accurately by collecting additional data. Knowledge uncertainty is related to a lack of data or information about geologic materials and a lack of understanding of the physical laws that govern their behavior and, thus, limit the ability to model subsurface conditions. In geotechnical engineering, knowledge uncertainty is often considered to include (1) site characterization (or statistical estimation) uncertainty, (2) model uncertainty, and (3) parameter (or measurement) uncertainty (Lacasse and Nadim, 1996; Phoon and Kulhawy, 1999; Baecher and Christian, 2003). Unlike natural variability, knowledge uncertainty can in principle be reduced collecting additional data and improving the quality of the data and models.

Geoprosessionals infer or estimate the uncertainties regarding the geometry (i.e., stratigraphy and groundwater level) and properties of subsurface materials using inductive reasoning based on limited data, judgment, and experience (Baecher and Christian, 2003) when performing analyses and preparing designs. A subsurface exploration program can be viewed as a critical element to identifying and reducing the knowledge uncertainties and to more accurately estimating the natural variability regarding soil and rock conditions at the project site. A thorough subsurface exploration program is a means to an end of identifying, characterizing, and reducing geotechnical risks associated with knowledge uncertainty and

natural variability. In many cases, the marginal costs of a more thorough subsurface exploration program are small compared to the risk-reduction benefits.

2.3 Geotechnical Risks

Geotechnical risks comprise both technical and financial risks. Technical risks are related to the inability of a structure to satisfy the desired performance requirements for one or more limit states, including service, fatigue and fracture, strength, and extreme event. Financial risks are related to claims, change orders, and cost and schedule overruns attributed to subsurface conditions that differ from those anticipated based on the preconstruction site investigation, as well as an overly conservative design.

2.3.1 Technical Risk

Geotechnical-related technical risks are often attributed to weak or soft soils, loose sands, expansive clays, and jointed rock, among other causes. Geotechnical failures may be related to the following:

- Global or local stability (i.e., exceeding the strength-limit state)
- Excessive deformation (i.e., exceeding the service-limit state)
- Internal piping and erosion
- Shrink and swell of foundation soils
- Collapse of metastable soils (e.g., loess)
- Collapse of subsurface voids due to natural phenomena (e.g., karst) or human activity (e.g., mining)
- Extreme events, including earthquakes (e.g., soil liquefaction, lateral spreading) or floods (e.g., scour)

Sowers (1993) examined nearly 500 failures of civil infrastructure, including foundations, embankment dams, excavations, tunnels, highways, waste disposal facilities, port and marine structures, and heavy construction. Most of the failures he examined involved geotechnical engineering issues. Based on analysis results presented by Sowers, it can be inferred that approximately 20 percent of the failures he considered involved inadequate or missing data, factors that Sowers attributes often to an engineer's or owner's decision in the early stages to postpone or forgo a detailed site investigation to save time and money. The timely recognition of the benefits related to detailed site investigation may have reduced the technical risks and the number of failures.

2.3.2 Financial Risk

There have been numerous studies in recent years to examine geotechnical-related financial risks (Hoek and Palmeiri, 1998; Prezzi et al., 2011; Boeckmann and Loehr, 2016; Neupane, 2016). Hoek and Palmeiri (1998) observed that on all major civil engineering projects, geotechnical risks are a “serious factor in cost and schedule control.” They also concluded that the inadequacy of information obtained from the site investigation program is a leading contributor to geotechnical risks on large projects. This was found to be particularly true for those projects that are linear in nature (e.g., highways, tunnels), because boreholes are often widely spaced and the interpolation between boreholes introduces additional knowledge uncertainty.

Prezzi et al. (2011) examined more than 300 contracts issued by the Indiana Department of Transportation (DOT) and found that 41 percent of road contracts and 37 percent of bridge contracts experienced geotechnical change orders. These change orders comprised approximately 1.3 percent of the total estimated construction costs per year. Based on interviews with engineers from Indiana DOT and their consultants, Prezzi et al. (2011) concluded that one of the main reasons for the large numbers of geotechnical change orders was the failure to identify areas of poor subgrade soil due, in part, to an insufficient site investigation. Prezzi et al. (2011) found that the geotechnical change orders for Indiana DOT agreed with a survey the authors conducted of other state DOTs that found a primary reason for change orders in other states were unexpected site conditions due to insufficient site investigations.

Boeckmann and Loehr (2016) surveyed 55 transportation agencies and found that construction claims, change orders, and cost overruns resulted most frequently from differing site conditions (DSCs), including (1) pile overruns, (2) higher-than-expected groundwater, (3) misclassified or mischaracterized subgrade soils, (4) unanticipated rock encountered during foundation construction, and (5) mischaracterized rock for drilled shaft construction. Boeckmann and Loehr (2016) estimated that the costs associated with claims, change orders, and overruns caused by DSCs were likely much greater than 7 percent of the project budget for some projects.

Neupane (2016) surveyed geotechnical engineers from state DOTs and consulting firms to evaluate the causes and impacts of geotechnical problems on bridge and road construction projects. Responses were received by 53 engineers representing 42 different state DOTs and 43 consulting engineers. The survey respondents indicated geotechnical-related problems frequently caused cost overruns, schedule overruns, and construction claims resulting in additional costs ranging from at least 5 percent to more than 25 percent of the project cost. Among the most common geotechnical-related causes of cost and schedule overruns, claims, and change orders were (1) an insufficient number of borings or soundings, (2) misclassified or mischaracterized subgrade soils, and (3) poorly defined groundwater conditions (i.e., higher groundwater table than expected).

The results of these studies are consistent in drawing attention to the significant financial risks caused by a poor subsurface investigation that fails to sufficiently reduce the knowledge uncertainties and accurately evaluate the natural variability in the subsurface soils.

2.3.3 Risk Mitigation

The previously cited studies also provide recommendations to mitigate geotechnical risks. In general, these recommendations fall into one of four categories:

- Provide an adequate budget to enable more borings, soundings, and tests to be conducted.
- Retain suitably qualified and experienced consultants to plan and perform the site investigation, evaluate potential risks, and prepare a geotechnical baseline report (GBR) consistent with the risks.
- Allocate sufficient time and resources to prepare a thorough GBR.
- Improve subsurface investigation practices to include developing and implementing minimum standards.

The results of the referenced studies and surveys imply that technical and financial risks can be readily mitigated by conducting a more thorough subsurface exploration to reduce knowledge

uncertainties and better characterize natural variability. Although this is true, it should be recognized that (1) these risks cannot be eliminated altogether and (2) there may already be an implicit acceptance of these risks as tolerable and, thus, a more thorough subsurface exploration is not considered justified. This latter point is called the normalization of deviance, defined by Vaughn (1996) as “the gradual process through which unacceptable practices or standards become acceptable.” In many cases, the normalization of deviance associated with an adequate subsurface investigation can be attributed to human and organizational factors that are not included in engineering analysis and design methods (Sowers, 1993; Baecher and Christian, 2003; Bea, 2006). Sowers (1993) attributes it to “ignorance of prevailing practice” or “rejection of current technology.” Bea (2006) calls the failure to take advantage of available information an “unknown knowable,” and Bazerman and Watkins (2004) call the consequences of not using available information a “predictable surprise.” From these descriptions, it is clear that many geotechnical-related risks can also be reduced by becoming familiar with best practices for geotechnical site investigations and avoiding the normalization of deviance.

Contracting mechanisms for transportation projects range from traditional design–bid–build, where designs are fully developed before construction work is bid and awarded, to alternative contracting methods, where designs and solutions may be developed after the contract is bid and awarded. Examples of alternative contracting methods include design–build, and construction manager/general contractor (sometimes referred to as construction manager at-risk). Variants of design–build projects might also include contractual agreements for financing, facility operations, and maintenance. In all contracting cases, the better site conditions and geotechnical risks are identified, communicated, and clearly recognized among all stakeholders early in project and bid development, the more likely geotechnical risks can be effectively managed.

2.3.4 Geotechnical Risk for Design–Build Projects

Mitigating the risk of differing geotechnical site conditions is more difficult for design–build contracts awarded before a complete subsurface investigation is conducted. Typical design–build highway projects often provide only a small fraction of the necessary geotechnical investigation at the time of procurement. As a result, construction costs could increase due to unforeseen site conditions at the time the contract is awarded. Although this risk is intended to be assumed by the contractor, it is likely that it will be assigned ultimately to the owner. However, thorough geotechnical site characterization conducted prior to award and the use of geotechnical baseline reporting, which establish an interpretive and common understanding between the contractor and state highway agency regarding anticipated subsurface conditions, can be effectively used to minimize geotechnical associated risks. Essex (2007) provides guidelines for using the GBR as a risk management tool for design–build projects. *NCHRP Report 884: Guidelines for Managing Geotechnical Risks in Design–Build Projects* (NCHRP, 2018) is intended to assist public agencies in managing geotechnical risk on highway construction projects that are delivered using the design–build contracting mechanism. The guidelines are intended to provide strategies for aligning the DOT’s and its design–builder’s perception of geotechnical risk and provide geotechnical risk management tools that can be used to implement those strategies on typical design–build projects.

2.4 Load and Resistance Factor Design (LRFD) and Subsurface Investigation

LRFD is a reliability-based approach that replaces the single factor of safety that is used in allowable stress design (ASD) with individual factors applied independently to loads and resistances.

Various combinations of factored loads are used to define limit states corresponding to service, fatigue, strength, and extreme events. The individual factors are intended to reflect the natural variability and knowledge uncertainties associated with both loads and resistances and can be chosen to replicate conventional factors of safety or, preferably, to result in a target probability of failure or reliability index based on reliability theory.

For geotechnical analyses (e.g., driven piles), the resistance factors depend primarily on the method used to calculate the nominal resistance. However, consideration is also given to the type and extent of the subsurface exploration program to account for knowledge uncertainty and the natural variability of the subsurface materials. For example, resistance factors in Article 10.5.5 of *AASHTO LRFD Bridge Design Specifications* (2020) for the strength-limit state were calibrated using the average values of soil parameters from *in situ* and laboratory tests, accounting for the typical variability in the property. It is noted in Article 10.5.5 that smaller resistance factors should be used if “site or material variability is anticipated to be unusually high.” Conversely, higher resistance factors may be used if they are based on “substantial statistical data combined with calibration” via reliability theory. Similarly, Article 10.5.5 notes that when, for example, static or dynamic load tests are used for driven pile and drilled shaft foundations, the number of tests used to develop design resistance factors should be based on the variability in subsurface conditions. In this regard, LRFD represents a step forward in explicitly recognizing the important roles of uncertainty and risk in geotechnical practice. LRFD also provides a framework for achieving a more efficient and reasonable design via the use of improved resistance factors that are directly linked to the thoroughness of the subsurface investigation.

2.5 References

- AASHTO. *AASHTO LRFD Bridge Design Specifications*, 9th ed. LRFDDBS-9. American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials, Washington, DC, 2020.
- Baecher, G. B. and J. T. Christian. *Reliability and Statistics in Geotechnical Engineering*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., Hoboken, NJ, 2003.
- Bazerman, M. H. and M. D. Watkins. *Predictable Surprises: The Disasters You Should Have Seen Coming and How to Prevent Them*. Harvard Business School Press, Boston, MA, 2004.
- Bea, R. Reliability and Human Factors in Geotechnical Engineering. *Journal of Geotechnical and Geoenvironmental Engineering*, Vol. 132, No. 5, 2006, pp. 631–643.
- Boeckmann, A. Z. and J. E. Loehr. National Cooperative Highway Research Program Synthesis 484: Influence of Geotechnical Investigation and Subsurface Conditions on Claims, Change Orders, and Overruns. Transportation Research Board, National Research Council, Washington, DC, 2016.
- Essex, R. J. *Geotechnical Baseline Reports for Construction: Suggested Guidelines*. The Technical Committee on Geotechnical Reports of the Underground Technology Research Council, American Society of Civil Engineers, Reston, VA, 2007.
- FHWA. *Geotechnical Site Characterization*. Geotechnical Engineering Circular No. 5. National Highway Institute Course No. 132031, NHI-16-072. Federal Highway Administration. U.S. Department of Transportation, Washington, DC, April 2017.
- Hoek, E. and A. Palmeiri. Geotechnical Risks on Large Civil Engineering Projects. Presented at International Association of Engineering Geologists Congress. Vancouver, BC, September 21–25, 1998.

ICE. *Inadequate Site Investigation*. Institution of Civil Engineers. Thomas Telford, London, UK, 1991.

Lacasse, S. and F. Nadim. Uncertainties in Characterising Soil Properties. In *Uncertainty in the Geologic Environment: From Theory to Practice*. Edited by C. D. Shackelford, P. P. Nelson, and M. J. S. Roth. Geotechnical Special Publication No. 58, American Society of Civil Engineers, New York, NY, 1996, pp. 49–75.

NCHRP. National Cooperative Highway Research Program Report 884: Guidelines for Managing Geotechnical Risks in Design–Build Projects. Transportation Research Board, National Research Council, Washington, DC, 2018.

NRC. *Geotechnical Site Investigations for Underground Projects*, Vol. 1: Overview of Practice and Legal Issues, Evaluation of Cases, Conclusions, and Recommendations. National Research Council, Washington, DC, 1984.

Neupane, K. P. Causes and Impacts of Geotechnical Problems on Bridge and Road Construction Projects. MS Thesis, Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering and Construction, University of Nevada, Las Vegas, NV, December 2016.

Phoon, K. K. and F. W. Kulhawy. Characterisation of Geotechnical Variability. *Canadian Geotechnical Journal*, Vol. 36, 1999, pp. 612–624.

Prezzi, M., B. McCullough, and V. K. D. Mohan. *Analysis of Change Orders in Geotechnical Engineering Work at INDOT*. FHWA/IN/JTRP-2011/10. Joint Transportation Research Program, Indiana Department of Transportation and Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN, 2011.

Sowers, G. F. Human Factors in Civil and Geotechnical Engineering Failures. *Journal of Geotechnical Engineering*, Vol. 119, No. 2, 1993, pp. 238–256.

Vaughn, D. *The Challenger Launch Decision: Risky Technology, Culture, and Deviance at NASA*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago, IL, 1996.

Chapter 3

Subsurface Investigation Processes

3.1 Introduction

This chapter presents processes for developing the scope for the subsurface investigations that are typically conducted to collect subsurface data for planning, designing, constructing, and operating transportation facilities. The specific motivations may include selecting appropriate foundation types, determining if specialty construction means and methods are required, or estimating bid quantities. The scope of a subsurface investigation is typically governed by the types and amount of data that need to be collected to develop an appropriate ground model for the project to address these requirements. The scope is optimized by selecting the most appropriate and efficient methods and equipment for collecting and evaluating the required data. The topics covered in this chapter include the following:

1. Identifying the types of data required to address the anticipated geotechnical risks and performance issues
2. Determining the required appropriate type of data
3. Selecting the most appropriate investigation equipment for the anticipated site conditions
4. Selecting the appropriate scope for geophysical testing and the appropriate geophysical methods
5. Selecting the appropriate scope for *in situ* testing and the appropriate *in situ* tests
6. Selecting the appropriate sampling equipment and borehole advancing methods for the anticipated subsurface conditions
7. Selecting the appropriate type of measurements to evaluate groundwater conditions
8. Selecting the appropriate scope for laboratory testing and the appropriate laboratory tests

R 13 (ASTM D420) contains complementary guidance on developing the scope of a geotechnical site investigation and selecting the appropriate geophysical, *in situ*, and laboratory test methods.

3.2 Types of Data Required for Subsurface Investigations

Determining the types of data required for an investigation is a critical step of investigation planning because the data drives the scope as well as the cost and schedule of the investigation activities. If inappropriate types of data are obtained or appropriate information is missed, data gaps will occur. The data gaps may require remobilizing to the field to collect the missing information, which will add to the investigation cost and could delay a project. An understanding of the primary factors that influence the types of information needed for an investigation is critical to developing a sound investigation plan. The remainder of this section discusses the three primary factors that govern the types of data that need to be collected and analyzed for an investigation:

- Subsurface investigation objectives
- Information that can be obtained from available records
- Information that can be obtained from a site reconnaissance

Reviewing the available records and conducting site reconnaissance provides information that will aid in understanding the local geology, potential variability in subsurface conditions, likely performance issues that need to be addressed by the investigation, available pertinent data, and the data gaps that need to be filled to satisfy the investigation objective(s).

3.2.1 Subsurface Investigation Objectives

The objective(s) of a subsurface investigation must be clearly defined and understood for the project features being investigated to correctly determine the data requirements. Otherwise, the type of data collected may not be appropriate. Investigation objectives can be broadly grouped into the following four categories:

1. Project planning
2. Design and construction
3. Performance monitoring during construction and operation
4. Forensic evaluations

3.2.1.1 Project Planning Investigations

Investigations related to project planning are typically conducted during the initial stages of project development when multiple corridors and alignments within each corridor are being evaluated. This is so project planning investigation results can be factored into selecting the project corridor and alignments. The primary objective of a geotechnical investigation during the planning stage is to identify geologic or man-made constraints that can significantly affect major planning considerations (e.g., public safety during and after construction, environmental protection, construction costs, operation costs, project delivery schedule). Acquiring subsurface information to identify geologic or man-made constraints may or may not require an extensive or costly field effort during the planning stage. Examples of geologic and man-made constraints that could affect project planning are presented in Table 3-1. To aid in determining the types of information that may be required during a planning investigation, Table 3-1 also includes the types of information that are typically required to evaluate each potential constraint.