


**REPORT ON THE GEOTECHNICAL
INVESTIGATION OF THE
PROPOSED NEW LANDFILL SITE, MALUTI-A-
PHOFONG**



Title: **REPORT ON THE GEOTECHNICAL INVESTIGATION OF
THE NEW LANDFILL SITE, MALUTI-A-PHOFONG**

Prepared by: JB Consult
P.O. Box 40833
Moreleta Ridge
0044
Tel: (012) 345 5968 Fax: (086) 218 5470

Client: MALUTI-A-PHOFONG

Project No. JBC076

Keywords: Landfill site; soil profiling, soil testing; Sandstone and siltstone; No groundwater seepage; ferricrete, clay, Liner material,

Project team: J.Bloem Pr. Sci. Nat.

Date: December 2013

JB Consult



.....
Author

REPORT ON THE GEOTECHNICAL INVESTIGATION OF THE NEW LANDFILL SITE, MALUTI-A-PHOFONG

Table of Contents

| | | |
|------|-------------------------------------|------|
| 1. | INTRODUCTION | 1-1 |
| 2. | PURPOSE OF THE INVESTIGATION | 2-1 |
| 3. | SITE LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION | 3-1 |
| 4. | GEOLOGY..... | 4-1 |
| 5. | METHOD OF INVESTIGATION..... | 5-1 |
| 6. | RESULTS | 6-1 |
| 6.1 | SOIL PROFILES..... | 6-1 |
| 6.2 | LABORATORY TESTS..... | 6-2 |
| 7. | DISCUSSION OF RESULTS..... | 7-1 |
| 7.1 | PERCHED WATER LEVEL | 7-1 |
| 7.2 | ROAD CONSTRUCTION..... | 7-1 |
| 7.3 | EXCAVATEBILITY..... | 7-1 |
| 7.4 | LINER MATERIAL | 7-1 |
| 7.5 | CLAY VOLUMES..... | 7-2 |
| 7.6 | FOUNDATION CONDITIONS..... | 7-3 |
| 8. | CONCLUSIONS | 8-1 |
| 9. | RECOMMENDATIONS | 9-1 |
| 10. | REFERENCES | 10-1 |
| A-1 | 10-1 | |
| B-1 | 10-1 | |
| C -1 | 10-1 | |

REPORT ON THE GEOTECHNICAL INVESTIGATION OF THE NEW LANDFILL SITE, MALUTI-A-PHOFONG

1. INTRODUCTION

The author was requested by Landfill Consult, on behalf of their client, to determine the sub soil conditions of the proposed new Landfill Site close to Phuthadijhaba. The brief was simply to excavate test holes on the site and determine the geological layers and excavateability of the material on site. This will also provide information to determine the viability of the establishment of the landfill.

2. PURPOSE OF THE INVESTIGATION

The purpose of the investigation was the following:

- Determine the geological and geotechnical characteristics of the different soils underlying the site;
- Determine excavateability of the in-situ material on site;
- Identify geotechnical constraints for the establishment of a landfill facility for general waste;
- Comment on possible liner quality material on site; and
- Give recommendations as to any other special precaution to be taken, including shallow ground water seepage.

3. SITE LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION

This site is located east of Phuthaditjhaba on previously cultivated land. Access is via paved and gravel roads that goes via the Matsikeng suburb of Puthadijhaba. The location of the site is indicated on the following map, **Figure 1**.




Figure 1: Site Locality

The area investigated has been cultivated previously with prominent contours constructed along the slopes of the ridge. There is also an old sand quarry on the northern edge of the property.

The natural gradient of the site is to the north and east with a 4 – 6 % gradient and surface run-off will drain to the north to the Eland River.

4. GEOLOGY

The geological map indicates that the site is underlain by alternating bands of mudstone, siltstone and sandstone, very typical of the Ecca Group of the Karoo Supergroup (Figure 2). Dolerite intrusions are also present in most of the Karoo sedimentary rock that intruded as sills. However there was no evidence of dolerite present on the site during the excavations of the test pits.

The Weinert N-value, which gives an indication of the predominant rock weathering process, is 2.4 for this region and therefore decomposition is the overriding process.



Figure 2: Site Geology

5. METHOD OF INVESTIGATION

A Bell TLB was used to open 12 test pits to determine the subsurface conditions. All the test pits were dug to their refusal or the maximum reach of the excavator. The test pits were placed in such a manner as to get maximum coverage of the proposed future development of the site.

The test pits were profiled by a qualified engineering geologist according to the method described by Jennings et al (1973).

The profiles are included in **Appendix A** with photos of each test hole included in **Appendix B**. Coordinates of all the test pits were taken and are included on the soil profiles and are indicated on **Figure 3**.

Selected soil horizons were sampled to confirm the soil description and these results are included in **Appendix C**




Figure 3: Test Pit Positions

6. RESULTS

6.1 SOIL PROFILES

The test pits were spaced in such a manner to determine the availability of liner material, if any, and to determine if there is a perched water level on site

Table 6.1: Test pit profile summary of the site showing depths of the different soil horizons

| Test Pit No | Brown Silty Sand | Ferricrete Layer | Silty Sand | Sandy Silt | Test pit depth (m) (refusal) |
|-------------|------------------|------------------|------------|------------|-------------------------------------|
| MAP TP1 | 0 – 0.5 | 0.5 - 0.8 | 0.8 - 1.8 | | 1.8 – Refusal on Sandstone |
| MAP TP2 | 0 – 0.25 | 0.25 - 0.45 | 0.45 – 0.9 | | 0.9 - Refusal on Sandstone |
| MAP TP3 | 0 – 0.8 | 0.8 – 1.1 | 1.1 – 1.5 | | 1.5 - Refusal on Sandstone |
| MAP TP4 | 0 – 0.1 | 0.1 - 0.5 | 0.5 – 1.3 | | 1.3 - Refusal on Sandstone |
| MAP TP5 | 0 – 0.3 | 0.3 – 0.8 | 0.8 – 1.4 | | 1.4 - Refusal on Siltstone |
| MAP TP6 | 0 – 0.3 | 0.3 – 0.9 | 0.9 – 1.1 | 1.1 – 2.3 | 2.3 – End of Hole - Siltstone |
| MAP TP7 | 0 – 0.1 | 0.1 – 0.7 | 0.7 – 1.8 | | 1.8 - Refusal on Sandstone |
| MAP TP8 | 0 – 0.3 | 0.3 – 0.8 | 0.8 – 1.2 | 1.2 – 3.0 | 3.0 – End of hole - Siltstone |
| MAP TP9 | 0 – 0.3 | 0.3 – 0.6 | 0.6 – 1.2 | 1.2 – 1.4 | 1.4 - Refusal on Siltstone |
| MAP TP10 | 0 – 0.3 | 0.3 – 1.1 | 1.1 – 1.7 | | 1.7 - Refusal on Sandstone |
| MAP TP11 | 0 – 0.3 | 0.3 – 0.7 | 0.7 – 1.0 | 1.0 – 1.8 | 1.8 - Refusal on Siltstone |
| MAP TP12 | 0 – 0.1 | 0.1 – 0.7 | | | 1.7 - Refusal on Hardpan Ferricrete |

In most of the test pits the machine refused on either soft rock sandstone or siltstone with partial refusal in MAP TP 6 and 8 on soft rock Siltstone. Although only one test pit, MAP TP 12, refused on Hardpan Ferricrete, a poorly developed ferricrete layer is present in most of the test pits.

No groundwater seepage was encountered in the test pits during the investigation, however, perched water during the rainy season could occur above the Ferricrete layer.

The elevation of the site suggests it is situated below the African erosion surface. The African erosion surface represents a base level of erosion during which there was a prolonged exposure to weathering processes. The remnants of these areas are thus deeply weathered to the order of tens of meters.

The findings of this investigation are consistent with the notion that the site is below this African surface. The significance of this is that bedrock is shallower and ferricrete is well developed (McKnight, 1997).

6.2 LABORATORY TESTS

The *Plasticity Index* of the samples tested was between 4 and 18 with the *Linear Shrinkage* being between 2 and 10. The *Grading Modulus* is in general poor with values between 0.09 and 0.24.

The permeability test results on remoulded disturbed samples from test pits MAP TP 8, compacted to 95% Standard Proctor density, give permeability values of between 2.0×10^{-7} and 3.0×10^{-7} cm/s, which indicates that the material will be suitable for use in liner construction.

The disturbed sample taken and tested in MAP TP 1 showed a **CBR** values of 16.2 at 95% MOD AASHTO that classify the material as a G7. Therefore this material can only be used as a fill.

TABLE 1: SUMMARY OF FOUNDATION INDICATOR TEST RESULTS

| SAMPLE No | TEST PIT No | SAMPLE Depth (m) | ORIGIN | DESCRIPTION | MAX DIAM (mm) | % <0,075 | % CLAY | ¹ GM | ² LL | ³ PI | ⁴ LS % | HRB | ⁵ USCS |
|-----------|-------------|------------------|-------------|--------------------|---------------|----------|--------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-------------------|-----------|-------------------|
| 55199 | MAP TP1 | 0.0-0.5 | Transported | Silty sand | 4.75 | 29 | 2 | 0.98 | 20 | 4 | 2 | A-2-4(0) | SM |
| 55200 | MAP TP1 | 0.5-0.8 | Pedogenic | Silty sandy gravel | 13.2 | 25 | 7 | 1.74 | 26 | 11 | 5 | A-2-6(0) | SC |
| 55201 | MAP TP1 | 0.8-1.8 | Residual | Silty sand | 13.2 | 28 | 10 | 1.17 | 30 | 14 | 6.5 | A-2-6(1) | SC |
| 55202 | MAP TP6 | 1.1-2.3 | Residual | Clayey silt | 0.425 | 94 | 27 | 0.06 | 42 | 18 | 10 | A-7-6(12) | CL |

TABLE 1 (cont.) SUMMARY OF MOD AASHTO AND CBR TEST RESULTS

| Test Pit NO. | SAMPLE Depth (m) | DESCRIPTION | MAX DIAMETER (mm) | % <0,075 | ¹ GM | ² LL | ³ PI | ⁴ LS % | ⁸ MOD MDD kg/m ³ | ⁹ OMC % | CBR | | | | | ⁷ TRH14 | MATERIAL USAGE |
|--------------|------------------|-------------|-------------------|----------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-------------------|--|--------------------|-----|------|------|------|-----|--------------------|----------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | 90 | 93 | 95 | 98 | 100 | | |
| MAP TP 1 | 0.8-1.8 | Silty Sand | 13.2 | 28 | 1.17 | 30 | 14 | 6.5 | 2054 | 8.5 | 9.0 | 12.8 | 16.2 | 25.9 | 36 | G7 | Fill |

TABLE 1 (cont.) FALLING HEAD PERMIABILITY TEST RESULTS

| SAMPLE No | TEST PIT No | SAMPLE Depth (m) | DESCRIPTION | Moisture Content | | Dry Density kg/m ³ | Coefficient of Permeability (m/s) | | | Average (cm/s) |
|-----------|-------------|------------------|-------------|------------------|----------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| | | | | Before Test (%) | After Test (%) | | Range | | Average (m/s) | |
| | | | | | | | Minimum | Maximum | | |
| 2579-1 | MAP TP 8 | 1.2 – 3.0 | Clayey silt | 18.3 | 21.4 | 1678 | 2.0×10^{-9} | 3.0×10^{-9} | 2.5×10^{-9} | 2.5×10^{-7} |

7. DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

During the Test Pit investigation the generalized soil profiles can be summarised as follows:

Typical profile:

| | |
|------------|--|
| 0 – 0.3m | Brown, medium dense, silty sand. Topsoil. |
| 0.4 – 1.0m | Brown, medium dense, silty sandy reworked Sandstone/Siltstone. Ferricrete Layer. |
| 1.0- 1.8m | Yellow/red, very dense silty sand. Residual Sandstone. |
| 1.8- 3.0m | Olive Brown and purple, firm clayey silt. Residual Siltstone. |

7.1 PERCHED WATER LEVEL

A perched water level is usually associated with the presence of Ferricrete in the soil profile. However during the test pit excavation a poorly developed Ferricrete layer was evident in all the holes. However there was no groundwater seepage present in any of the test pit.

7.2 ROAD CONSTRUCTION

Samples that were taken during the investigation show that the material on site cannot be used as road building material in the construction of internal roads. All the construction material for road building will have to imported to the site

7.3 EXCAVATEBILITY

The excavator that was used on site was the Bell TLB. In most of the test pits the excavator refused on soft rock.

The excavatebility of the material on site was in the **Intermediate** to **Hard** range.

7.4 LINER MATERIAL

The DWAF's "Minimum Requirements for Waste Disposal by Landfill" document gives the following requirements for a clayey soil to be used as a compacted clay liner:

- Plasticity Index (PI) of at least 10

- Maximum particle size of 25 mm
- Permeability not greater than 1×10^{-6} cm/s for General waste (G) landfills and not greater than 1×10^{-7} cm/s for Hazardous waste (H) landfills.

The clay sample taken has a PI value of 18, and maximum particle size less than 25 mm. The remoulded permeability values of 2.5×10^{-7} cm/s indicate that the clay is suitable for use in a General waste liner, and is marginally suitable for use in a Hazardous waste liner.

The clays underlying the site are therefore considered suitable for use in the compacted clay component of both general waste and hazardous waste geo-composite landfill liners.

7.5 CLAY VOLUMES

The volume of the clay has been calculated using a software program called Surfer, the program uses three methods to calculate the volume, namely: The Trapezoidal rule, Simpson's rule and the Simpson's 3/8 rule.

The difference in the volume calculations by the three different methods measures the accuracy of the volume calculations. If the three volumes are reasonably close together, the true volume is close to these values (Golden Software Inc).

The GPS data that were used for the calculations were the following:

- Coordinates, and
- The elevation of the test pits

The volume of the clay was calculated from top of first intersection of the clay to the maximum depth of the clay.

This volume could differ from the actual volume in the field due to a few factors i.e.

- Unconformities in the subsoil strata;
- Undulating weathering of the residual rock; and
- The maximum reach of the machine used (clay could extend deeper).

The volume of clay calculated in Area 1 comes to a total of **18 622 m³**.

Although the test result indicates that the clay is suitable for the use as liner material the calculations indicate that there is not enough material for the construction of the site. Therefore either a clay source has to be located or a GCL used for the liner construction of the site.

7.6 FOUNDATION CONDITIONS

Due to the medium activity indicated on the Van der Merwe Activity diagram, it is recommended that certain precautions should be taken to prevent structural damage to newly constructed buildings. According to the NHBRC this site will classify as an H – H1 and all the prescribed conditions as specified should be adhered to.

8. CONCLUSIONS

- The site is underlain by sandstone and siltstone that consist mainly of silty sands and clayey silts.
- During the fieldwork 12 test pits were excavated using a Bell TLB.
- This test pits varied in depth between 0.9 and 3.0m.
- No perched water was present in any of the test pits.
- A perched water level could be present on the drainage area during the rainy season.
- Excavation of the material on site will pose no problem as the material classify as *intermediate to hard*.
- The clay material found on site will be suitable for the use as liners material however the volumes are low.
- Due to the nature of the soil on site the only major concern will be perched water that could occur during the rainy season, however this can be overcome by proper design of a storm water and groundwater control system.
- Therefore the site is suitable for the use as a GENERAL LANDFILL SITE.

9. RECOMMENDATIONS

- The site will be suited to develop a GENERAL WASTE DISPOSAL site.
- Liner material for the construction of the landfill liners is present on site, however additional volumes must be imported due to the low site volumes or a GCL could be used.
- Proper sub-soil drainage systems should be constructed due to the presence of a perch water level on site.
- Building foundations must be reinforced or earth mattresses should be used due to the swell potential of the soils on site. Allowable bearing pressure will be approximately 150 kPa.
- The foundation should also be protected from moisture ingress by constructing a concrete or paved apron around the buildings.
- Material will have to be imported for the building of the site roads.

10. REFERENCES

Jennings, J.E., A.A.B. Brink and A.B.A. Williams. *Revised guide to soil profiling for civil engineering purposes in southern Africa*. The Civil Engineer in South Africa, 1973.

“Minimum Requirements for Waste Disposal by Landfill”, DWAF, Second Edition 1998.

Appendix A


Test Pit and Borehole profiles

Appendix B

Test Pit and Borehole Photo's

Appendix C

Laboratory Results




NOTES

- 1) No Groundwater seepage.
- 2) Partial Refusal at 1.8m.

CONTRACTOR :
MACHINE : BELL TLB
DRILLED BY :
PROFILED BY : J Bloem
TYPE SET BY : J Bloem
SETUP FILE : STANDA~1.SET

INCLINATION :
DIAM : TRENCH
DATE : 29.10.2013
DATE : 29.10.2013
DATE : 09/12/13 17:19
TEXT : ..JACOB~1MAPNEW~1.TXT

ELEVATION : 1783
X-COORD : 3153569
Y-COORD : (29)0009826




NOTES

- 1) No Groundwater seepage.
- 2) Refusal at 0.7m.

CONTRACTOR :
MACHINE : BELL TLB
DRILLED BY :
PROFILED BY : J Bloem

INCLINATION :
DIAM : TRENCH
DATE : 29.10.2013
DATE : 29.10.2013
DATE : 09/12/13 17:19
TEXT : ..JACOBL~1MAPNEW~1.TXT

ELEVATION : 1781
X-COORD : 3153664
Y-COORD : (29)0009628



NOTES

- 1) No Groundwater seepage.
- 2) Refusal at 1.8m.
- 3) Disturbed Sample at 0.1--0.5m.
- 4) Disturbed Sample at 0.5--0.8m.
- 5) Disturbed Sample at 0.8--1.8m.

CONTRACTOR :
MACHINE : BELL TLB
DRILLED BY :
PROFILED BY : J Bloem

TYPE SET BY : J Bloem
SETUP FILE : STANDA~1.SET

INCLINATION :
DIAM : TRENCH
DATE : 29.10.2013
DATE : 29.10.2013

DATE : 09/12/13 17:19
TEXT : ..\JACOB~1\MAPNEW~1.TXT


ELEVATION : 1784
X-COORD : 3153663
Y-COORD : (29)0010076

HOLE No: MAP TP1

Maluti-A-Phofung Municipality
Proposed New Landfill Site

HOLE No: MAP TP2
Sheet 1 of 1

JOB NUMBER: JBC076



NOTES

- 1) No Groundwater seepage.
- 2) Refusal at 0.9m.

CONTRACTOR :
MACHINE : BELL TLB
DRILLED BY :
PROFILED BY : J Bloem


TYPE SET BY : J Bloem
SETUP FILE : STANDA~1.SET

INCLINATION :
DIAM : TRENCH
DATE : 29.10.2013
DATE : 29.10.2013

DATE : 09/12/13 17:19
TEXT : ..JACOBL~1MAPNEW~1.TXT

ELEVATION : 1784
X-COORD : 3153834
Y-COORD : (29)0010182

HOLE No: MAP TP2



NOTES

- 1) No Groundwater seepage.
- 2) Refusal at 1.5m.

CONTRACTOR :
MACHINE : BELL TLB
DRILLED BY :
PROFILED BY : J Bloem


TYPE SET BY : J Bloem
SETUP FILE : STANDA~1.SET

INCLINATION :
DIAM : TRENCH
DATE : 29.10.2013
DATE : 29.10.2013

DATE : 09/12/13 17:19
TEXT : ..JACOB~1MAPNEW~1.TXT

ELEVATION : 1789
X-COORD : 3153834
Y-COORD : (29)0010249

HOLE No: MAP TP3



NOTES

- 1) No Groundwater seepage.
- 2) Refusal at 1.3m.

CONTRACTOR :
MACHINE : BELL TLB
DRILLED BY :
PROFILED BY : J Bloem


TYPE SET BY : J Bloem
SETUP FILE : STANDA~1.SET

INCLINATION :
DIAM : TRENCH
DATE : 29.10.2013
DATE : 29.10.2013

DATE : 09/12/13 17:19
TEXT : ..\JACOBL~1\MAPNEW~1.TXT

ELEVATION : 1793
X-COORD : 3154113
Y-COORD : (29)0010071

HOLE No: MAP TP4



EOH

NOTES

- 1) No Groundwater seepage.
- 2) No Refusal.

CONTRACTOR :
MACHINE : BELL TLB
DRILLED BY :
PROFILED BY : J Bloem


TYPE SET BY : J Bloem
SETUP FILE : STANDA~1.SET

INCLINATION :
DIAM : TRENCH
DATE : 29.10.2013
DATE : 29.10.2013

DATE : 09/12/13 17:19
TEXT : ..JACOBL~1MAPNEW~1.TXT

ELEVATION : 1789
X-COORD : 3153924
Y-COORD : (29)0010005

HOLE No: MAP TP5



CONTRACTOR :
MACHINE : BELL TLB
DRILLED BY :
PROFILED BY : J Bloem
TYPE SET BY : J Bloem
SETUP FILE : STANDA~1.SET


INCLINATION :
DIAM : TRENCH
DATE : 29.10.2013
DATE : 29.10.2013
DATE : 09/12/13 17:19
TEXT : ..JACOBL~1MAPNEW~1.TXT

ELEVATION : 1785
X-COORD : 3153756
Y-COORD : (29)0009897

Maluti-A-Phofung Municipality
Proposed New Landfill Site

HOLE No: MAP TP7
Sheet 1 of 1

JOB NUMBER: JBC076



NOTES

- 1) No Groundwater seepage.
- 2) Refusal at 1.8m.

CONTRACTOR :
MACHINE : BELL TLB
DRILLED BY :
PROFILED BY : J Bloem


TYPE SET BY : J Bloem
SETUP FILE : STANDA~1.SET

INCLINATION :
DIAM : TRENCH
DATE : 29.10.2013
DATE : 29.10.2013

DATE : 09/12/13 17:19
TEXT : ..JACOBL~1MAPNEW~1.TXT

ELEVATION : 1784
X-COORD : 3153837
Y-COORD : (29)0009717

HOLE No: MAP TP7




NOTES

- 1) No Groundwater seepage.
- 2) Partial Refusal at 2.0m.
- 3) Disturbed Sample at 1.2--2.0m.

CONTRACTOR :
MACHINE : BELL TLB
DRILLED BY :
PROFILED BY : J Bloem
TYPE SET BY : J Bloem
SETUP FILE : STANDA~1.SET

INCLINATION :
DIAM : TRENCH
DATE : 29.10.2013
DATE : 29.10.2013
DATE : 09/12/13 17:19
TEXT : ..JACOB~1MAPNEW~1.TXT

ELEVATION : 1787
X-COORD : 3154008
Y-COORD : (29)0009825



NOTES

- 1) No Groundwater seepage.
- 2) Partial Refusal at 1.4m.

CONTRACTOR :
MACHINE : BELL TLB
DRILLED BY :
PROFILED BY : J Bloem


TYPE SET BY : J Bloem
SETUP FILE : STANDA~1.SET

INCLINATION :
DIAM : TRENCH
DATE : 29.10.2013
DATE : 29.10.2013

DATE : 09/12/13 17:19
TEXT : ..JACOBL~1MAPNEW~1.TXT

ELEVATION : 1790
X-COORD : 3154205
Y-COORD : (29)0009937

HOLE No: MAP TP9



NOTES

- 1) No Groundwater seepage.
- 2) Refusal at 1.7m.

CONTRACTOR :
MACHINE : BELL TLB
DRILLED BY :
PROFILED BY : J Bloem
TYPE SET BY : J Bloem
SETUP FILE : STANDA~1.SET


INCLINATION :
DIAM : TRENCH
DATE : 29.10.2013
DATE : 29.10.2013
DATE : 09/12/13 17:18
TEXT : ..JACOBL~1MAPNEW~1.TXT

ELEVATION : 1782
X-COORD : 3153476
Y-COORD : (29)0010003

Foundation Indicator Test Data


| | | | |
|-------------|---------------------------------------|------|------------------|
| Project | JB Consult - Qua Qua Newlandfill Site | | |
| Project No. | HP/B 390-18 | Date | 15 November 2013 |

| Sample No. | 55199 | 55200 | 55201 | Sample No. | 55199 | 55200 | 55201 |
|----------------|----------|-----------|-----------|--|------------|------------|------------|
| Field Ref. No. | TP 1 | TP 1 | TP 1 | %Gravel | 1 | 43 | 5 |
| Depth | 0 - 0.5 | 0.5 - 0.8 | 0.8 - 1.8 | %Sand | 74 | 35 | 70 |
| Sieve size | %Passing | % Passing | % Passing | %Silt | 22 | 14 | 15 |
| 75.00 | 100 | 100 | 100 | %Clay | 2 | 7 | 10 |
| 63.00 | 100 | 100 | 100 | NMC % | Not Tested | Not Tested | Not Tested |
| 53.00 | 100 | 100 | 100 | Liquid Limit | 20 | 26 | 30 |
| 37.50 | 100 | 100 | 100 | Plasticity Index | 4 | 11 | 14 |
| 26.50 | 100 | 100 | 100 | Linear Shrink. | 2. | 5. | 6.5 |
| 19.00 | 100 | 100 | 100 | Overall P.I. | 3 | 5 | 8 |
| 13.20 | 100 | 100 | 100 | Grading Modulus | 0.98 | 1.74 | 1.17 |
| 4.75 | 100 | 76 | 99 | H.R.B. | A-2-4 (0) | A-2-6 (0) | A-2-6 (1) |
| 2.00 | 99 | 57 | 95 | Unified | SM | SC | SC |
| 0.85 | 91 | 51 | 81 | Weston swell (%) at 1 kPa | | | |
| 0.425 | 74 | 44 | 59 | Analysis as per method D422 of ASTM of 1985 The results reported relate only to the samples tested. Documents may only be reproduced or published in their full context. | | | |
| 0.25 | 53 | 37 | 42 | | | | |
| 0.15 | 41 | 31 | 35 | | | | |
| 0.075 | 29 | 25 | 28 | | | | |
| 0.04 | 18 | 17 | 21 | | | | |
| 0.02 | 11 | 13 | 17 | | | | |
| 0.006 | 6 | 10 | 12 | | | | |
| 0.002 | 2 | 7 | 10 | | | | |



Remarks:

Activity Diagram After D H van der Merwe




Plotted Values:

| Sample | Clay Frac | PI |
|--------|-----------|-----|
| 55199 | 2.0 | 2.8 |
| 55200 | 7.5 | 5.0 |
| 55201 | 10.1 | 8.3 |

Foundation Indicator Test Data


| | | | |
|-------------|---------------------------------------|------|------------------|
| Project | JB Consult - Qua Qua Newlandfill Site | | |
| Project No. | HP/B 390-18 | Date | 15 November 2013 |

| | | | | | | | |
|----------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|--|------------|--|--|
| Sample No. | 55202 | | | Sample No. | 55202 | | |
| Field Ref. No. | TP 6 | | | %Gravel | 0 | | |
| Depth | 1.1 - 2.3 | | | %Sand | 8 | | |
| Sieve size | %Passing | % Passing | % Passing | %Silt | 66 | | |
| 75.00 | 100 | | | %Clay | 27 | | |
| 63.00 | 100 | | | NMC % | Not Tested | | |
| 53.00 | 100 | | | Liquid Limit | 42 | | |
| 37.50 | 100 | | | Plasticity Index | 18 | | |
| 26.50 | 100 | | | Linear Shrink. | 10. | | |
| 19.00 | 100 | | | Overall P.I. | 18 | | |
| 13.20 | 100 | | | Grading Modulus | 0.06 | | |
| 4.75 | 100 | | | H.R.B. | A-7-6 (12) | | |
| 2.00 | 100 | | | Unified | CL | | |
| 0.85 | 100 | | | Weston swell (%) at 1 kPa | | | |
| 0.425 | 100 | | | Analysis as per method D422 of ASTM of 1985 The results reported relate only to the samples tested. Documents may only be reproduced or published in their full context. | | | |
| 0.25 | 98 | | | | | | |
| 0.15 | 97 | | | | | | |
| 0.075 | 94 | | | | | | |
| 0.04 | 90 | | | | | | |
| 0.02 | 84 | | | | | | |
| 0.006 | 50 | | | | | | |
| 0.002 | 27 | | | | | | |



Remarks:

Activity Diagram After D H van der Merwe



Plotted Values:

| Sample | Clay Frac | PI |
|--------|-----------|------|
| 55202 | 26.8 | 18.1 |


Moisture Density Relationship

| | | | |
|------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------|------------------|
| Project: | JB Consult - Qua Qua Newlwndfill Site | | |
| Project No.: | HP/B 390-18 | Date: | 12 November 2013 |
| Field Reference: | TP 1 | Laboratory Ref.: | 55201 |
| Depth (m): | 0.8 - 1.8 | Remarks: | |
| Description: | - | | |

Compactive Effort: Mod. AASHTO

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|--|--|--|--|
| Percent Water Content (%): | 7.4 | 8.3 | 9.2 | 6.2 | 10.4 | | | | |
| Dry Density (kg/m ³): | 2031 | 2054 | 2041 | 1988 | 1994 | | | | |

Maximum Dry Density: 2054 kg/m³ **Optimum Moisture Content:** 8.5 %



Analysis according to Method A7 of TMH1 of 1986.
The results relate only to the samples tested.
This report may only be reproduced or published in its full context.
Remarks:

Client : CIVILAB (PTY) LTD - CENTURION
Address : P O BOX 7661
 : CENTURION
 : 46

Client Reference :
Order No. : HP/B 390-18

Attention :
Facsimile : 012-653-0997
E-mail :

Date Received : 05/11/2013
Date Tested : 03/12/2013-12/12/2013
Date Reported : 28/01/2014

Project : Qua Qua Newlandfill Site
Project No. : 2013-B-2579

Page : 1 of 4

Herewith please find the test report(s) pertaining to the above project. All tests were conducted in accordance with prescribed test method(s). Information herein consists of the following:

| Test(s) conducted / Item(s) measured | Qty. | Test Method(s) | Authorized By | Page(s) |
|--|-------|-----------------|---------------|----------------|
| MDD & OMC | 1.000 | TMH1 A7 | W van Zyl | 3 |
| Atterberg Limits < 0.425mm | 1.000 | TMH1 A2, A3, A4 | W van Zyl | 2 |
| Sieve Analysis 0.075mm (Mass Grading) | 1.000 | TMH1 A1 | W van Zyl | 2 |
| Hydrometer Analysis | 1.000 | ASTM D422 | W van Zyl | 2 |
| Permeability: Falling Head | 1.000 | KH Head | W van Zyl | 1 file, 1 page |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

Any test results contained in this report and marked with * in the table above are "not SANAS accredited" and are not included in the schedule of accreditation for this laboratory.

Any information contained in this test report pertain only to the areas and/or samples tested. Documents may only be reproduced or published in their full context.

While every care is taken to ensure that all tests are carried out in accordance with recognised standards, neither Civilab (Proprietary) Limited nor its employess shall be liable in any way whatsoever for any error made in the execution or reporting of tests or any erroneous conclusions drawn therefrom or for any consequences thereof.

All interpretations, Interpolations, Opinions and/or Classifications contained in this report falls outside our scope of accreditation.

The following parameters, where applicable, were excluded from the classification procedure: Chemical modifications, Additional fines, Fractured Faces, Soluble Salts, pH, Conductivity, Coarse Sand Ratio, Durability (COLTO: G4-G9).

The following parameters, where applicable, were assumed: Rock types were assumed to be of an Arenaceous nature with Siliceous cementing material.

Unless otherwise requested or stated, all samples will be discarded after a period of 3 months.


Deviations in Test Methods:

Client : CIVILAB (PTY) LTD - CENTURION
 Project : Qua Qua Newlandfill Site
 Project No : 2013-B-2579

Date Received: 21/11/2013
 Date Reported: 28/01/2014
 Page No. : 2 of 4

FOUNDATION INDICATOR

| | | |
|--------------------------------------|---------|--|
| Laboratory Number | 1 | |
| Field Number | TP 8 | |
| Client Reference | | |
| Depth (m) | 1.2-2.0 | |
| Position | | |
| Coordinates | X Y | |
| Description | | |
| Additional Information | | |
| Calcrete / Crushed Stabilizing Agent | | |




Moisture Content & Relative Density-TMH1 Metod A12T

| | |
|-------------------------|--|
| Moisture Content (%) | |
| Relative Density (S.G.) | |

Sieve Analysis (Wet Preparation) - TMH1 Method A1(a)

| | | |
|--------------------|----------|-----|
| Percentage Passing | 75.0 mm | 100 |
| | 63.0 mm | 100 |
| | 53.0 mm | 100 |
| | 37.5 mm | 100 |
| | 26.5 mm | 100 |
| | 19.0 mm | 100 |
| | 13.2 mm | 100 |
| | 4.75 mm | 100 |
| | 2.00 mm | 100 |
| | 0.425 mm | 99 |
| 0.075 mm | 61 | |
| Grading Modulus | 0.4 | |



Hydrometer Analysis - ASTM Method D422

| | | |
|--------------------|----------|----|
| Percentage Passing | 0.060 mm | 60 |
| | 0.040 mm | 57 |
| | 0.020 mm | 54 |
| | 0.006 mm | 48 |
| | 0.002 mm | 41 |
| Gravel | % | 0 |
| Sand | % | 40 |
| Silt | % | 19 |
| Clay | % | 41 |


Laboratory Number : 1

Atterberg Limits - TMH1 Method A2, A3 & A4

| | | |
|------------------|---|-----|
| Liquid Limit | % | 36 |
| Plasticity Index | % | 22 |
| Linear Shrinkage | % | 8.0 |
| Overall PI | % | 22 |

Classifications

| | |
|----------------------|---------|
| HRB | A-6(10) |
| Unified | CL |
| Weston Swell @ 1 kPa | |



Client : CIVILAB (PTY) LTD - CENTURION
 Project : Qua Qua Newlandfill Site
 Project No: 2013-B-2579

Date Received: 21/11/2013
 Date Reported: 28/01/2014
 Page No. : 3 of 4

MOISTURE DENSITY RELATIONSHIP


| | | |
|------------------------|---------|--|
| Laboratory Number | 1 | |
| Field Number | TP 8 | |
| Client Reference | | |
| Depth (m) | 1.2-2.0 | |
| Position | | |
| Coordinates | X | |
| | Y | |
| Description | | |
| Additional Information | | |
| Calcrete / Crushed | | |
| Stabilizing Agent | | |

Maximum Dry Density & Optimum Moisture Content - TMH1 Method A7

| | |
|--------------------|-----------------|
| Compactive Effort: | Modified AASHTO |
|--------------------|-----------------|

| | | | | | | | |
|------------------|-------------------|------|------|------|------|------|--|
| Dry Density | kg/m ³ | 1674 | 1698 | 1725 | 1705 | 1671 | |
| Moisture Content | % | 12.8 | 14.8 | 16.8 | 18.8 | 20.8 | |

| | | |
|------------------|-------------------|------|
| Max. Dry Density | kg/m ³ | 1725 |
| Optimum Moisture | % | 17 |




California Bearing Ratio Results

| | | | |
|------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------|-------------|
| Project: | JB Consult - Qua Qua Newlwndfill Site | | |
| Project No.: | HP/B 390-18 | Date: | 12 Nov 2013 |
| Field Reference: | TP 1 | Lab. Sample Ref: | 55201 |
| Depth (m): | 0.8 - 1.8 | Remarks: | |
| Description: | - | | |

| CBR at | | | Swell (%) | Final Moisture Content (%) | Mod AASHTO Data | | CBR Compaction Data | | |
|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------------------------|--------------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------------------|----------------|----------------------|
| 2.54 (mm) | 5.08 (mm) | 7.62 (mm) | | | Max Dry Density (kg/m ³) | Optimum Moisture (%) | Dry Density (kg/m ³) | Compaction (%) | Moisture Content (%) |
| 36 | 44 | 44 | 0.5 | 11.6 | 2054 | 8.5 | 2054 | 100.0 | 8.2 |
| 17 | 21 | 21 | 0.6 | 13.2 | | | 1962 | 95.5 | |
| 10 | 11 | 11 | 0.8 | 13.9 | | | 1871 | 91.1 | |

| Interpolated Data | Compaction | 90% | 93% | 95% | 98% | 100% |
|-------------------|------------|-----|------|------|------|------|
| | CBR | 9.0 | 12.8 | 16.2 | 25.9 | 36.0 |



The samples were tested in accordance with Method A8 of TMH1 of 1990.
The results reported relate only to the samples tested.
Documents may only be reproduced or published in their full context.



MAP TP 1



MAP TP 2



MAP TP 3



MAP TP 4



MAP TP 5



MAP TP 6



MAP TP 7



MAP TP 8



MAP TP 9



MAP TP 10



MAP TP 11



MAP TP 12