

A STUDY ON EFFECTS OF SATURATION ON SOIL SUBGRADE STRENGTH

**A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE
REQUIRMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF**

MASTER OF TECHNOLOGY

In

CIVIL ENGINEERING

By

PRAGYANSHREE PADHY

(Roll No. 211CE3247)



**Department of Civil Engineering
National Institute of Technology, Rourkela
Odisha – 769 008
MAY 2013**

A STUDY ON EFFECTS OF SATURATION ON SOIL SUBGRADE STRENGTH

Thesis

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of

MASTER OF TECHNOLOGY

In

CIVIL ENGINEERING

[Specialization: Transportation Engineering]

By

Pragyanshree Padhy

Roll No. 211CE3247

Under the guidance of

Prof. Mahabir Panda



**Department of Civil Engineering
National Institute of Technology, Rourkela
Odisha-769 008**

MAY 2013



ROURKELA

DEPARTMENT OF CIVIL ENGINEERING

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

ROURKELA, ODISHA-769008

CERTIFICATE

This is to certify that the thesis entitled “**A STUDY ON EFFECTS OF SATURATION ON SOIL SUBGRADE STRENGTH**” submitted by **Pragyanshree Padhy** bearing roll no. **211CE3247** in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the award of **Master of Technology** in **Civil Engineering** with specialization in “**Transportation Engineering**” during 2011-2013 session at the National Institute of Technology, Rourkela is an authentic work carried out by her under my supervision and guidance.

To the best of my knowledge, the results contained in this thesis have not been submitted to any other University or Institute for the award of any degree or diploma.

Date:

Prof. Mahabir Panda

Place: Rourkela

Department of Civil Engineering

National Institute of technology

Rourkela, Odisha-769008

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my deep sense of gratitude from the core of my heart to my supervisor Prof. Mahabir Panda, Professor of the Civil Engineering Department, NIT Rourkela for initiating an interesting study, his personal commitment, interesting discussion and valuable advice. He has been continuously encouraging me throughout the work and contributing with valuable guidance and supervision.

I am very grateful to Prof. Nagendra Roy, HOD of Civil Engineering Department, Prof. Prasanta kumar Bhuyan, and Prof. Ujjal Chattaraj for their helpful suggestions during my entire course work. I also extend my sincere thanks to the Department of Civil Engineering, Ceramic Engineering and Metallurgy Engineering at Nit Rourkela for providing all the facilities needed for this project work.

My thanks to Mr. S. C. Xess, Mr. Hari Mohan Garnayak, Rahul bhai and Sambhu bhai of Highway and Concrete Laboratory can never be enough in mere words. They simply helped in every possible way they could. Without their guidance and cooperation I could not have finished this research.

I also want to convey sincere thanks to all my friends, especially to Transportation Engineering Specialization for making my stay in the campus a pleasant one. Last but not the least I would also like to thank my parents and the Almighty whose blessings have helped me in achieving great strides.

ROURKELA

Pragyanshree Padhy

Roll no. 211ce3247

ABSTRACT

The design of the pavement layers to be laid over sub grade soil starts off with the estimation of sub grade strength and the volume of traffic to be carried. Design of the various pavement layers are very much dependent on the strength of the sub grade soil over which they are going to be laid. Sub grade strength is mostly expressed in terms of CBR (California Bearing Ratio). Weaker sub grade essentially requires thicker layers whereas stronger sub grade goes well with thinner pavement layers. The sub grade is always subjected to change in saturation level due to precipitation, capillary action, flood or abrupt rise or subsidal of water table. Change in moisture level in sub grade causes change in the sub grade strength. And it becomes quite essential for an engineer to understand the exact nature of dependence of sub grade strength on moisture variation. An understanding of the dependence of the CBR strength of local soils on water content will contribute towards better design and maintenance practices. Normally CBR test is an easy and well adopted method conducted on soil samples to measure the strength of sub grade. However, many other tests are also considered for assessing the sub grade strength.

The strength of soil, used for sub grade may vary largely on the amount of saturation in it, *i.e.* amount of water exposed to the soil. Hence, in this study an attempt has been made to vary the degree of soaking and hence the saturation level in various types of soils and study the engineering properties of soils including CBR at different saturation levels.

It is observed that for coarse grained soil, worst engineering properties are observed after three days of soaking and for fine grained soils, the same is found at the end of four days.

Keywords: *Sub grade soil, Moisture content , Compaction, Degree of saturation, CBR*

CONTENT

Item	Page no.
Certificate	i
Acknowledgement	ii
Abstract	iii
Content	iv-viii
List of Figures	ix-xii
List of Tables	xiii-xvii
Chapter 1	
Introduction	1-4
1.1 Subgrade	1
1.1.1 Subgrade Performance	1
1.1.2 Desirable Properties	2
1.2 California Bearing Ratio Test	3
1.3 Organization of Thesis	4
Chapter 2	
Literature Review	5-9

2.1 Effect of moisture variation on California	5
Bearing Ratio Test	
2.2 Effect of moisture variation on Direct shear test	8
Chapter 3	
Methodology and Experimental Investigations	10-13
Methodology	10
3.1 Experimental Investigation	10
3.1.1 Liquid Limit	11
3.1.2 Plastic Limit	11
3.1.3 Plasticity Index	11
3.1.4 Differential Free Swell	11
3.1.5 Specific Gravity	12
3.1.6 Sieve Analysis	12
3.1.7 Modified Proctor Test	12
3.1.8 California Bearing Ratio Test	12
3.1.9 Direct Shear Test	13
Chapter 4	
Results and Discussions	14-10
4.1 Type 1 Soil	14

4.1.1 Index Properties	14
4.1.2 Particle Size Distribution	15
4.1.3 Modified Proctor Compaction Test	16
4.1.4 California Bearing Ratio Test Results	17
4.1.4.1 Test-1 (conducted under OMC (16.4%) and MDD (1.84g/cc)	17
4.1.4.2 Test 2 (98% dry side) under moisture content (12.89%) and dry density (1.8g/cc)	24
4.1.4.3 Test 3 (98% wet side) under moisture content (17.8%) and dry density (1.8g/cc)	30
4.1.1.4 Test 4 (97% dry side) under moisture content (12.2%) and dry density (1.78g/cc)	35
4.1.1.5 Test 5 (97% wet side) under moisture content (19%) and dry density (1.78g/cc)	40
4.2 Type 2 Soil	45-71
4.2.1 Index Properties	45
4.2.2 Particle Size Distribution	45
4.2.3 Modified Proctor Compaction Test	46
4.2.4 California Bearing Ratio Test Results	47

4.2.4.1	Test-1(conducted under OMC (14.8%) and MDD (1.85g/cc)	47
4.2.4.2	Test 2 (98% dry side) under moisture content (12.46%) and dry density (1.82g/cc)	52
4.2.4.3	Test 3 (98% wet side) under moisture content (16.25%) and dry density (1.82g/cc)	57
4.2.4.4	Test 4 (97% dry side) under moisture content (10.7%) and dry density (1.794g/cc)	62
4.2.4.5	Test 5 (97% wet side) under moisture content (17.8%) and dry density (1.794g/cc)	67
4.3	Type 3 Soil	72-99
4.3.1	Index Properties	72
4.3.2	Particle Size Distribution	72
4.3.3	Modified Proctor Compaction Test	73
4.3.4	California Bearing Ratio Test Results	74
4.3.3.1	Test-1(conducted under OMC (10.83%) and MDD (2.15g/cc)	74
4.3.3.2	Test 2 (98% dry side) under moisture content (12.46%) and dry density (1.82g/cc)	79
4.3.3.3	Test 3 (98% wet side) under moisture content (16.25%) and dry density (1.82g/cc)	84

4.3.3.4 Test 4 (97% dry side) under moisture content (7.5%) and dry density (2.08g/cc)	89
4.3.3.5 Test 4 (97% wet side) under moisture content (12.5%) and dry density (2.08g/cc)	94
4.4 Direct Shear Test Results	99-101
Chapter 5	106-107
Conclusions	106
Future scope of work	107
References	108- 109

List of Figures

Figure 4.1: Modified proctor compaction test for type – 1 soil	16
Figure 4.2 Load vs penetration graph for test – 1, type – 1 soil for unsoaked condition	17
Figure 4.3 Load vs penetration graph for test –1, type – 1soil for soaked (day - 1) condition	18
Figure 4.4 Load vs penetration graph for test –1, type – 1soil for soaked (day – 2) condition	18
Figure 4.5 Load vs penetration graph for test –1, type – 1soil for soaked (day - 3) condition	19
Figure 4.6 Load vs penetration graph for test –1, type – 1soil for soaked (day - 4) condition	19
Figure 4.7 Load vs penetration graph for test –1, type – 1soil for soaked (day - 5) condition	20
Figure 4.8 Horizontal and vertical positions of soil sample	21
Figure 4.9 Load vs penetration graph for test –2, type – 1soil for unsoaked condition	24
Figure 4.10 Load vs penetration graph for test –2, type – 1soil for soaked (day-1) condition	25
Figure 4.11 Load vs penetration graph for test –2, type – 1soil for soaked (day-2) condition	25
Figure 4.12 Load vs penetration graph for test –2, type – 1soil for soaked (day-3) condition	26
Figure 4.13 Load vs penetration graph for test –2, type – 1soil for soaked (day-4) condition	26
Figure 4.14 Load vs penetration graph for test –2, type – 1soil for soaked (day-5) condition	27
Figure 4.15 Load vs penetration graph for test –3, type – 1soil for unsoaked condition	30
Figure 4.16 Load vs penetration graph for test –3, type – 1soil for soaked (day-1) condition	30
Figure 4.17 Load vs penetration graph for test –3, type – 1soil for soaked (day-2) condition	31
Figure 4.18 Load vs penetration graph for test –3, type – 1soil for soaked (day-3) condition	31
Figure 4.19 Load vs penetration graph for test –3, type – 1soil for soaked (day-4) condition	32
Figure 4.20 Load vs penetration graph for test –3, type – 1soil for soaked (day-5) condition	32
Figure 4.21 Load vs penetration graph for test –4, type – 1soil for unsoaked condition	35
Figure 4.22 Load vs penetration graph for test –4, type – 1soil for soaked (day-1) condition	35
Figure 4.23 Load vs penetration graph for test –4, type – 1soil for soaked (day-2) condition	36
Figure 4.24 Load vs penetration graph for test –4, type – 1soil for soaked (day-3) condition	36

Figure 4.25	Load vs penetration graph for test –4, type – 1soil for soaked (day-4) condition	37
Figure 4.26	Load vs penetration graph for test –4, type – 1soil for soaked (day-5) condition	37
Figure 4.27	Load vs penetration graph for test –5, type – 1soil for unsoaked condition	40
Figure 4.28	Load vs penetration graph for test –5, type – 1soil for soaked (day-1) condition	40
Figure 4.29	Load vs penetration graph for test –5, type – 1soil for soaked (day-2) condition	41
Figure 4.30	Load vs penetration graph for test –5, type – 1soil for soaked (day-3) condition	41
Figure 4.31	Load vs penetration graph for test –5, type – 1soil for soaked (day-4) condition	42
Figure 4.32	Load vs penetration graph for test –5, type – 1soil for soaked (day-5) condition	42
Figure 4.33:	Modified proctor compaction test for type – 2 soil	46
Figure 4.34	Load vs penetration graph for test – 1, type – 2 soil for unsoaked condition	47
Figure 4.35	Load vs penetration graph for test –1, type – 2soil for soaked (day - 1) condition	47
Figure 4.36	Load vs penetration graph for test –1, type – 2soil for soaked (day – 2) condition	48
Figure 4.37	Load vs penetration graph for test –1, type – 2soil for soaked (day - 3) condition	48
Figure 4.38	Load vs penetration graph for test –1, type – 2soil for soaked (day - 4) condition	49
Figure 4.39	Load vs penetration graph for test –1, type – 2soil for soaked (day - 5) condition	49
Figure 4.40	Load vs penetration graph for test –2, type – 2soil for unsoaked condition	52
Figure 4.41	Load vs penetration graph for test –2, type – 2soil for soaked (day-1) condition	52
Figure 4.42	Load vs penetration graph for test –2, type – 2soil for soaked (day-2) condition	53
Figure 4.43	Load vs penetration graph for test –2, type – 2soil for soaked (day-3) condition	53
Figure 4.44	Load vs penetration graph for test –2, type – 2soil for soaked (day-4) condition	54
Figure 4.45	Load vs penetration graph for test –2, type – 2soil for soaked (day-5) condition	54
Figure 4.46	Load vs penetration graph for test –3, type – 2soil for unsoaked condition	57
Figure 4.47	Load vs penetration graph for test –3, type – 2soil for soaked (day-1) condition	57
Figure 4.48	Load vs penetration graph for test –3, type – 2soil for soaked (day-2) condition	58
Figure 4.49	Load vs penetration graph for test –3, type – 2soil for soaked (day-3) condition	58

Figure 4.50	Load vs penetration graph for test –3, type – 2soil for soaked (day-4) condition	59
Figure 4.51	Load vs penetration graph for test –3, type – 2soil for soaked (day-5) condition	59
Figure 4.52	Load vs penetration graph for test –4, type – 2soil for unsoaked condition	62
Figure 4.53	Load vs penetration graph for test –4, type – 2 soil for soaked (day-1) condition	62
Figure 4.54	Load vs penetration graph for test –4, type – 2soil for soaked (day-2) condition	63
Figure 4.55	Load vs penetration graph for test –4, type – 2soil for soaked (day-3) condition	63
Figure 4.56	Load vs penetration graph for test –4, type – 2soil for soaked (day-4) condition	64
Figure 4.57	Load vs penetration graph for test –4, type – 2soil for soaked (day-5) condition	64
Figure 4.58	Load vs penetration graph for test –5, type – 2soil for unsoaked condition	67
Figure 4.59	Load vs penetration graph for test –5, type – 2soil for soaked (day-1) condition	67
Figure 4.60	Load vs penetration graph for test –5, type – 2soil for soaked (day-2) condition	68
Figure 4.61	Load vs penetration graph for test –5, type – 2soil for soaked (day-3) condition	68
Figure 4.62	Load vs penetration graph for test –5, type – 2soil for soaked (day-4) condition	69
Figure 4.63	Load vs penetration graph for test –5, type – 2soil for soaked (day-5) condition	69
Figure 4.64:	Modified proctor compaction test for type – 2 soil	73
Figure 4.65	Load vs penetration graph for test – 1, type – 2 soil for unsoaked condition	74
Figure 4.66	Load vs penetration graph for test –1, type – 2soil for soaked (day - 1) condition	74
Figure 4.67	Load vs penetration graph for test –1, type – 2soil for soaked (day – 2) condition	75
Figure 4.68	Load vs penetration graph for test –1, type – 2soil for soaked (day - 3) condition	75
Figure 4.69	Load vs penetration graph for test –1, type – 2soil for soaked (day - 4) condition	76
Figure 4.70	Load vs penetration graph for test –1, type – 2soil for soaked (day - 5) condition	76
Figure 4.71	Load vs penetration graph for test –2, type – 2soil for unsoaked condition	79
Figure 4.72	Load vs penetration graph for test –2, type – 2soil for soaked (day-1) condition	79
Figure 4.73	Load vs penetration graph for test –2, type – 2soil for soaked (day-2) condition	80
Figure 4.74	Load vs penetration graph for test –2, type – 2soil for soaked (day-3) condition	80

Figure 4.75	Load vs penetration graph for test -2, type - 2soil for soaked (day-4) condition	81
Figure 4.76	Load vs penetration graph for test -2, type - 2soil for soaked (day-5) condition	81
Figure 4.77	Load vs penetration graph for test -3, type - 2soil for unsoaked condition	84
Figure 4.78	Load vs penetration graph for test -3, type - 2soil for soaked (day-1) condition	84
Figure 4.79	Load vs penetration graph for test -3, type - 2soil for soaked (day-2) condition	85
Figure 4.80	Load vs penetration graph for test -3, type - 2soil for soaked (day-3) condition	85
Figure 4.81	Load vs penetration graph for test -3, type - 2soil for soaked (day-4) condition	86
Figure 4.82	Load vs penetration graph for test -3, type - 2soil for soaked (day-5) condition	86
Figure 4.83	Load vs penetration graph for test -4, type - 2soil for unsoaked condition	89
Figure 4.84	Load vs penetration graph for test -4, type - 2 soil for soaked (day-1) condition	89
Figure 4.85	Load vs penetration graph for test -4, type - 2soil for soaked (day-2) condition	90
Figure 4.86	Load vs penetration graph for test -4, type - 2soil for soaked (day-3) condition	90
Figure 4.87	Load vs penetration graph for test -4, type - 2soil for soaked (day-4) condition	91
Figure 4.88	Load vs penetration graph for test -4, type - 2soil for soaked (day-5) condition	91
Figure 4.89	Load vs penetration graph for test -5, type - 2soil for unsoaked condition	94
Figure 4.90	Load vs penetration graph for test -5, type - 2soil for soaked (day-1) condition	94
Figure 4.91	Load vs penetration graph for test -5, type - 2soil for soaked (day-2) condition	95
Figure 4.92	Load vs penetration graph for test -5, type - 2soil for soaked (day-3) condition	95
Figure 4.93	Load vs penetration graph for test -5, type - 2soil for soaked (day-4) condition	96
Figure 4.94	Load vs penetration graph for test -5, type - 2soil for soaked (day-5) condition	96
Figure 4.95	Shear stress vs normal stress for test -1,type- 1 soil	99
Figure 4.96	Shear stress vs normal stress for test -2,type- 1 soil	99
Figure 4.97	Shear stress vs normal stress for test -3,type- 1 soil	100
Figure 4.98	Shear stress vs normal stress for test -4,type- 1 soil	100
Figure 4.99	Shear stress vs normal stress for test -5,type- 1 soil	101

LIST OF TABLES

Table-4.1 Index properties of type – 1 soil	14
Table-4.2 Grain size distribution of type - 1 soil	15
Table 4.3 Moisture content for test- 1,type – 1 soil for soaked (day - 1) condition	22
Table 4.4 Moisture content for test -1, type – 1 soil for soaked (day - 2) condition	22
Table4. 5 Moisture content for test – 1, type – 1 soil for soaked (day - 3) condition	23
Table 4.6 Moisture content for test – 1,type – 1 soil for soaked (day - 4) condition	23
Table 4.7 Moisture content for test – 1, type – 1 soil for soaked (day - 5) condition	24
Table 4.8 Moisture content for test – 2, type – 1 soil for soaked (day - 1) condition	28
Table 4.9 Moisture content for test – 2, type – 1 soil for soaked (day - 2) condition	28
Table 4.10 Moisture content for test – 2, type – 1 soil for soaked (day - 3) condition	28
Table 4.11 Moisture content for test – 2, type – 1 soil for soaked (day - 4) condition	29
Table 4.12 Moisture content for test – 2, type – 1 soil for soaked (day - 5) condition	29
Table 4.13 Moisture content for test – 3, type – 1 soil for soaked (day - 1) condition	33
Table 4.14 Moisture content for test – 3, type – 1 soil for soaked (day - 2) condition	33
Table 4.15 Moisture content for test – 3, type – 1 soil for soaked (day -3) condition	33
Table 4.16 Moisture content for test –3, type – 1 soil for soaked (day - 4) condition	34
Table 4.17 Moisture content for test –3, type – 1 soil for soaked (day - 5) condition	34
Table 4.18 Moisture content for test – 4, type – 1 soil for soaked (day - 1) condition	38
Table 4.19 Moisture content for test – 4, type – 1 soil for soaked (day - 2) condition	38
Table 4.20 Moisture content for test – 4, type – 1 soil for soaked (day - 3) condition	38
Table 4.21 Moisture content for test – 4, type – 1 soil for soaked (day - 4) condition	39
Table 4.22. Moisture content for test – 4, type – 1 soil for soaked (day - 5) condition	39
Table 4.23 Moisture content for test – 5, type – 1 soil for soaked (day - 1) condition	43

Table 4.24	Moisture content for test – 5, type – 1 soil for soaked (day - 2) condition	43
Table 4.25	Moisture content for test – 5, type – 1 soil for soaked (day - 3) condition	43
Table 4.26	Moisture content for test – 5, type – 1 soil for soaked (day - 4) condition	44
Table 4.27	Moisture content for test – 5, type – 1 soil for soaked (day - 5) condition	44
Table 4. 28	Index properties of type – 2 soil	45
Table 4.29	Grain size distribution of type - 2 soil	45
Table 4.30	Moisture content for test – 1, type – 2 soil for soaked (day - 1) condition	50
Table 4.31	Moisture content for test – 1, type – 2 soil for soaked (day - 2) condition	50
Table 4.32	Moisture content for test – 1, type – 2 soil for soaked (day - 3) condition	50
Table 4.33	Moisture content for test – 1, type – 2 soil for soaked (day - 4) condition	51
Table 4.34	Moisture content for test – 1, type – 2 soil for soaked (day - 5) condition	52
Table 4.35	Moisture content for test – 2, type – 2 soil for soaked (day - 1) condition	55
Table 4.36	Moisture content for test – 2, type – 2 soil for soaked (day - 2) condition	55
Table 4.37	Moisture content for test – 2, type – 2 soil for soaked (day - 3) condition	55
Table 4.38	Moisture content for test – 2, type – 2 soil for soaked (day - 4) condition	56
Table 4.39	Moisture content for test – 2, type – 2 soil for soaked (day - 5) condition	56
Table 4.40	Moisture content for test – 3, type – 2 soil for soaked (day - 1) condition	60
Table 4.41	Moisture content for test – 3, type – 2 soil for soaked (day - 2) condition	60
Table 4.42	Moisture content for test – 3, type – 2 soil for soaked (day - 3) condition	60
Table 4.43	Moisture content for test – 3, type – 2 soil for soaked (day - 4) condition	61
Table 4.44	Moisture content for test – 3, type – 2 soil for soaked (day - 5) condition	61
Table 4.45	Moisture content for test – 4, type – 2 soil for soaked (day - 1) condition	65
Table 4.46	Moisture content for test – 4, type – 2 soil for soaked (day - 2) condition	65
Table 4.47	Moisture content for test – 4, type – 2 soil for soaked (day - 3) condition	65
Table 4.48	Moisture content for test – 4, type – 2 soil for soaked (day - 4) condition	66

Table 4.49	Moisture content for test – 4, type – 2 soil for soaked (day - 5) condition	66
Table 4.50	Moisture content for test – 5, type – 2 soil for soaked (day - 1) condition	70
Table 4.51	Moisture content for test – 5, type – 2 soil for soaked (day - 2) condition	70
Table 4.52	Moisture content for test – 5, type – 2 soil for soaked (day - 3) condition	70
Table 4.53	Moisture content for test – 5, type – 2 soil for soaked (day - 4) condition	71
Table 4.54	Moisture content for test – 5, type – 2 soil for soaked (day - 5) condition	71
Table4. 55	Index properties of type- 3 soil	72
Table4. 56	Grain size distribution of type - 3 soil	72
Table 4.57	Moisture content for test – 1, type – 3 soil for soaked (day - 1) condition	77
Table 4.58	Moisture content for test – 1, type – 3 soil for soaked (day - 2) condition	77
Table 4.59	Moisture content for test – 1, type – 3 soil for soaked (day - 3) condition	77
Table 4.60	Moisture content for test – 1, type – 3 soil for soaked (day - 4) condition	78
Table 4.61	Moisture content for test – 1, type – 3 soil for soaked (day - 5) condition	78
Table 4.62	Moisture content for test – 2, type – 3 soil for soaked (day - 1) condition	82
Table 4.63	Moisture content for test – 2, type – 3 soil for soaked (day - 2) condition	82
Table 4.64	Moisture content for test – 2, type – 3 soil for soaked (day - 3) condition	82
Table 4.65	Moisture content for test – 2, type – 3 soil for soaked (day - 4) condition	83
Table 4.66	Moisture content for test – 2, type – 3 soil for soaked (day - 5) condition	83
Table 4.67	Moisture content for test – 3, type – 3 soil for soaked (day - 1) condition	87
Table 4.68	Moisture content for test – 3, type – 3 soil for soaked (day - 2) condition	87
Table 4.69	Moisture content for test – 3, type – 3 soil for soaked (day - 3) condition	87
Table 4.70	Moisture content for test – 3, type – 3 soil for soaked (day - 4) condition	88
Table 4.71	Moisture content for test – 3, type – 3 soil for soaked (day - 5) condition	88
Table 4.72	Moisture content for test – 4, type – 3 soil for soaked (day - 1) condition	92
Table 4.73	Moisture content for test – 4, type – 3 soil for soaked (day - 2) condition	92

Table 4.74	Moisture content for test – 4, type – 3 soil for soaked (day - 3) condition	92
Table 4.75	Moisture content for test – 4, type – 3 soil for soaked (day - 4) condition	93
Table 4.76	Moisture content for test – 4, type – 3 soil for soaked (day - 5) condition	93
Table 4.77	Moisture content for test – 5, type – 3 soil for soaked (day - 1) condition	97
Table 4.78	Moisture content for test – 5, type – 3 soil for soaked (day - 2) condition	97
Table 4.79	Moisture content for test – 5, type – 3 soil for soaked (day - 3) condition	97
Table 4.80	Moisture content for test – 5, type – 3 soil for soaked (day - 4) condition	98
Table 4.81	Moisture content for test – 5, type – 3 soil for soaked (day - 5) condition	98
Table4. 82	CBR values of first type of soil	102
Table4. 83	CBR values of second type of soil	103
Table4. 84	CBR values of third type of soil	104

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 SUBGRADE

The crust of a pavement, whether flexible or rigid, rests on a soil foundation on an embankment or cutting, normally known as subgrade. Subgrade can be defined as a compacted layer, generally of naturally occurring local soil, assumed to be 500/300 mm in thickness, just beneath the pavement crust, providing a suitable foundation for the pavement. The subgrade in embankment is compacted in two layers, usually to a higher standard than the lower part of the embankment. The soil in subgrade is normally stressed to certain minimum level of stresses due to the traffic loads and the subgrade soil should be of good quality and appropriately compacted so as to utilize its full strength to withstand the stresses due to traffic loads. This leads to economization of the overall pavement thickness. On the other hand the subgrade soil is characterized for its strength for the purpose of analysis and design of pavement.

1.1.1 SubgradePerformance

A subgrade's performance generally depends on three of the basic characteristics, which are briefly described below:

1. Load bearing capacity: The subgrade must be able to support loads transmitted from the pavement structure. This load bearing capacity is often affected by degree of compaction, moisture content, and soil type. A subgrade that can support a high amount of loading without excessive deformation is considered good.

2. Moisture content: Moisture tends to affect a number of subgrade properties including load bearing capacity, shrinkage and swelling. Moisture content can be influenced by a number of things such as drainage, groundwater table elevation, infiltration, or pavement porosity (which can be assisted by cracks in the pavement). Generally, excessively wet subgrades will deform excessively under load.
3. Shrinkage and/or swelling: Some soils shrink or swell depending upon their moisture content. Additionally, soils with excessive fines content may be susceptible to frost heave in northern climates. Shrinkage, swelling and frost heave will tend to deform and crack any pavement type constructed over them.

1.1.2 Desirable Properties

The desirable properties of subgrade soil as a highway material are

- Withstand capability (Stability)
- Ease of compaction
- Strength permanency
- Low change in volume during adverse conditions of weather and ground water table
- Superior drainage
- Incompressibility

The most common parameter used to evaluate pavement layer strength is the California Bearing Ratio (CBR). The CBR value is influenced by the water content and the dry density as well as the texture of the soil. Generally, the CBR test in the laboratory is conducted on test samples prepared at the dry density and water content likely to be achieved in the field. Whereas the

Field dry density can be fairly well predicted the difficulty is to determine the stable moisture content at which to conduct the test.

1.2 CALIFORNIA BEARING RATIO TEST

The California Bearing Ratio Test (CBR Test) is a penetration test developed by *California State Highway Department (U.S.A.)* for evaluating the bearing capacity of subgrade soil. The CBR test was first introduced or developed by O.J. Porter at California Highway Department in 1920. It is otherwise called as load-deformation test which is conducted in the laboratory or in the fields and these results are generally used to find the thickness of pavement layers, base course and other layers of a given traffic loading by the use of empirical design chart. Initially it practiced for the design of surfaced and un-surfaced airfields which is still based upon CBR today.

The CBR determines the thickness of different elements constituting the pavement. The CBR test is the ratio of force per unit area required to penetrate soil mass by a circular plunger of 50mm at the rate of 1.25mm/min. Observations are carried out between the load resistances (penetration) vs. plunger penetration.. The California bearing ratio, CBR is expressed as the ratio of the load resistance (test load) of a given soil sample to the standard load at 2.5mm or 5mm penetration, expressed in percentage.

$$\text{CBR} = (\text{Test load}/\text{Standard load}) \times 100$$

The standard load for 2.5mm and 5mm penetrations are 1370 kg and 2055 kg respectively. The CBR test is carried out on a small scale penetration of dial reading with probing ring divisions. The proving ring divisions are taken corresponding to the penetrations at 0, 0.5, 1, 1.5, 2, 2.5, 3, 3.5, 4, 4.5, 5, 5.5, 6, 6.5, 7, 7.5, 8, 8.5, 9, 9.5, 10, 10.5, 11, 11.5, 12, 12.5 and from which Test loads are calculated and hence CBR value of soil is being determined. The maximum

load and penetration is recorded if it occurs for a penetration of less than 12.5 mm. The curve is mainly convex upwards although the initial portion of the curve may be concave upwards due to surface irregularities. A correction is then applied by drawing a tangent to the curve at the point of greatest slope. The corrected origin will be the point where the tangent meets the abscissa. The CBR values are usually calculated for penetrations of 2.5 mm and 5mm. Generally the CBR values at 2.5mm penetration will be greater than 5mm penetration and in such a case the former is taken as the CBR value for design purposes. If the CBR value corresponding to a penetration of 5mm exceeds that for 2.5mm, the test is repeated. If identical results follow, the bearing ratio corresponding to 5mm penetration is taken for design.

Considering the above, it has been proposed in this project to study the various strength properties of different types of soil made at different moisture and density levels and conclude the general aspects of moisture conditions on determination of different strength parameters, so as to achieve the most viable and economical pavement design.

1.3 ORGANIZATION OF THESIS

The thesis consists of six chapters as described below:

- Chapter 1 gives a brief introduction of the project
- Chapter 2 deals with a review of previous work on laboratory studies.
- Chapter 3 deals with methodology and experimental investigation.
- Analysis of the results and discussion on the experimental investigations is discussed in Chapter 4.
- Conclusions of this research are summarized in Chapter 5.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 EFFECT OF MOISTURE VARIATION ON CBR

Alayaki and Bajomo(2011) examined the effect of moisture variation on the strength characteristics of laterite soil in Abeokuta, Ogun State, Nigeria. The result showed that an increase in the soaking period of the compacted soil sample from 1 to 5 days result in decrease in the CBR of the soil. He observed that the top face of the soaking soil has a CBR value greater than that at the bottom face.

Jaleel (2011) studied the effect of soaking on the top and bottom CBR value of a sub-base material. He prepared fourteen CBR samples at 95% relative modified AASHTO compaction. The results showed that, a significant drop in the CBR for top and bottom due to the soaking was observed. Most of decrease in soaking CBR value was pronounced in the first days for top and bottom CBR, respectively. From the results of the testing conducted in this study on the effect of soaking period on top and bottom subbase for highway purpose, he concluded that the load applied on the subbase layer decreases with increase of period soaking.

Ampadu (2006) examined the effect of water content on the CBR of a subgrade soil samples of soil from a study site were prepared by laboratory compaction at the optimum water content using different levels of compaction to obtain samples at different densities. The remolded samples were then subjected to different levels of wetting in a water tank and different degrees of drying in the laboratory and the CBR value were determined. From the laboratory CBR test results on a subgrade material at different water contents for three different dry densities, it may be concluded

that the rate of change in CBR per percentage change in water content during drying from the OMC was 3 to 7 times larger than during wetting from OMC.

Singh et al.(2011) developed regression-based models for estimating soaking and unsoaking California Bearing Ratio (CBR) values for fine-grained subgrade soils .Five locally available soils were collected from different zones of West Bengal. The samples were compacted at four different levels of compaction (i.e., 50, 56, 65, and 75 blows) and at five different levels of moisture contents on dry and wet sides of an optimum moisture content (OMC) of a soil (i.e., $\pm 2\%$ OMC, $\pm 1\%$ OMC, and OMC). Regression models were developed considering different independent parameters namely, index properties of soils, degree of compaction, and moisture content. It was observed that the CBR value, both soaking and unsoaking significantly affected by change in moisture content and compaction effort.

Ningsih et al.(2012) studied correlation between index properties and CBR tests of Pekanbaru (Indonesia) soils with and without soaking. This research aims to make comparisons between CBR soaking test results for CBR un-soaking in some variation of clay content and make simple comparisons between CBR soaking for CBR unsoaking by considering the soil properties. The results showed that there was a linear correlation between the CBR soaking and CBR unsoaking also influenced by the nature of the index (the properties of the soil).

Rahman(2010) studied the correlation between CBR results and physical properties of soil. Correlation had been proposed in the study to predict the CBR values at top face of the soil sample for Malaysia's type of soil based on the collected soil data and results from laboratory

works. These correlations were developed based on the Maximum dry density (MDD), Optimum moisture content(OMC) and the number of blows(of CBR test).

Hussain(2008) correlated between CBR value and Undrained Shear Strength from Vane Shear Test. Several soil samples with different Plasticity Index and moisture content were compacted and tested using CBR test and Vane Shear test to obtain the data to establish the correlation. He found that CBR value and Undrained shear strength increases with increase of Plastic index. CBR value and Undrained shear strength from Vane shear test of soil samples are inversely proportional with the moisture content.

Cokca et al.(2003) studied the effects of compaction moisture content on the shear strength of an unsaturated clay. In this study, the effects of compaction moisture content and soaking on the unsaturated shear strength parameters of clay were investigated. Experiments were done on samples compacted at optimum moisture content , on the dry side of optimum and on the wet side of optimum .He found that angle of friction decreases rapidly with increasing moisture contents , the cohesion component of shear strength attains its peak value at around optimum Moisture content and then decreases.

ERES Division(2001) studied correlation of CBR values with soil index properties. The objective of this study was to develop general correlations that describe the relationship between Soil Index Properties and the California Bearing Ratio (CBR) and Resilient Modulus(MR) of unbound materials such as base, subbase, and subgrade layers in pavement systems.

Yasinet al. studied the Effect of Submergence on Subgrade Strength. His study aimed at determining the effects of depth of submergence and duration of submergence on the subgrade strength of soil samples collected from the Dhaka-Aricha highway. CBR tests were performed with different heights of submergence after normal soaking period and also after prolonged submergence. For the studied depth and duration of submergence, no effect of submergence on sub-grade CBR strength could be found for any of the three types of soils tested.

Razouki et al.(2003) examined Long-term soaking effect on strength and deformation characteristics of a gypsiferous subgrade soil. The behaviour during long-term soaking of the California Bearing Ratio (CBR), the resilient modulus and the deformation of compacted Iraqi gypsiferous soil containing about 34% gypsum was studied. Sixteen (CBR) samples compacted at optimum moisture content and 95% of the maximum dry density of the modified AASHTO compaction test were prepared. The paper reveals that a soaking period of four days can lead to misleading and unsafe results regarding strength, stiffness and deformation of gypsiferous soils.

2.2 EFFECT OF MOISTURE VARIATION ON DIRECT SHEAR TEST

Kim(2011) studied the variation of shear strength of weathered granite soil with water content. This study investigates the effects of initial water content and disturbance on the strength reduction for both disturbed and undisturbed samples of weathered granite soil in Korea using direct shear test. Several series of direct shear tests were carried out on undisturbed or disturbed samples with various water contents under normal stress ranging from 30 KPa to 140 KPa. He found out that cohesion and friction angle of weathered granite soils linearly decrease with an increase in degree of saturation.

Blazejczak et al. (1995) investigated the effect of soil water conditions and soil compaction on the age hardening process of loamy sand and silty loamy sand in relation to the tensile strength. Soil samples were moulded at water contents 10%,15%,20% and compacted upto 1.35,1.45,1.55g/cm³. At intervals after moulding, the tensile strengths of the moist samples were measured with the indirect tension test. High water content had a negative effect on the tensile strength of soil at constant bulk density. High bulk density, however, had a positive effect on tensile strength at constant water content.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY AND EXPERIMENTAL INVESTIGATIONS

INTRODUCTION

The entire study has been conducted on three types of soil, *i.e.* 1. Clayey Soil (from Bonai, Sundergarh District), 2. Clayey soil (from Rajgangpur, Sundergarh District) and 3. Red Moorum Soil (from NIT Rourkela campus).

Initially experiments were conducted to find out different properties of soil such as index properties, grain size distribution and differential free swell index. Later on heavy compaction tests were conducted to find out the optimum moisture content & corresponding maximum dry density. Then CBR tests were made at different moisture contents including OMC and analysis made to investigate the variation of CBR with respect to different days of soaking, *i.e.* from unsoaked (day 0) to soaked (day 5). The variations were also made with regard to moisture content at different layers along with different positions (east, west, north, south, centre positions) and also the variations of moisture content with respect to different days of soaking were observed. Direct Shear Test was also conducted on the soil samples.

3.1 EXPERIMENTAL INVESTIGATIONS

Soils are classified with different engineering properties which affect the behavior of soil under different conditions. These properties are described briefly here.

3.1.1 Liquid Limit

The liquid limit (LL) is the water content at which a soil changes from plastic to liquid behavior. At this limit, the soil possesses a small value of shear strength, losing its ability to flow as a liquid. In other words, the liquid limit is the minimum moisture content at which the soil tends to flow as a liquid.

3.1.2 Plastic Limit

Plastic limit (PL) is the arbitrary limit of water content at which the soil tends to pass from the plastic state to the semi-solid state of consistency. Thus, this is the minimum water content, at which the change in shape of the soil is accompanied by visible cracks, i.e., when worked upon, the soil crumbles.

3.1.3 Plasticity Index

Plasticity Index (PI) is the range of water content within which the soil exhibits plastic properties, that is, it is the difference between liquid and plastic limits.

Plasticity Index (**IP**) = Liquid Limit(**WL**) - Plastic Limit (**WP**)

3.1.4 Differential Free Swell

Free Swell Index is the increase in volume of a soil, without any external constraints, on submergence in water.

$$\text{Free swell index} = \frac{V_d - V_k}{V_k} \times 100\%$$

Where, V_d = volume of soil specimen read from the graduated cylinder containing distilled water.

V_k = volume of soil specimen read from the graduated cylinder containing kerosene.

3.1.5 Specific Gravity

Specific gravity of soil solids is defined as the ratio of unit weight of solids to the unit weight of water at the standard temperature (4°C).

3.1.6 Sieve Analysis

About 1kg of soil was taken and it was washed thoroughly with water on 75 micron sieve ,soil retained on sieve was dried and weighed and used for sieve analysis .These dried soils were passed through stack of sieves like 4.75mm,2.36mm,1.18mm,600 μ m,300 μ m,150 μ m, 0.75 μ m.

3.1.7 Modified Proctor Test

The Proctor compaction test is a laboratory method of experimentally determining the optimal moisture content at which a given soil type will become most dense and achieve its maximum dry density. The term Proctor is in honor of R. R. Proctor, who in 1933 showed that the dry density of a soil for a given compactive effort depends on the amount of water the soil contains during soil compaction. His original test is most commonly referred to as the standard Proctor compaction test; later on, his test was updated to create the modified Proctor compaction test.

3.1.8 California Bearing Ratio Test

The CBR is a measure of resistance of a material to penetration of standard plunger under controlled density and moisture conditions. The test procedure should be strictly adhered if high degree of reproducibility is desired. The CBR test may be conducted in re-moulded or undisturbed specimens in the laboratory. The test has been extensively investigated for field correlation of flexible pavement thickness requirement.

Briefly, the test consists of causing a cylindrical plunger of 50mm diameter to penetrate a pavement component material at 1.25mm/minute. The loads, for 2.5mm and 5mm are recorded. This load is expressed as a percentage of standard load value at a respective deformation level to obtain CBR value.

3.1.9 Direct Shear Test:

A direct shear test is a laboratory or field test used by geotechnical engineers to measure the shear strength properties of soil or rock material, or of discontinuities in soil or rock masses.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

4.1 TYPE 1 SOIL

4.1.1 Index Properties

The index properties such as Liquid limit, Plastic limit, Plasticity Index value are presented in Table 4.1 as follows:

Table-4.1 Index properties of type – 1 soil

Index property	Experimental Value
Liquid Limit	55.29%
Plastic Limit	34.04%
Plasticity Index	21.25%
Specific Gravity	2.65
Differential Swell Index	57%

4.1.2 PARTICLE SIZE DISTRIBUTION

The grain size distribution of this soil sample has been shown in Table 4.2.

Table-4.2 Grain size distribution of type - 1 soil

I.S Sieve no.	Weight retained in gm	Percentage Weight retained	Percentage weight passing
4.75mm	4.6	0.46	99.54
2mm	14.5	1.45	98.09
1mm	20.2	2.02	96.07
0.6mm	5	0.5	95.57
0.425mm	9.8	0.98	94.59
0.3mm	5.1	0.51	94.08
.212mm	21.1	2.11	91.17
.015mm	15.6	1.56	90.41
0.075mm	30.49	3.049	87.361

Based on the above properties the IS Soil Classification for the soil sample under test is 'OH'.

4.1.3 Modified Proctor Compaction Test

The results of modified proctor compaction test are represented in figure 4.1:




Figure 4.1: Modified proctor compaction test for type – 1 soil

4.1.4 California Bearing Ratio Test Results

4.1.4.1 Test-1(conducted under OMC (16.4%) and MDD (1.84g/cc))




Figure 4.2 Load vs penetration graph for test – 1, type – 1 soil for unsoaked condition




Figure 4.3 Load vs penetration graph for test -1, type - 1soil for soaked (day - 1) condition




Figure 4.4Load vs penetration graph for test -1, type - 1soil for soaked (day - 2) condition




Figure 4.5 Load vs penetration graph for test -1, type - 1 soil for soaked (day - 3) condition




Figure 4.6 Load vs penetration graph for test -1, type - 1 soil for soaked (day - 4) condition




Figure 4.7 Load vs penetration graph for test -1, type - 1 soil for soaked (day - 5) condition

MOISTURE VARIATION IN SOIL SAMPLE

Attempts have been made to take soil samples from various parts of a CBR sample for determination of moisture content, as per the schematic diagram given in Figure 4.8. Middle layer is almost in the middle of the sample (vertical level). The top and bottom layers are about 15 cm from the top and bottom of a sample respectively. The east and west for each layer (horizontal) indicate towards left and right side of the sample respectively, while north and south represent samples away and towards the observer respectively.




Figure 4.8 Horizontal and vertical positions of soil sample

Table 4.3 Moisture content for test- 1,type – 1 soil for soaked (day - 1) condition

Vertical Positions	MOISTURE CONTENTS%				
	Horizontal Positions				
	EAST	WEST	NORTH	SOUTH	CENTRE
TOP	16.93	17.52	17.74	18.90	18.64
MIDDLE	16.77	16.56	16.65	16.50	16.70
BOTTOM	16.62	17.80	15.65	16.49	16.73

Table4.4 Moisture content for test -1, type – 1 soil for soaked (day - 2) condition

Vertical Positions	MOISTURE CONTENTS%				
	Horizontal Positions				
	EAST	WEST	NORTH	SOUTH	CENTRE
TOP	26.48	26.92	24.26	23.36	25.12
MIDDLE	18.84	18.57	18.76	18.54	18.49
BOTTOM	17.34	17.66	17.84	18.17	17.96

Table4. 5 Moisture content for test – 1, type – 1 soil for soaked (day - 3) condition

Vertical Positions	MOISTURE CONTENTS%				
	Horizontal Positions				
	EAST	WEST	NORTH	SOUTH	CENTRE
TOP	24.52	24.28	24.78	24.88	23.98
MIDDLE	19.70	20.03	20.44	20.88	19.63
BOTTOM	17.75	17.86	18.33	17.78	18.72

Table4.6 Moisture content for test – 1, Type – 1 soil for soaked (day - 4) condition

Vertical Positions	MOISTURE CONTENTS%				
	Horizontal Positions				
	EAST	WEST	NORTH	SOUTH	CENTRE
TOP	25.52	24.97	24.60	24.67	25.40
MIDDLE	19.33	20.94	21.43	22.75	22.7
BOTTOM	20.64	19.57	19.82	20.22	21.84

Table 4.7 Moisture content for test – 1, type – 1 soil for soaked (day - 5) condition

Vertical Positions	MOISTURE CONTENTS%				
	Horizontal Positions				
	EAST	WEST	NORTH	SOUTH	CENTRE
TOP	28.18	26.25	26.25	25.68	25.55
MIDDLE	24.43	22.96	22.39	21.87	23.09
BOTTOM	22.39	19.40	20.75	21.74	20.61

4.1.4.2 Test 2 (98% dry side) under moisture content (12.89%) and dry density (1.8g/cc)




Figure 4.9 Load vs penetration graph for test –2, type – 1 soil for unsoaked condition




Figure 4.10 Load vs penetration graph for test -2, type -1 soil for soaked (day-1) condition




Figure 4.11 Load vs penetration graph for test -2, type -1 soil for soaked (day-2) condition




Figure 4.12 Load vs penetration graph for test -2, type -1 soil for soaked (day-3) condition




Figure 4.13 Load vs penetration graph for test -2, type -1 soil for soaked (day-4) condition




Figure 4.14 Load vs penetration graph for test -2, type - 1 soil for soaked (day-5) condition

MOISTURE VARIATION IN SOIL SAMPLE

Table 4.8 Moisture content for test – 2, type – 1 soil for soaked (day - 1) condition

Vertical Positions	MOISTURE CONTENTS%				
	Horizontal Positions				
	EAST	WEST	NORTH	SOUTH	CENTRE
TOP	13.93	13.52	14.41	13.90	14.56
MIDDLE	14.36	14.78	14.38	13.69	13.44
BOTTOM	13.08	13.65	13.68	13.49	13.73

Table 4.9 Moisture content for test – 2, type – 1 soil for soaked (day - 2) condition

Vertical Positions	MOISTURE CONTENTS%				
	Horizontal Positions				
	EAST	WEST	NORTH	SOUTH	CENTRE
TOP	18.96	20.39	21.39	23.54	22.08
MIDDLE	20.14	21.11	22.17	20.17	20.87
BOTTOM	19.68	17.58	17.77	18.25	18.81

Table 4.10 Moisture content for test – 2, type – 1 soil for soaked (day - 3) condition

Vertical Positions	MOISTURE CONTENTS%				
	Horizontal Positions				
	EAST	WEST	NORTH	SOUTH	CENTRE
TOP	24.26	23.09	23.55	24.96	22.09
MIDDLE	20.11	21.30	20.85	21.33	22.47
BOTTOM	19.35	18.56	18.25	19.09	20.01

Table 4.11 Moisture content for test – 2, type – 1 soil for soaked (day - 4) condition

Vertical Positions	MOISTURE CONTENTS%				
	Horizontal Positions				
	EAST	WEST	NORTH	SOUTH	CENTRE
TOP	25.89	26.32	25.54	26.32	25.58
MIDDLE	24.27	25.03	24.72	24.48	23.39
BOTTOM	22.03	23.36	23.57	22.96	23.05

Table 4.12 Moisture content for test – 2, type – 1 soil for soaked (day - 5) condition

Vertical Positions	MOISTURE CONTENTS%				
	Horizontal Positions				
	EAST	WEST	NORTH	SOUTH	CENTRE
TOP	28.53	28.36	27.44	28.63	27.54
MIDDLE	27.66	26.57	26.64	25.87	26.32
BOTTOM	24.12	25.41	24.39	24.98	25.35

4.1.4.3 Test 3 (98% wet side) under moisture content (17.8%) and dry density (1.8g/cc)




Figure 4.15 Load vs penetration graph for test -3, type -1 soil for unsoaked condition




Figure 4.16 Load vs penetration graph for test -3, type -1 soil for soaked (day-1) condition




Figure 4.17 Load vs penetration graph for test -3, type -1 soil for soaked (day-2) condition




Figure 4.18 Load vs penetration graph for test -3, type -1 soil for soaked (day-3) condition




Figure 4.19 Load vs penetration graph for test -3, type -1 soil for soaked (day-4) condition




Figure 4.20 Load vs penetration graph for test -3, type -1 soil for soaked (day-5) condition

MOISTURE VARIATION IN SOIL SAMPLE

Table 4.13 Moisture content for test – 3, type – 1 soil for soaked (day - 1) condition

Vertical Positions	MOISTURE CONTENTS%				
	Horizontal Positions				
	EAST	WEST	NORTH	SOUTH	CENTRE
TOP	23.37	23.27	23.45	23.69	20.64
MIDDLE	20.47	22.01	21.25	22.02	20.33
BOTTOM	19.83	20.93	21.25	21.11	19.42

Table 4.14 Moisture content for test – 3, type – 1 soil for soaked (day - 2) condition

Vertical Positions	MOISTURE CONTENTS%				
	Horizontal Positions				
	EAST	WEST	NORTH	SOUTH	CENTRE
TOP	23.24	23.79	23.21	23.62	22.38
MIDDLE	21.90	21.46	21.57	21.69	20.60
BOTTOM	21.64	21.46	21.92	21.77	20.88

Table 4.15 Moisture content for test – 3, type – 1 soil for soaked (day -3) condition

Vertical Positions	MOISTURE CONTENTS%				
	Horizontal Positions				
	EAST	WEST	NORTH	SOUTH	CENTRE
TOP	25.08	26.68	26.37	25.24	24.56
MIDDLE	21.62	22.44	21.68	20.01	20.49
BOTTOM	19.37	20.35	20.08	19.65	20.47

Table 4.16 Moisture content for test –3, type – 1 soil for soaked (day - 4) condition

Vertical Positions	MOISTURE CONTENTS%				
	Horizontal Positions				
	EAST	WEST	NORTH	SOUTH	CENTRE
TOP	25.53	25.48	24.35	24.34	25.57
MIDDLE	21.28	22.20	20.88	20.80	20.44
BOTTOM	19.07	19.56	19.55	18.46	19.12

Table 4.17 Moisture content for test –3, type – 1 soil for soaked (day - 5) condition

Vertical Positions	MOISTURE CONTENTS%				
	Horizontal Positions				
	EAST	WEST	NORTH	SOUTH	CENTRE
TOP	27.68	27.91	26.22	25.96	25.47
MIDDLE	22.01	21.06	20.65	20.86	20.56
BOTTOM	20.10	19.37	19.39	19.15	21.72

4.1.1.4 Test 4 (97% dry side) under moisture content (12.2%) and dry density (1.78g/cc)




Figure 4.21 Load vs penetration graph for test -4, type -1 soil for unsoaked condition




Figure 4.22 Load vs penetration graph for test -4, type -1 soil for soaked (day-1) condition




Figure 4.23 Load vs penetration graph for test -4, type -1 soil for soaked (day-2) condition




Figure 4.24 Load vs penetration graph for test -4, type -1 soil for soaked (day-3) condition




Figure 4.25 Load vs penetration graph for test -4, type -1 soil for soaked (day-4) condition




Figure 4.26 Load vs penetration graph for test -4, type -1 soil for soaked (day-5) condition

MOISTURE VARIATION IN SOIL SAMPLE

Table 4.18Moisture content for test – 4, type – 1 soil for soaked (day - 1) condition

Vertical Positions	MOISTURE CONTENTS%				
	Horizontal Positions				
	EAST	WEST	NORTH	SOUTH	CENTRE
TOP	23.28	21.85	24.40	23.97	23.42
MIDDLE	17.25	17.46	17.18	16.95	16.64
BOTTOM	16.77	16.37	15.93	15.67	15.92

Table 4.19Moisture content for test – 4, type – 1 soil for soaked (day - 2) condition

Vertical Positions	MOISTURE CONTENTS%				
	Horizontal Positions				
	EAST	WEST	NORTH	SOUTH	CENTRE
TOP	26.32	26.30	24.79	24.29	25.11
MIDDLE	21.69	21.99	23.18	22.31	20.96
BOTTOM	20.06	18.59	19.82	19.49	20.02

Table 4.20Moisture content for test – 4, type – 1 soil for soaked (day - 3) condition

Vertical Positions	MOISTURE CONTENTS%				
	Horizontal Positions				
	EAST	WEST	NORTH	SOUTH	CENTRE
TOP	28.28	25.91	27.68	28.28	28.10
MIDDLE	25.64	17.58	21.62	22.57	23.59
BOTTOM	21.33	19.92	17.57	19.24	19.58

Table 4.21Moisture content for test – 4, type – 1 soil for soaked (day - 4) condition

Vertical Positions	MOISTURE CONTENTS%				
	Horizontal Positions				
	EAST	WEST	NORTH	SOUTH	CENTRE
TOP	29.56	28.44	28.61	29.03	29.12
MIDDLE	26.09	25.32	25.59	25.60	26.46
BOTTOM	22.09	21.84	20.93	21.78	22.85

Table 4.22.Moisture content for test – 4, type – 1 soil for soaked (day - 5) condition

Vertical Positions	MOISTURE CONTENTS%				
	Horizontal Positions				
	EAST	WEST	NORTH	SOUTH	CENTRE
TOP	31.49	31.40	31.27	30.75	29.37
MIDDLE	28.40	28.18	27.70	27.87	27.84
BOTTOM	27.42	26.15	27.20	26.83	26.27

4.1.1.5 Test 5 (97% wet side) under moisture content (19%) and dry density (1.78g/cc)




Figure 4.27 Load vs penetration graph for test -5, type -1 soil for unsoaked condition




Figure 4.28 Load vs penetration graph for test -5, type -1 soil for soaked (day-1) condition




Figure 4.29 Load vs penetration graph for test -5, type -1 soil for soaked (day-2) condition




Figure 4.30 Load vs penetration graph for test -5, type -1 soil for soaked (day-3) condition




Figure 4.31 Load vs penetration graph for test -5, type -1 soil for soaked (day-4) condition




Figure 4.32 Load vs penetration graph for test -5, type -1 soil for soaked (day-5) condition

MOISTURE VARIATION IN SOIL SAMPLE

Table 4.23 Moisture content for test – 5, type – 1 soil for soaked (day - 1) condition

Vertical Positions	MOISTURE CONTENTS%				
	Horizontal Positions				
	EAST	WEST	NORTH	SOUTH	CENTRE
TOP	23.28	21.85	24.40	23.97	23.42
MIDDLE	22.32	21.58	22.37	21.87	22.45
BOTTOM	21.04	20.96	21.67	21.56	20.97

Table 4.24 Moisture content for test – 5, type – 1 soil for soaked (day - 2) condition

Vertical Positions	MOISTURE CONTENTS%				
	Horizontal Positions				
	EAST	WEST	NORTH	SOUTH	CENTRE
TOP	24.26	24.98	23.02	23.30	26.50
MIDDLE	23.38	23.88	23.47	22.97	23.77
BOTTOM	22.25	22.83	21.37	22.54	22.31

Table 4.25 Moisture content for test – 5, type – 1 soil for soaked (day - 3) condition

Vertical Positions	MOISTURE CONTENTS%				
	Horizontal Positions				
	EAST	WEST	NORTH	SOUTH	CENTRE
TOP	25.29	26.46	20.83	25.15	27.15
MIDDLE	24.42	24.69	24.15	23.87	25.53
BOTTOM	23.51	24.04	21.29	22.31	22.24

Table 4.26Moisture content for test – 5, type – 1 soil for soaked (day - 4) condition

Vertical Positions	MOISTURE CONTENTS%				
	Horizontal Positions				
	EAST	WEST	NORTH	SOUTH	CENTRE
TOP	27.86	28.51	26.69	27.53	26.72
MIDDLE	26.65	27.46	25.52	24.87	25.69
BOTTOM	23.38	24.54	24.29	25.13	24.62

Table 4.27Moisture content for test – 5, type – 1 soil for soaked (day - 5) condition

Vertical Positions	MOISTURE CONTENTS%				
	Horizontal Positions				
	EAST	WEST	NORTH	SOUTH	CENTRE
TOP	28.96	29.34	28.54	28.71	28.63
MIDDLE	26.67	26.37	25.93	25.63	27.84
BOTTOM	25.27	25.95	25.30	26.08	26.37

4.2 TYPE 2 SOIL

4.2.1 Index properties:

The results of index properties such as Liquid limit, Plastic limit, Plasticity Index value are presented in Table 4.28 as follows:

Table 4.28 Index properties of type – 2 soil

Description of index property	Experimental Value
Liquid Limit	46.36%
Plastic Limit	28.23%
Plasticity Index	18.13%
Specific Gravity	2.66
Differential Swell Index	31.58%

4.2.2 Particle size distribution

The grain size distribution of this soil sample has been shown in Table 4.29

Table 4.29 Grain size distribution of type - 2 soil

I.S Sieve no.	Weight retained in gm	Percentage Weight	Percentage weight
4.75mm	0	0	100
2mm	1.1	0.11	99.89
1mm	3.8	0.38	99.51
0.6mm	5.0	0.5	99.01
0.425mm	3.8	0.38	98.63
0.3mm	5.8	0.58	98.05
.212mm	8.4	0.84	97.21
.105mm	11.1	1.11	96.1
0.075mm	32.0	3.2	92.9

Based on the above properties the IS Soil Classification for the soil sample under test is 'CI'

4.2.3 Modified Proctor Compaction Test

The results of modified proctor compaction test are represented in figure:




Figure 4.33: Modified proctor compaction test for type – 2 soil

4.2.4 California Bearing Ratio Test results:

4.2.4.1 Test-1 (conducted under OMC (14.8%) and MDD (1.85g/cc))




Figure 4.34 Load vs penetration graph for test -1, type - 2 soil for unsoaked condition




Figure 4.35 Load vs penetration graph for test -1, type - 2 soil for soaked (day-1) condition




Figure 4.36 Load vs penetration graph for test -1, type -2 soil for soaked (day-2) condition




Figure 4.37 Load vs penetration graph for test -1, type -2 soil for soaked (day-3) condition




Figure 4.38 Load vs penetration graph for test -1, type -2 soil for soaked (day-4) condition




Figure 4.39 Load vs penetration graph for test -1, type -2 soil for soaked (day-5) condition

MOISTURE VARIATION IN SOIL SAMPLE

Table 4.30 Moisture content for test – 1, type – 2 soil for soaked (day - 1) condition

Vertical Positions	MOISTURE CONTENTS%				
	Horizontal Positions				
	EAST	WEST	NORTH	SOUTH	CENTRE
TOP	17.19	17.52	17.89	17.66	17.57
MIDDLE	16.43	17.02	17.15	16.88	17.02
BOTTOM	16.49	16.94	16.69	16.59	16.82

Table 4.31 Moisture content for test – 1, type – 2 soil for soaked (day - 2) condition

Vertical Positions	MOISTURE CONTENTS%				
	Horizontal Positions				
	EAST	WEST	NORTH	SOUTH	CENTRE
TOP	20.15	21.08	21.35	20.28	21.49
MIDDLE	19.43	20.63	19.38	20.07	18.80
BOTTOM	18.55	20.07	16.39	19.85	18.24

Table 4.32 Moisture content for test – 1, type – 2 soil for soaked (day - 3) condition

Vertical Positions	MOISTURE CONTENTS%				
	Horizontal Positions				
	EAST	WEST	NORTH	SOUTH	CENTRE
TOP	22.04	19.77	21.67	20.76	21.23
MIDDLE	19.70	18.19	20.44	20.88	18.25
BOTTOM	19.25	19.45	17.33	19.14	18.24

Table 4.33Moisture content for test – 1, type – 2 soil for soaked (day - 4) condition

Vertical Positions	MOISTURE CONTENTS%				
	Horizontal Positions				
	EAST	WEST	NORTH	SOUTH	CENTRE
TOP	23.21	22.87	23.28	23.02	22.63
MIDDLE	23.85	20.57	21.88	20.03	21.92
BOTTOM	20.45	20.37	19.66	20.08	19.63

Table 4.34Moisture content for test – 1, type – 2 soil for soaked (day - 5) condition

Vertical Positions	MOISTURE CONTENTS%				
	Horizontal Positions				
	EAST	WEST	NORTH	SOUTH	CENTRE
TOP	25.34	24.65	25.13	24.78	25.54
MIDDLE	23.31	22.57	22.85	21.19	23.64
BOTTOM	21.14	21.57	21.36	20.96	20.87

4.2.4.2 Test 2 (98% dry side) under moisture content (12.46%) and dry density (1.82g/cc)




Figure 4.40 Load vs penetration graph for test -2, type - 2 soil for un soaked condition




Figure 4.41 Load vs penetration graph for test -2, type - 2 soil for soaked (day-1) condition




Figure 4.42 Load vs penetration graph for test -2, type -2 soil for soaked (day-2) condition




Figure 4.43 Load vs penetration graph for test -2, type -2 soil for soaked (day-3) condition




Figure 4.44 Load vs penetration graph for test -2, type -2 soil for soaked (day-4) condition




Figure 4.45 Load vs penetration graph for test -2, type -2 soil for soaked (day-5) condition

MOISTURE VARIATION IN SOIL SAMPLE

Table 4.35 Moisture content for test – 2, type – 2 soil for soaked (day - 1) condition

Vertical Positions	MOISTURE CONTENTS%				
	Horizontal Positions				
	EAST	WEST	NORTH	SOUTH	CENTRE
TOP	16.55	16.22	16.87	17.30	19.88
MIDDLE	14.21	14.29	14.93	15.19	15.04
BOTTOM	14.37	13.94	14.64	13.45	13.35

Table 4.36 Moisture content for test – 2, type – 2 soil for soaked (day - 2) condition

Vertical Positions	MOISTURE CONTENTS%				
	Horizontal Positions				
	EAST	WEST	NORTH	SOUTH	CENTRE
TOP	18.65	18.88	17.96	18.02	18.56
MIDDLE	17.25	16.54	15.47	16.23	16.87
BOTTOM	15.44	15.36	14.98	15.56	15.87

Table 4.37 Moisture content for test – 2, type – 2 soil for soaked (day - 3) condition

Vertical Positions	MOISTURE CONTENTS%				
	Horizontal Positions				
	EAST	WEST	NORTH	SOUTH	CENTRE
TOP	23.83	24.22	24.55	23.76	24.26
MIDDLE	21.68	20.87	20.86	21.74	22.19
BOTTOM	20.72	21.12	20.66	20.78	21.58

Table 4.38 Moisture content for test – 2, type – 2 soil for soaked (day - 4) condition

Vertical Positions	MOISTURE CONTENTS%				
	Horizontal Positions				
	EAST	WEST	NORTH	SOUTH	CENTRE
TOP	21.31	21.97	21.55	21.66	22.55
MIDDLE	20.28	21.21	20.44	20.04	16.53
BOTTOM	19.01	20.66	20.17	19.77	20.39

Table 4.39 Moisture content for test – 2, type – 2 soil for soaked (day - 5) condition

Vertical Positions	MOISTURE CONTENTS%				
	Horizontal Positions				
	EAST	WEST	NORTH	SOUTH	CENTRE
TOP	23.14	23.53	23.80	23.69	23.82
MIDDLE	22.01	22	21.90	22.18	22.23
BOTTOM	21.40	21.64	21.75	22.05	21.40

4.2.4.3 Test 3 (98% wet side) under moisture content (16.25%) and dry density (1.82g/cc)




Figure 4.46 Load vs penetration graph for test -3, type -2 soil for unsoaked condition




Figure 4.47 Load vs penetration graph for test -3, type -2 soil for soaked (day-1) condition




Figure 4.48 Load vs penetration graph for test -3, type - 2 soil for soaked (day-2) condition




Figure 4.49 Load vs penetration graph for test -3, type - 2 soil for soaked (day-3) condition




Figure 4.50 Load vs penetration graph for test -3, type -2 soil for soaked (day-4) condition




Figure 4.51 Load vs penetration graph for test -3, type -2 soil for soaked (day-5) condition

MOISTURE VARIATION IN SOIL SAMPLE

Table 4.40 Moisture content for test – 3, type – 2 soil for soaked (day - 1) condition

Vertical Positions	MOISTURE CONTENTS%				
	Horizontal Positions				
	EAST	WEST	NORTH	SOUTH	CENTRE
TOP	17.36	18.37	17.49	18.22	18.74
MIDDLE	16.37	16.56	17.08	16.33	16.58
BOTTOM	16.03	16.25	16.44	17.02	17.09

Table 4.41 Moisture content for test – 3, type – 2 soil for soaked (day - 2) condition

Vertical Positions	MOISTURE CONTENTS%				
	Horizontal Positions				
	EAST	WEST	NORTH	SOUTH	CENTRE
TOP	18.23	19.37	18.22	18.81	19.06
MIDDLE	17.76	16.99	17.25	18.08	17.33
BOTTOM	16.88	16.82	16.35	17.24	17.49

Table 4.42 Moisture content for test – 3, type – 2 soil for soaked (day - 3) condition

Vertical Positions	MOISTURE CONTENTS%				
	Horizontal Positions				
	EAST	WEST	NORTH	SOUTH	CENTRE
TOP	20.96	21.35	20.44	20.97	21.29
MIDDLE	19.95	19.32	20.03	18.54	19.63
BOTTOM	18.85	17.24	18.36	17.83	17.52

Table 4.43 Moisture content for test – 3, type – 2 soil for soaked (day - 4) condition

Vertical Positions	MOISTURE CONTENTS%				
	Horizontal Positions				
	EAST	WEST	NORTH	SOUTH	CENTRE
TOP	22.25	23.48	22.63	21.68	23.37
MIDDLE	21.58	22.09	21.68	21.77	22.06
BOTTOM	20.65	21.05	20.77	20.63	21.57

Table 4.44 Moisture content for test – 3, type – 2 soil for soaked (day - 5) condition

Vertical Positions	MOISTURE CONTENTS%				
	Horizontal Positions				
	EAST	WEST	NORTH	SOUTH	CENTRE
TOP	24.26	25.33	25.64	24.39	25.09
MIDDLE	22.89	23.45	22.63	22.87	23.08
BOTTOM	21.11	21.35	22.06	21.47	22.87

4.2.4.4 Test 4 (97% dry side) under moisture content (10.7%) and dry density (1.794g/cc)




Figure 4.52 Load vs penetration graph for test -4, type -2 soil for unsoaked condition




Figure 4.53 Load vs penetration graph for test -4, type -2 soil for soaked (day-1) condition




Figure 4.54 Load vs penetration graph for test -4, type -2 soil for soaked (day-2) condition




Figure 4.55 Load vs penetration graph for test -4, type -2 soil for soaked (day-3) condition




Figure 4.56 Load vs penetration graph for test -4, type -2 soil for soaked (day-4) condition




Figure 4.57 Load vs penetration graph for test -4, type -2 soil for soaked (day-5) condition

MOISTURE VARIATION IN SOIL SAMPLE

Table 4.45 Moisture content for test – 4, type – 2 soil for soaked (day - 1) condition

Vertical Positions	MOISTURE CONTENTS%				
	Horizontal Positions				
	EAST	WEST	NORTH	SOUTH	CENTRE
TOP	15.56	17.88	16.32	16.25	17.89
MIDDLE	14.44	13.38	15.22	14.36	14.41
BOTTOM	13.35	14.09	13.25	14.08	13.55

Table 4.46 Moisture content for test – 4, type – 2 soil for soaked (day - 2) condition

Vertical Positions	MOISTURE CONTENTS%				
	Horizontal Positions				
	EAST	WEST	NORTH	SOUTH	CENTRE
TOP	19.39	18.88	19.75	18.26	19.35
MIDDLE	17.77	17.15	16.63	16.58	17.65
BOTTOM	15.52	16.05	15.98	16.66	15.55

Table 4.47 Moisture content for test – 4, type – 2 soil for soaked (day - 3) condition

Vertical Positions	MOISTURE CONTENTS%				
	Horizontal Positions				
	EAST	WEST	NORTH	SOUTH	CENTRE
TOP	20.68	21.55	21.74	20.87	22.09
MIDDLE	18.63	18.85	19.68	19.55	20.02
BOTTOM	16.59	17.49	17.65	16.38	17.55

Table 4.48 Moisture content for test – 4, type – 2 soil for soaked (day - 4) condition

Vertical Positions	MOISTURE CONTENTS%				
	Horizontal Positions				
	EAST	WEST	NORTH	SOUTH	CENTRE
TOP	22.39	23.89	23.34	22.57	23.88
MIDDLE	21.35	21.69	22.38	21.57	20.96
BOTTOM	19.65	19.55	20.38	19.91	19.66

Table 4.49 Moisture content for test – 4, type – 2 soil for soaked (day - 5) condition

Vertical Positions	MOISTURE CONTENTS%				
	Horizontal Positions				
	EAST	WEST	NORTH	SOUTH	CENTRE
TOP	25.31	24.93	24.48	24.66	25.57
MIDDLE	23.59	23.37	22.85	22.69	23.37
BOTTOM	22.55	21.38	21.57	22.68	21.15

4.2.4.5 Test 5 (97% wet side) under moisture content (17.8%) and dry density (1.794g/cc)




Figure 4.58 Load vs penetration graph for test -5, type -2 soil for unsoaked condition




Figure 4.59 Load vs penetration graph for test -5, type -2 soil for soaked (day-1) condition




Figure 4.60 Load vs penetration graph for test -5, type - 2 soil for soaked (day-2) condition




Figure 4.61 Load vs penetration graph for test -5, type - 2 soil for soaked (day-3) condition




Figure 4.62 Load vs penetration graph for test -5, type - 2 soil for soaked (day-4) condition




Figure 4.63 Load vs penetration graph for test -5, type - 2 soil for soaked (day-5) condition

MOISTURE VARIATION IN SOIL SAMPLE

Table 4.50 Moisture content for test – 5, type – 2 soil for soaked (day - 1) condition

Vertical Positions	MOISTURE CONTENTS%				
	Horizontal Positions				
	EAST	WEST	NORTH	SOUTH	CENTRE
TOP	20.34	22.34	21.25	22.24	22.63
MIDDLE	20.05	21.24	20.36	20.57	21.19
BOTTOM	19.66	19.85	18.86	20.06	20.59

Table 4.51 Moisture content for test – 5, type – 2 soil for soaked (day - 2) condition

Vertical Positions	MOISTURE CONTENTS%				
	Horizontal Positions				
	EAST	WEST	NORTH	SOUTH	CENTRE
TOP	22.58	23.69	23.57	22.35	23.96
MIDDLE	21.06	21.55	21.68	21.85	22.58
BOTTOM	20.58	20.97	21.11	22.03	22.54

Table 4.52 Moisture content for test – 5, type – 2 soil for soaked (day - 3) condition

Vertical Positions	MOISTURE CONTENTS%				
	Horizontal Positions				
	EAST	WEST	NORTH	SOUTH	CENTRE
TOP	24.55	23.38	24.96	24.22	23.57
MIDDLE	22.89	23.35	24.45	23.30	23.67
BOTTOM	20.86	21.84	22.05	22.68	21.15

Table 4.53 Moisture content for test – 5, type – 2 soil for soaked (day - 4) condition

Vertical Positions	MOISTURE CONTENTS%				
	Horizontal Positions				
	EAST	WEST	NORTH	SOUTH	CENTRE
TOP	25.53	26.23	25.63	26.35	24.49
MIDDLE	24.42	23.55	23.14	24.08	24.39
BOTTOM	22.57	22.58	21.98	21.54	20.69

Table 4.54 Moisture content for test – 5, type – 2 soil for soaked (day - 5) condition

Vertical Positions	MOISTURE CONTENTS%				
	Horizontal Positions				
	EAST	WEST	NORTH	SOUTH	CENTRE
TOP	26.35	26.32	25.58	25.21	24.88
MIDDLE	25.03	24.36	25.88	23.69	24.44
BOTTOM	23.35	22.87	22.57	24.06	23.35

TYPE 3 SOIL

4.3 Index properties:

The results of index properties such as Liquid limit, Plastic limit, Plasticity Index value are presented in Table4.55 as follows:

Table4. 55 Index properties of type- 3 soil

Description of index property	Experimental Value
Liquid Limit	28.18%
Plastic Limit	18.18%
Plasticity Index	10%
Specific Gravity	2.73
Differential Swell Index	10%

4.3.1 Particle size distribution

The grain size distribution of this soil sample has been shown in Table4.56

Table4. 56 Grain size distribution of type - 3soil

I.S Sieve no.	Weight retained in gm	Percentage Weight	Percentage weight
4.75mm	169	16.9	83.1
2mm	208.6	20.86	62.24
1mm	151.7	15.17	47.07
0.6mm	47.3	4.73	42.34
0.425mm	23.6	2.36	39.98
0.3mm	15.9	1.59	38.39
.212mm	26.6	2.66	35.73
.015mm	10.8	1.08	34.65
0.075mm	30.9	3.09	31.56

Based on the above properties the IS Soil Classification for the soil sample under test is 'GM'

4.3.2 Modified Proctor Compaction Test

The results of modified proctor compaction test are represented in figure:




Figure 4.64 Modified proctor compaction test for type – 3 soil

4.3.3 California Bearing Ratio Test results:

4.3.3.1 Test-1 (conducted under OMC (10.83%) and MDD (2.15g/cc))




Figure 4.65 Load vs penetration graph for test -1, type -3 soil for unsoaked condition




Figure 4.66 Load vs penetration graph for test -1, type -3 soil for soaked (day-1) condition




Figure 4.67 Load vs penetration graph for test -1, type - 3 soil for soaked (day-2) condition




Figure 4.68 Load vs penetration graph for test -1, type - 3 soil for soaked (day-3) condition




Figure 4.69 Load vs penetration graph for test -1, type - 3 soil for soaked (day - 4) condition




Figure 4.70 Load vs penetration graph for test -1, type - 3 soil for soaked (day-5) condition

MOISTURE VARIATION IN SOIL SAMPLE

Table 4.57 Moisture content for test – 1, type – 3 soil for soaked (day - 1) condition

Vertical Positions	MOISTURE CONTENTS%				
	Horizontal Positions				
	EAST	WEST	NORTH	SOUTH	CENTRE
TOP	11.50	12.13	11.48	11.49	11.90
MIDDLE	11.08	11.36	11.57	10.77	10.87
BOTTOM	10.58	11.23	10.58	10.83	11.25

Table 4.58 Moisture content for test – 1, type – 3 soil for soaked (day - 2) condition

Vertical Positions	MOISTURE CONTENTS%				
	Horizontal Positions				
	EAST	WEST	NORTH	SOUTH	CENTRE
TOP	13.47	12.40	12.69	12.20	12.37
MIDDLE	11.95	11.47	11.82	12.61	11.49
BOTTOM	11.24	11.94	10.84	9.68	11.25

Table 4.59 Moisture content for test – 1, type – 3 soil for soaked (day - 3) condition

Vertical Positions	MOISTURE CONTENTS%				
	Horizontal Positions				
	EAST	WEST	NORTH	SOUTH	CENTRE
TOP	13.16	13.68	1.347	13.82	14.11
MIDDLE	12.23	12.96	12.62	12.28	12.22
BOTTOM	11.12	10.69	11.58	11.47	10.39

Table 4.60 Moisture content for test – 1, type – 3 soil for soaked (day - 4) condition

Vertical Positions	MOISTURE CONTENTS%				
	Horizontal Positions				
	EAST	WEST	NORTH	SOUTH	CENTRE
TOP	13.59	14.25	13.79	14.84	14.09
MIDDLE	13.18	12.94	12.54	13.39	13.03
BOTTOM	12.69	12.5	12.58	13.04	12.64

Table 4.61 Moisture content for test – 1, type – 3 soil for soaked (day - 5) condition

Vertical Positions	MOISTURE CONTENTS%				
	Horizontal Positions				
	EAST	WEST	NORTH	SOUTH	CENTRE
TOP	14.04	13.13	14.67	14.03	13.92
MIDDLE	13.39	12.91	12.33	13.25	13.7
BOTTOM	12.09	12.82	11.85	12.70	11.12

4.3.3.2 Test 2 (98% dry side) under moisture content (12.%) and dry density (2.107g/cc)




Figure 4.71 Load vs penetration graph for test -1, type -3 soil for unsoaked condition




Figure 4.72 Load vs penetration graph for test -1, type -3 soil for soaked (day-1) condition




Figure 4.73 Load vs penetration graph for test -1, type - 3 soil for soaked (day-2) condition




Figure 4.74 Load vs penetration graph for test -1, type - 3 soil for soaked (day-3) condition




Figure 4.75 Load vs penetration graph for test -1, type - 3 soil for soaked (day-4) condition




Figure 4.76 Load vs penetration graph for test -1, type - 3 soil for soaked (day-5) condition

MOISTURE VARIATION IN SOIL SAMPLE

Table 4.62 Moisture content for test – 2, type – 3 soil for soaked (day - 1) condition

Vertical Positions	MOISTURE CONTENTS%				
	Horizontal Positions				
	EAST	WEST	NORTH	SOUTH	CENTRE
TOP	11.11	11.24	12.60	12.84	12.65
MIDDLE	11.82	11.51	11.12	10.03	10.56
BOTTOM	11.62	11.78	11.17	12.15	11.60

Table 4.63 Moisture content for test – 2, type – 3 soil for soaked (day - 2) condition

Vertical Positions	MOISTURE CONTENTS%				
	Horizontal Positions				
	EAST	WEST	NORTH	SOUTH	CENTRE
TOP	13.34	13.02	12.91	13.79	13.69
MIDDLE	13.11	13.87	13.34	13.20	13.55
BOTTOM	12.45	12.70	12.58	12.69	12.58

Table 4.64 Moisture content for test – 2, type – 3 soil for soaked (day - 3) condition

Vertical Positions	MOISTURE CONTENTS%				
	Horizontal Positions				
	EAST	WEST	NORTH	SOUTH	CENTRE
TOP	13.84	14.16	13.26	13.68	13.54
MIDDLE	13.91	13.24	13.33	13.17	12.85
BOTTOM	12.05	12.58	11.83	13.88	12.22

Table 4.65 Moisture content for test – 2, type – 3 soil for soaked (day - 4) condition

Vertical Positions	MOISTURE CONTENTS%				
	Horizontal Positions				
	EAST	WEST	NORTH	SOUTH	CENTRE
TOP	14.07	13.31	13.26	13.60	13.90
MIDDLE	13.85	12.88	13.46	13.93	13.45
BOTTOM	13.06	12.28	11.33	12.63	12.70

Table 4.66 Moisture content for test – 2, type – 3 soil for soaked (day - 5) condition

Vertical Positions	MOISTURE CONTENTS%				
	Horizontal Positions				
	EAST	WEST	NORTH	SOUTH	CENTRE
TOP	15.03	14.61	14.58	14.35	13.18
MIDDLE	14.93	13.09	13.18	13.71	13.05
BOTTOM	12.53	12.87	12.75	13.36	12.77

4.3.3.3Test 3 (98% wet side) under moisture content (16.25%) and dry density (1.82g/cc)




Figure 4.77 Load vs penetration graph for test -3, type - 3 soil for unsoaked condition




Figure 4.78 Load vs penetration graph for test -3, type - 3 soil for soaked (day - 1) condition




Figure 4.79 Load vs penetration graph for test -3, type - 3 soil for soaked (day - 2) condition




Figure 4.80 Load vs penetration graph for test -3, type - 3 soil for soaked (day - 3) condition




Figure 4.81 Load vs penetration graph for test -3, type - 3 soil for soaked (day - 4) condition




Figure 4.82 Load vs penetration graph for test -3, type - 3 soil for soaked (day - 5) condition

MOISTURE VARIATION IN SOIL SAMPLE

Table 4.67 Moisture content for test – 3, type – 3 soil for soaked (day - 1) condition

Vertical Positions	MOISTURE CONTENTS%				
	Horizontal Positions				
	EAST	WEST	NORTH	SOUTH	CENTRE
TOP	14.63	14.64	13.53	15.26	14.63
MIDDLE	13.24	12.77	12.48	14.66	12.61
BOTTOM	12.91	13.42	13.73	11.42	12.60

Table 4.68 Moisture content for test – 3, type – 3 soil for soaked (day - 2) condition

Vertical Positions	MOISTURE CONTENTS%				
	Horizontal Positions				
	EAST	WEST	NORTH	SOUTH	CENTRE
TOP	13.55	14.57	13.66	13.86	13.03
MIDDLE	13.29	12.78	13.69	12.87	13.00
BOTTOM	12.55	13.31	13.50	13.14	13.73

Table 4.69 Moisture content for test – 3, type – 3 soil for soaked (day - 3) condition

Vertical Positions	MOISTURE CONTENTS%				
	Horizontal Positions				
	EAST	WEST	NORTH	SOUTH	CENTRE
TOP	14.53	14.10	13.64	13.52	13.04
MIDDLE	12.98	12.17	12.45	12.48	13.57
BOTTOM	12.87	12.15	12.42	12.62	12.60

Table 4.70 Moisture content for test – 3, type – 3 soil for soaked (day - 4) condition

Vertical Positions	MOISTURE CONTENTS%				
	Horizontal Positions				
	EAST	WEST	NORTH	SOUTH	CENTRE
TOP	14.03	14.13	13.16	12.63	13.30
MIDDLE	13.89	12.55	12.72	12.69	13.25
BOTTOM	12.13	12.36	12.46	12.44	12.89

Table 4.71 Moisture content for test – 3, type – 3 soil for soaked (day - 5) condition

Vertical Positions	MOISTURE CONTENTS%				
	Horizontal Positions				
	EAST	WEST	NORTH	SOUTH	CENTRE
TOP	14.45	14.67	14.27	14.07	14.28
MIDDLE	13.74	12.77	13.34	13.60	13.08
BOTTOM	13.54	13.77	13.25	13.85	13.91

4.3.3.4 Test 4 (97% dry side) under moisture content (7.5%) and dry density (2.08g/cc)




Figure 4.83 Load vs penetration graph for test -4, type -3 soil for unsoaked condition




Figure 4.84 Load vs penetration graph for test -4, type -3 soil for soaked (day -1) condition




Figure 4.85 Load vs penetration graph for test -4, type - 3 soil for soaked (day-2) condition




Figure 4.86 Load vs penetration graph for test -4, type - 3 soil for soaked (day-3) condition




Figure 4.87 Load vs penetration graph for test -4, type - 3 soil for soaked (day-5) condition




Figure 4.88 Load vs penetration graph for test -4, type - 3 soil for soaked (day-5) condition

MOISTURE VARIATION IN SOIL SAMPLE

Table 4.72 Moisture content for test – 4, type – 3 soil for soaked (day - 1) condition

Vertical Positions	MOISTURE CONTENTS%				
	Horizontal Positions				
	EAST	WEST	NORTH	SOUTH	CENTRE
TOP	12.25	12.01	12.14	12.81	12.63
MIDDLE	11.56	11.23	11.89	11.14	10.36
BOTTOM	10.99	11.34	10.69	9.86	10.89

Table 4.73 Moisture content for test – 4, type – 3 soil for soaked (day - 2) condition

Vertical Positions	MOISTURE CONTENTS%				
	Horizontal Positions				
	EAST	WEST	NORTH	SOUTH	CENTRE
TOP	13.23	13.69	12.87	13.21	13.25
MIDDLE	11.86	12.36	10.87	11.52	11.69
BOTTOM	10.58	11.58	11.69	10.87	10.56

Table 4.74 Moisture content for test – 4, type – 3 soil for soaked (day - 3) condition

Vertical Positions	MOISTURE CONTENTS%				
	Horizontal Positions				
	EAST	WEST	NORTH	SOUTH	CENTRE
TOP	13.69	13.45	14.87	14.02	14.36
MIDDLE	12.85	12.98	13.47	13.58	14.05
BOTTOM	11.25	11.87	11.58	11.24	12.36

Table 4.75 Moisture content for test – 4, type – 3 soil for soaked (day - 4) condition

Vertical Positions	MOISTURE CONTENTS%				
	Horizontal Positions				
	EAST	WEST	NORTH	SOUTH	CENTRE
TOP	14.83	14.31	14.00	14.96	14.34
MIDDLE	13.69	13.88	13.49	13.36	13.87
BOTTOM	12.70	12.54	11.98	12.54	12.65

Table 4.76 Moisture content for test – 4, type – 3 soil for soaked (day - 5) condition

Vertical Positions	MOISTURE CONTENTS%				
	Horizontal Positions				
	EAST	WEST	NORTH	SOUTH	CENTRE
TOP	14.13	14.70	14.02	14.67	13.86
MIDDLE	13.54	13.66	12.35	13.01	13.24
BOTTOM	12.48	13.86	12.76	13.14	13.93

4.3.3.5 Test 5 (97% wet side) under moisture content (12.5%) and dry density (2.08g/cc)




Figure 4.89 Load vs penetration graph for test -5, type -3 soil for unsoaked condition




Figure 4.90 Load vs penetration graph for test -5, type -3 soil for soaked (day-1) condition




Figure 4.91 Load vs penetration graph for test -5, type -3 soil for soaked (day-2) condition




Figure 4.92 Load vs penetration graph for test -5, type -3 soil for soaked (day-3) condition




Figure 4.93 Load vs penetration graph for test -5, type -3 soil for soaked (day-4) condition




Figure 4.94 Load vs penetration graph for test -5, type -3 soil for soaked (day-5) condition

MOISTURE VARIATION IN SOIL SAMPLE

Table 4.77 Moisture content for test – 5, type – 3 soil for soaked (day - 1) condition

Vertical Positions	MOISTURE CONTENTS, %				
	Horizontal Positions				
	EAST	WEST	NORTH	SOUTH	CENTRE
TOP	13.23	14.25	14.63	14.12	15.02
MIDDLE	13.25	13.29	13.64	13.87	13.78
BOTTOM	12.05	12.04	12.97	13.02	12.54

Table 4.78 Moisture content for test – 5, type – 3 soil for soaked (day - 2) condition

Vertical Positions	MOISTURE CONTENTS, %				
	Horizontal Positions				
	EAST	WEST	NORTH	SOUTH	CENTRE
TOP	14.36	14.52	14.21	14.32	13.65
MIDDLE	13.58	14.25	14.02	13.85	13.47
BOTTOM	12.87	12.57	12.47	12.96	12.36

Table 4.79 Moisture content for test – 5, type – 3 soil for soaked (day - 3) condition

Vertical Positions	MOISTURE CONTENTS%				
	Horizontal Positions				
	EAST	WEST	NORTH	SOUTH	CENTRE
TOP	14.85	14.69	14.27	14.65	14.21
MIDDLE	13.96	13.65	13.45	13.28	13.54
BOTTOM	13.02	13.24	13.77	12.54	12.41

Table 4.80 Moisture content for test – 5, type – 3 soil for soaked (day - 4) condition

Vertical Positions	MOISTURE CONTENTS%				
	Horizontal Positions				
	EAST	WEST	NORTH	SOUTH	CENTRE
TOP	14.16	15.88	15.73	14.44	14.46
MIDDLE	14.01	13.87	13.44	13.47	13.86
BOTTOM	13.56	13.68	13.81	13.82	12.70

Table 4.81 Moisture content for test – 5, type – 3 soil for soaked (day - 5) condition

Vertical Positions	MOISTURE CONTENTS%				
	Horizontal Positions				
	EAST	WEST	NORTH	SOUTH	CENTRE
TOP	15.23	15.55	15.32	15.21	14.88
MIDDLE	14.89	14.36	14.57	14.26	14.22
BOTTOM	14.02	14.36	14.52	14.87	13.58

4.1.5 DIRECT SHEAR TEST RESULTS

Direct shear test was carried out at different dry densities and moisture contents.

Type 1 soil

Results of direct shear test are:




Figure 4.95 Shear stress vs normal stress for test -1, type- 1 soil





Figure 4.96 Shear stress vs normal stress for test -2, type- 1 soil



il

Figure 4.97 Shear stress vs normal stress for test -3, type- 1 soil




Figure 4.98 Shear stress vs normal stress for test -4, type- 1 soil




Figure 4.99 Shear stress vs normal stress for test -5, type- 1 soil

CBR VALUES OF SOIL

Table 4.82 CBR values of first type of soil

Compaction Conditions(M.C&D.D)	CBR(%)					
	DAYS OF SOAKING					
	0	1	2	3	4	5
OMC &MDD (16.4,1.85)	48	2.9	2.2	1.9	1.6	1.5
98% Density(wet side) (17.8,1.8)	37.47	2.22	1.97	1.82	1.59	1.26
98% Density(dry side) (12.89,1.8)	35.03	1.98	1.87	1.82	1.77	1.54
97% Density(wet side) (19,1.78)	34.62	2.88	1.6	1.5	1.11	0.97
97% Density(dry side) (12.2,1.78)	30.46	3.90	2.31	2.10	2.00	1.92

Table4. 83 CBR values of second type of soil

Compaction Conditions(M.C&D.D)	CBR(%)					
	DAYS OF SOAKING					
	0	1	2	3	4	5
OMC &MDD (14.8,1.85)	35.39	3.57	2.9	2.67	2.5	1.13
98% Density(dry side) (12.46,1.82)	31.77	2.6	1.96	1.87	1.56	0.9
98% Density(wet side) (16.25,1.82)	33.05	2.12	2.08	1.95	1.78	1.12
97% Density(dry side) (10.7,1.794)	32.45	2.02	1.83	1.74	1.67	0.7
97% Density(wet side) (17.8,1.794)	34.33	2.07	1.93	1.88	1.76	0.6

Table4. 84 CBR values of third type of soil

Compaction Conditions (O.M.C & D.D)	CBR (%)					
	DAYS OF SOAKING					
	0	1	2	3	4	5
OMC & MDD (10.83%,2.15gm/cc)	72.64	44.27	29.68	21.35	20.31	19.55
98% Density (wet side)(12%,2.107gm/cc)	44.58	30.96	23.43	20.73	15.08	14.04
98% Density (dry side) (8%,2.107gm/cc)	49.43	38.93	28.23	19.28	14.65	13.31
97% Density (Wet side) (12.5%,2.08gm/cc)	38.65	26.54	22.77	18.47	12.49	10.08
97% Density (dry side) (7.5%,2.08gm/cc)	34.23	20.33	15.98	13.72	8.85	8.28

From the above tests and results for the three type of soils , it has been found that for the first and second type of soil the decrease in strength (CBR Value) is quite similar. There is a sudden decrease in CBR from unsoaked condition to that with one day soaking. But there is no significant variation of CBR from third to fourth day of soaking. It has been observed that higher moisture contents result at top layers than compared to that in lower layers. Rate of decrease in CBR value for third type of soil is less. Effect of varying days of soaking does not affect much to third type of soil.

CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSIONS

6.1 CONCLUSIONS

An attempt has been made in this project work to explore the effect of saturation, i.e., soaking on the strength properties of subgrade soil, namely CBR which is widely used as a measure of design of all types of pavements. For this three types of soils have been considered. The effect of soaking on degree of saturation on different parts of the soil sample have also been considered in this study. From the results and discussions presented earlier, following conclusions are drawn :

1. It is observed that the CBR value of the given clayey soil sample with BIS classification “OH” prepared at a particular density decreases rapidly with time of soaking up to 1 day after which the rate of decrease is small. While the CBR value reduces by about 20 times compared to the unsoaked conditions, the loss of CBR value in 4 days is about half compared to that after 1 day. It is also observed that there are not much significant variations in CBR values from 3rd day to 4th day of soaking. When soil samples are taken from different points of the CBR sample and tested for its moisture content, it is also observed that there variations in moisture content in a given layer are not significant in unsoaked conditions and 1 day of soaking. However, it is observed that for a longer soaking time, higher moisture contents result at top layer compared to that in the lower layers.

2. For the 2nd type of soil considered and found to be of “CI” classification, the trend is almost similar to the first type of soil used.
3. For the 3rd type of soil classified as ‘GM’, the rate of decrease of strength is very less. Although there is decrease in CBR value with increase in number of days of soaking but the rate of decrease is not as much as in 1st type and 2nd type of soil considered.
4. For 1st type and 2nd type of soil wet side of Optimum Moisture Content (CBR values) gives better results than that dry side. However this trend was not observed 3rd type soil.
5. It has been observed that as usual with decrease in degree of compaction (either on wet or dry side) cohesion and angle of friction decreases.

6.2 Future Scope of Work

1. Other engineering properties such as direct shear, unconfined compression and triaxial test should also be considered for different levels of saturation.
2. Effect of stabilization with weak (clayey) soil on engineering properties at different levels of saturation needs to be explored.
3. The considerations on engineering properties as stated above may be applied to a variety of soils, so that a database may be prepared to justify the period of soaking of a soil for deciding the CBR value or any such engineering property that may be used for pavement design.

References

1. Alayaki, F. M., Bajomo, O. S. (2011), Effect of Moisture Variation on the Strength Characteristics of Laterite soil. Proceedings of the *Environmental Management Conference*, Federal University of Agriculture, Abeokuta, Nigeria.
2. Ampadu,S,I.K. (2006) , “Laboratory Investigation into the Effect of Water Content on the CBR of a Subgrade soil”.
3. Blazejczak,D.,Horn.R.,Pytko.J.(1995), “Soil tensile strength as affected by time, water content and bulk density”.*Int.Agrophysics*,pp179-188.
4. Cokca,E.,Erol,O., Armangil. (2004), “Effects of compaction moisture content on the shear strength of an unsaturated clay”, *Geotechnical and Geological Engineering* 22,pp285-297.
5. Chauhan.(2010),” a laboratory study on effect of test conditions on subgrade strength”. Unpublished B.Tech Thesis,N.I.T Rourkela.
6. ERES Division (2001), “Correlation of CBR values with soil index properties”, Illinois.
7. Hussain,N.A.B.(2008), “Correlation between CBR value and undrained shear strength from vane shear test”,Malaysia.
8. Jaleel,Z.T.(2011), Effect of Soaking on the CBR-Value of Subbase Soil. *Eng. and Tech. journal*, vol.29.
9. Kim,Y.T., Shin.H.,Park.D.K .(2011), “Variation of shear strength of weathered granite soil with water content”.pp253-258.

10. Nugroho,S.A., Hendri,A., Ningsih,S.R.(2012), Correlation between index properties and california bearing ratio test of pekanbaru soils with and without soaked.*Canadian Journal on Environmental, Construction and Civil Engineering Vol. 3*,Indonesia
11. Rahman,Q.B.A.(2010), “Correlation between CBR results and physical properties of soils”,Malaysia.
12. Razouki,S.S., Al-Azawi,M.S.(2003),”long – term soaking effect on strength and deformation characteristics of a gypsiferous subgrade soil”.*Engineering Journal of the University of Qatar*, Vol. 16,Iraq, pp49-60.
13. Singh,D., Reddy.,K.S, Yadu.L.(2011) , Moisture and Compaction Based Statistical Model for Estimating CBR of Fine Grained Subgrade Soils.*International Journal of Earth Sciences and Engineering*,pp 100-103.
14. Tomar and Mallick.(2011) , “a study on variation of test conditions on CBR determination” Unpublished B.Tech Thesis, N.I.T Rourkela.
15. Venkatramaiah C.(2009).,”Geotechnical Engineering”,*New Age International Publishers*,pp60-61.
16. Yasin,S.J.Md.,HossainAli,Md.,Al-Hussaini,T.M.,Hoque,E and Ahmed,S.,”Effect of Submergence on Subgrade Strength”,pp77-89.

