

Adverse Effects of Expansive Soils on Road Infrastructure and Evaluation of Chemical Remediation Techniques

by Hayder Abbas Hasan

Thesis submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for
the degree of **Doctor of Philosophy**

under the supervision of A. Prof. Hadi Khabbaz and
A. Prof. Behzad Fatahi

University of Technology Sydney
Faculty of Engineering and Information Technology
January 2019

CERTIFICATE OF ORIGINAL AUTHORSHIP

I, Hayder Abbas Hasan declare that this thesis is submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the award of Doctor of Philosophy, in the school of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Faculty of Engineering and Information Technology at the University of Technology Sydney.

This thesis is wholly my own work unless otherwise reference or acknowledged. In addition, I certify that all information sources and literature used are indicated in the thesis. This document has not been submitted for qualifications at any other academic institution. This research is supported by the Australian Government Research Training Program.

Signature:	Production Note: Signature removed prior to publication.
Date:	20/11/2019

Abstract

Using waste materials and creating novel methods to minimise the adverse effects of expansive soils reduces the cost of building foundations and also reduces their impact on the environment and landfill. Continuous swelling and shrinking cause cracks to form in structures built on expansive soils such as road pavements and embankments. This study describes how a combination of lime and sugarcane bagasse ash, a waste product of the sugar industry, is used to stabilise expansive soils. Since the amount of research addressing the effect of bagasse ash on soil stabilisation was limited, a comprehensive attempt has been made on expansive soils using bagasse ash to improve their engineering properties and reduce the need for traditional additives such as lime. There are large gaps with regards to the optimum amount of bagasse ash that can be used for lime treated soil, the most effective ratio between bagasse and the amount of lime, and the properties of soil treated with bagasse ash, and with or without lime. An array of tests to quantify the shear strength of treated soils, the durability of treated soils using different drying and wetting cycles, and the soil water characteristic curves of treated soils were carried out.

Two types of expansive soils were used in this experimental program; this first type came from a road construction site in Queensland (Soil Q) and is classified as a high plasticity clay; the second type was created in the laboratory by mixing 80% kaolin and 20% bentonite (Soil C). It was also defined as high plasticity clay. These samples were prepared by integrating soil with a mixture of hydrated lime (L) from 0 to 6.25% and up to 25% of bagasse ash. These combinations of lime to bagasse ash were prepared with different ratios (e.g. 1:1, 1:2, 1:3 and 1:4). A combination of lime and bagasse ash was added to the soil samples as a stabiliser at ratios of 6%, 10% 18% and 25%, based on the dry weight of soil. To determine how hydrated lime and bagasse ash affects the engineering properties of treated soils, tests such as particle size distribution, specific gravity, Atterberg limits, compaction, linear shrinkage, the free swell ratio, unconfined compressive strength (UCS), durability, the California bearing ratio

(CBR), free swell, swell pressure, consolidation, and direct shear and suction tests were carried out.

The results indicate that the dry density of natural and artificial soils decreases as the amount of additives increase, and the linear shrinkage, free swell ratio, free swelling and swell pressure of soils treated with a combination of lime and bagasse ash decreased more than soils treated only with lime or bagasse ash. The UCS and CBR of soil increased as the amount of additives and curing time increased, and when bagasse ash was added to soil treated with lime under various cycles of wetting-drying, it became more durable than soil treated just with lime. Moreover, the addition of bagasse ash to soil treated with lime reduced the gap between soaked and unsoaked CBR. The pre-consolidation pressure (σ'_c), the coefficient of consolidation (C_v), the compression index (C_c), the swell index (C_s), and the cohesion and friction angle of soils improved as the amount of additives (bagasse ash and/or lime) increased. The matric suction was determined based on the gravimetric water content and degree of saturation, using the filter paper technique. The air entry value parameter (a) of soils increased after adding 6.25% lime, but the highest a value was for soil samples treated with 6.25% L and 18.75% BA.

PLAXIS software was used to calculate the deformation and to evaluate the slope stability of a proposed embankment placed on top of the target expansive soil (Soil Q) under a fill embankment. Five models were developed to estimate the settlement of soil and assess the slope stability of a fill embankment under traffic loads. The Mohr-Coulomb model was used to simulate a fill embankment as well as treated soil and dense sand, while a soft soil model was applied to untreated soil with an over consolidation ratio of 1.2. These numerical models indicated that treating soil reduced its vertical displacement (settlement) due to an increase in its strength parameters, whereas the reduction in time is associated with an increase in its permeability. The slope stability of the fill embankment decreased slightly as the layer of treated soil was made thicker.

This study offers a promising way of using bagasse ash as an eco-friendly stabiliser for treating expansive soils, particularly in conjunction with lime for treatment of weak subgrade of roads.

Acknowledgements

This PhD project could not have been possible without the support provided by numerous people. In particular, I would like to express my deepest appreciation and gratitude to my supervisor, Associate Professor Hadi Khabbaz, for his excellent guidance and enthusiastic encouragement throughout this research study. His dedication and immeasurable efforts towards the field of Geotechnical Engineering always inspire me. In addition, his support, patience and most of all his friendship throughout this research are truly cherished. I would also like to thank my co-supervisor Associate Professor Behzad Fatahi, for his unfailing assistance, guidance and support over the past few years.

I wish to thank the technical, the administrative and the support staff at school of civil and environmental engineering at the University of Technology Sydney, for providing technical guidance, laboratory supports and research facilities.

I would also like to express my gratitude to my friends and colleagues, who supported me with their valuable advice and assistance. I am grateful to my father, mother and brothers for instilling patience and wisdom needed to complete this PhD project. Finally, I would like to express my deepest love to my wife, Taqwa Al-Khafaji, for her unconditional support in good and bad times.

Dedication

I would like to dedicate this Doctoral dissertation to my family, particularly my son, Ali, and my daughter, Huda. They have made me stronger, better and more fulfilled than I could have ever imagined. I love them to the moon and back. I equally dedicate this thesis to my wife Taqwa Al-Khafaji for her love, support and understanding.

List of Publications

- Hasan, H., Khabbaz, H., & Fatahi, B. (2016). Impact of quicklime and fly ash on the geotechnical properties of expansive clay. *4th Geo-China International Conference 2016*, pp. 93-100.
- Hasan, H., Dang, L., Khabbaz, H., Fatahi, B., & Terzaghi, S. (2016). Remediation of Expansive Soils Using Agricultural Waste Bagasse Ash. *Procedia Engineering, 143*, pp.1368-1375.
- Hasan, H., Khabbaz, H., & Fatahi, B. (2016). Expansive Soil Stabilization Using Lime-Bagasse Ash. *69th Canadian Geotechnical Conference - GeoVancouver 2016*.
- Hasan, H., Khabbaz, H., & Fatahi, B. (2017). Strength Property of Expansive Soils Treated with Bagasse Ash and Lime. *Springer International Publishing, Sustainable Civil Infrastructures*, pp. 22-35: Innovative Infrastructure Geo-technology.
- Hasan, H., Dang, L., Khabbaz, H., & Fatahi, B. (2017). Swelling pressure and consolidation of soft clay stabilized with bagasse ash and lime. *Proceedings of the 10th International Conference on the Bearing Capacity of Roads, Railways and Airfields (BCRRA 2017)*, June 28-30, 2017, Athens, Greece: CRC Press.
- Dang, L.C., Hasan, H., Fatahi, H., Jones, R. & Khabbaz, H. (2016). Enhancing the Engineering Properties of Expansive Soil Using Bagasse Ash and Hydrated Lime. *International journal of GEOMATE*, vol. 11, no. 25, pp. 2447-2454.
- Dang, L., Hasan, H., Fatahi, B. & Khabbaz, H. 2015, 'Influence of Bagasse Ash and Hydrated Lime on Strength and Mechanical Behaviour of Stabilised Expansive Soil', *GEOQuébec 2015*, Québec City, Canada.
- Dang, L., Hasan, H., Fatahi, B., Jones, R. & Khabbaz, H. 2015. Effects of Bagasse Ash and Hydrated Lime Addition on Engineering Properties of Expansive Soil. *GEOMATE 2015*, The GEOMATE International Society, Osaka, Japan.

Table of Contents

Abstract	ii
Acknowledgements	iv
List of Publications	vi
List of Figures	xii
List of Tables.....	xxii
Chapter 1. Introduction.....	1
1.1 Background	1
1.2 Research Scope and Objectives.....	4
1.3 Significance of this Research	4
1.4 Outline of the Thesis	5
Chapter 2. Literature Review.....	7
2.1 Introduction	7
2.2 Factors Affecting the Behaviour of Expansive Soil.....	8
2.2.1 Change in Water Content.....	8
2.2.2 Mineralogical Feature of Clay	9
2.2.3 Change of the Effective Stress and Suction	9
2.2.4 Density and Water Content.....	11
2.3 Movement in Expansive Soil and Magnitude of Heave.....	13
2.3.1 The Cyclic of Heave and Shrinkage	13
2.3.2 Progressive Swelling beneath Centre of Foundation	13
2.4 Identification of Expansive Soil Based on Physical Properties.....	18
2.4.1 Soil Index Properties Methods.....	18
2.4.2 Free Swell Test.....	21

2.4.3	Standard Absorption Moisture Content (SAMC)	21
2.4.4	Coefficient of Linear Extensibility (COLE)	23
2.5	Soil Stabilisation.....	23
2.5.1	Lime Stabilisation	29
2.5.2	Fly Ash Stabilisation.....	35
2.5.3	Bagasse Ash Stabilisation	42
2.6	Summary	54
Chapter 3.	Materials and Methods.....	56
3.1	Introduction	56
3.2	Materials.....	56
3.2.1	Queensland soil (Soil Q).....	57
3.2.2	Combination of kaolin - bentonite soil (Soil C).....	57
3.2.3	Hydrated lime (L).....	58
3.2.4	Bagasse ash (BA).....	58
3.3	Soil Preparation and Mixing with Additives.....	59
3.3.1	Queensland soil (Soil Q).....	59
3.3.2	Kaolin - bentonite soil (Soil C).....	59
3.4	Experimental Program.....	60
3.4.1	Particle size distribution.....	61
3.4.2	Specific gravity	61
3.4.3	Atterberg limits	61
3.4.4	Standard compaction.....	63
3.4.5	Linear shrinkage (LS)	69
3.4.6	Free swell ratio (FSR).....	69
3.4.7	Unconfined compressive strength (UCS).....	70

3.4.8	Durability	72
3.4.9	California bearing ratio (CBR).....	74
3.4.10	Free swelling.....	75
3.4.11	Swell pressure and Consolidation	77
3.5	Summary	80
Chapter 4.	Results and Discussion of General Tests	82
4.1	Introduction	82
4.2	Linear Shrinkage Tests (LS).....	83
4.2.1	Effect of the admixtures on Queensland soil (Soil Q)	83
4.2.2	Effect of the admixtures on Soil C.....	83
4.3	Free Swell Ratio Tests (FSR).....	85
4.3.1	Effect of the admixtures on FSR of Soil Q	85
4.3.2	Effect of the admixtures on FSR of Soil C	86
4.4	Unconfined Compressive Strength Tests (UCS).....	87
4.4.1	Effect of the admixtures on UCS of Soil Q.....	88
4.4.2	Effect of the admixtures on UCS of Soil C.....	92
4.5	Durability Tests (Drying – Wetting Cycles)	95
4.5.1	Effect of the admixtures on durability of Soil Q.....	95
4.5.2	Effect of the admixtures on durability of Soil C.....	102
4.6	California Bearing Ratio (CBR) Tests	106
4.6.1	Effect of the admixtures on CBR of Soil Q	106
4.6.2	Effect of the admixtures on CBR of Soil C.....	113
4.7	Free Swelling Tests (FS)	119
4.7.1	Effect of the admixtures on free swelling of Soil Q.....	119
4.7.2	Effect of the admixtures on free swelling of Soil C.....	123

4.8	Swell pressure and Consolidation Tests.....	124
4.8.1	Effect of admixture content on swell pressure and consolidation of Soil Q	124
4.8.2	Effect of admixture content on swell pressure and consolidation of Soil C	138
4.9	Summary	146
Chapter 5.	Shear Strength of Expansive Soils before and after Stabilisation.....	149
5.1	Introduction	149
5.2	The Principal Mechanism of Shearing Using Direct Shear Apparatus	150
5.3	Review of Chemical Treatment Using Direct Shear Test with Clayey Soils.....	151
5.4	Sample Preparation and Test Procedure.....	158
5.5	Results and Discussion.....	159
5.5.1	Queensland expansive soil (Soil Q).....	160
5.5.2	Created soil a mixture of 80% kaolin and 20% bentonite (Soil C).....	168
5.6	Summary	175
Chapter 6.	Soil Water Characteristic Curves	177
6.1	Introduction	177
6.2	Definition of Unsaturated Soil	177
6.3	Fundamentals of Soil Water Characteristic Curve	178
6.4	Filter Paper Method to Determine SWCC.....	179
6.5	Mathematical Equation of SWCC	181
6.5.1	Brooks and Corey (1964) model.....	182
6.5.2	van Genuchten (1980) model.....	182
6.5.3	Fredlund and Xing (1994) model.....	183
6.5.4	Pasha et al. (2015) model.....	183
6.6	Studies Referring to the Effect of Additives on SWCC Properties.....	184
6.7	Sample Preparation and Test Procedure.....	186

6.8	Results and Discussion.....	188
6.8.1	SWCC of treated and untreated Queensland soil (Soil Q).....	188
6.8.2	SWCC of Soil C without treatment or with treatment	193
6.9	Summary	197
Chapter 7. Numerical Investigations on Performance of Road Embankments Overlying Stabilised Expansive Soil.....		
7.1	Introduction	199
7.2	Numerical Modelling of Embankments Overlying Expansive Soils	199
7.2.1	Model 1: Analysing the embankment behaviour without considering the effect of uplift pressure	201
7.2.2	Model 2: Analysing the embankment behaviour including the effect of uplift pressure	213
7.2.3	Model 3: Comparing the embankment performance while the subgrade soil treated with lime or combined lime and bagasse ash.....	216
7.2.4	Model 4: Evaluating the effect of increasing the side slope angle of the embankment overlying untreated and treated soil using combined lime and bagasse ash.....	218
7.2.5	Model 5: Investigating the effect of geogrid inclusion at different location of lime-bagasse ash treated soil on performance of the embankment.....	218
7.3	Summery	221
Chapter 8. Conclusions and Recommendations		
8.1	Summary	223
8.2	Concluding Remarks	225
8.3	Recommendation for Further Study	236
References.....		237

List of Figures

<i>Figure 1.1 Disposal landfill of bagasse ash Montakarntiwong et al. (2013).</i>	3
<i>Figure 2.1 Variation of water content in the active zone (Nelson and Miller, 1992).</i>	9
<i>Figure 2.2 Using liquidity index to determine the active zone in Houston soil (O'Neill and Poormoayed, 1980).</i>	10
<i>Figure 2.3 Relationship of water content and swelling (Lyu et al. 2015).</i>	12
<i>Figure 2.4 Swelling pressure versus dry density reported by different investigators (Kaufhold et al. 2015).</i>	12
<i>Figure 2.5 Damage progression under expansive soil. (1) New foundation construction above expansive soil, which often has relatively uniform soil moisture. (2) Water from irrigation and rainfall moves under the perimeter of the foundation, resulting in edge lift. (3) Many years after construction, the water will eventually transfer under the centre of the foundation, resulting in centre lift (Day 2010).</i>	15
<i>Figure 2.6 Determination of zero swell pressure (σ_{sw}') from conventional consolidation test (Das, 2016).</i>	17
<i>Figure 2.7 Steps to determine the swell percentage from the constant pressure test (Das,2016).</i>	17
<i>Figure 2.8 Classification chart for swelling potential: (a) activity versus percent clay size of soil specimens compacted and tested with a normal stress of 6.9 kPa (Seed et al. 962), and (b) plasticity index against percent of clay size depending on activity (Van Der Merwe 1964).</i>	20
<i>Figure 2.9 Expansion potential as a function of clay content and COLE (Nelson and Miller, 1992).</i>	24
<i>Figure 2.10 Swelling path of untreated and treated soil with different percentage of lime at 1,7 and 28 days of curing (Al-Taie et al. 2016).</i>	31
<i>Figure 2.11 Effect of swell-shrink cycles on the vertical strain of untreated and treated soil with 2 and 3% lime at 7 days of curing (Al-Taie et al. 2016).</i>	31
<i>Figure 2.12 a) swell percentage of bentonite - sand mixtures with different lime contents and (b) Swelling pressure of bentonite–sand mixtures with different lime contents (Schanz and Elsayy, 2017).</i>	32

<i>Figure 2.13 (a) CBR values of various bentonite–lime mixtures with various sand contents (b) UCS of bentonite - lime mixtures with various sand contents and curing time (Schanz and Elsawy, 2017).</i>	34
<i>Figure 2.14 Effect of different lime (L) and fly ash (FA) contents (e.g. one L to three FA ratio) on consistency of various expansive soils (Hasan et al.2016).</i>	38
<i>Figure 2.15 Effect of different lime (L) and fly ash (FA) contents (e.g. one L to three FA ratio) on linear shrinkage of (40% B -60% K) soil after 3, 7 and 28 days of curing (Hasan et al.2016).</i>	38
<i>Figure 2.16 Effect of different lime (L) and fly ash (FA) contents (e.g. one L to three FA ratio) on: (a) Optimum moisture content (OMC), (b) maximum dry density (MDD) of two expansive soils (Hasan et al.2016).</i>	39
<i>Figure 2.17 Effect of different lime (L) and fly ash (FA) contents (e.g. one L to three FA ratio) on unconfined compressive strength (UCS) of (40% B -60% K) soil at various curing days (Hasan et al.2016).</i>	40
<i>Figure 2.18 Effect of 3% lime – 9% fly ash on UCS of different soils at 3, 7 and 28 curing days (Hasan et al.2016).</i>	40
<i>Figure 2.19 Effect of 5% lime – 15% fly ash on UCS of different soils at 3, 7 and 28 curing days (Hasan et al.2016).</i>	41
<i>Figure 2.20 Swelling (%) versus time (min) of (40% B -60% K) soil (Hasan et al.2016)...</i>	41
<i>Figure 2.21 Swelling (%) versus time (min) of (40% B -60% K) soil treated different lime (L) and fly ash (FA) contents (e.g. one L to three FA ratio) at 7 days of curing (Hasan et al., 2016).</i>	42
<i>Figure 2.22 Bagasse ash landfill (Singh et al. 2018).</i>	43
<i>Figure 2.23 X-ray diffraction patterns of virgin bagasse ash: (a) after Julphunthong (2016), and (b) after Madurwar et al. (2016).</i>	45
<i>Figure 2.24 SEM photographs of BA; (a) original magnification ×1,000, and (b) original magnification ×3,000 after Julphunthong (2016), while (c) original magnification ×1,000 after Jamsawang et al. (2017).</i>	46
<i>Figure 2.25 Effect of increasing bagasse ash content (%) on (a) soaked CBR, and (b) UCS with different curing time (Anupam et al., 2017).</i>	50

<i>Figure 2.26 Effect of increasing bagasse ash content (%) on (a) Cohesion stress, and (b) internal friction angle with different curing time (Anupam et al., 2017).</i>	51
<i>Figure 2.27 SEM of using 25% bagasse ash with soil (Anupam et al., 2017).</i>	52
<i>Figure 2.28 Relationship between strength loss and curing time with different replacement of cement by bagasse ash (Jamsawang et al., 2017).</i>	53
<i>Figure 2.29 Relationship between the modulus of elasticity (E_{50}) and the unconfined compressive (q_u) (Jamsawang et al., 2017).</i>	53
<i>Figure 3.1 Bagasse ash after sieving on sieve 425 μm.</i>	59
<i>Figure 3.2 Queensland soil (a) before air drying and (b) after sieving on 2.36 mm.</i>	60
<i>Figure 3.3 Flowchart of testing program.</i>	64
<i>Figure 3.4 Particle size distribution curve of Queensland soil (Soil Q).</i>	65
<i>Figure 3.5 Particle size distribution curve bagasse ash (BA).</i>	65
<i>Figure 3.6 Casagrande's device to determine the liquid limit of Soil Q before the test (soil paste with a groove), and (b) after the test (groove closure) over 12 mm length.</i>	66
<i>Figure 3.7 Standard compaction test results for Queensland soil (Soil Q).</i>	67
<i>Figure 3.8 Standard compaction test results for Soil C.</i>	68
<i>Figure 3.9 Linear shrinkage moulds of Queensland soil after drying in the oven.</i>	69
<i>Figure 3.10 Free swell ratio of Soil C treated with different additive contents.</i>	70
<i>Figure 3.11 (a) Specimens of Soil C during the curing period, and (b) a specimen of Soil C during UCS testing.</i>	72
<i>Figure 3.12 Specimens of Queensland soil treated with 6.25% (a) air dry cycle No. 3 and (b) wet cycle No. 6.</i>	74
<i>Figure 3.13 CBR specimens of Soil C before putting in plastic bags to be cured.</i>	75
<i>Figure 3.14 Free swelling test of Soil Q treated with different additives under 1 kPa surcharge.</i>	77
<i>Figure 3.15 A specimen of Soil C treated with 6.25% L-18.75% BA after 7 days of curing for swell pressure and consolidation tests.</i>	79
<i>Figure 4.1 Effect of additives on liner shrinkage of Soil Q with different curing time.</i>	84
<i>Figure 4.2 Influence of admixture content on free swell ratio (FSR) of control and treated Soil C.</i>	87
<i>Figure 4.3 Effect of variation of bagasse ash on UCS of Soil Q at 3, 7 and 28 curing days.</i>	88

<i>Figure 4.4 Effect of added lime on UCS of Soil Q at 3,7 and 28 curing days.</i>	89
<i>Figure 4.5 Effect of added lime-bagasse ash on UCS of Soil Q at 3, 7 and 28 days of curing.</i>	90
<i>Figure 4.6 Comparison between UCS of Soil Q treated with L and soil treated with L-BA at 3 days of curing.</i>	90
<i>Figure 4.7 Comparison between UCS of Soil Q treated with L and soil treated with L-BA at 7 days of curing.</i>	91
<i>Figure 4.8 Comparison between UCS of Soil Q treated with L and soil treated with L-BA at 28 days of curing.</i>	91
<i>Figure 4.9 Effect of BA on Soil C-2.5% L with different curing times.</i>	93
<i>Figure 4.10 Effect of BA on Soil C-4.5% L with different curing times.</i>	94
<i>Figure 4.11 Effect of BA on Soil C-6.25% L with different curing times.</i>	94
<i>Figure 4.12 UCS verse lime (L) to bagasse ash (BA) ratio of Soil C treated with 6.25% L and different BA contents ranging from 6.25% until to 31.25%.....</i>	95
<i>Figure 4.13 Stress-strain relationship of Soil Q treated with 6.25% L-18.75% BA after 2 drying-wetting cycles.</i>	96
<i>Figure 4.14 Stress-strain relationship of Soil Q treated with 6.25% L after 2 drying-wetting cycles</i>	97
<i>Figure 4.15 Stress-strain relationship of Soil Q treated with 6.25%L-18.75% BA after 3 drying-wetting cycles.</i>	97
<i>Figure 4.16 Stress-strain relationship of Soil Q treated with 6.25% L after 3 drying-wetting cycles.</i>	98
<i>Figure 4.17 Stress-strain relationship of Soil Q treated with 6.25% L-18.75% BA after 7 drying-wetting cycles.</i>	98
<i>Figure 4.18 Stress-strain relationship of Soil Q treated with 6.25% L after 7 drying-wetting cycles.</i>	99
<i>Figure 4.19 Stress-strain relationship of Soil Q treated with 6.25%L-18.75% BA after 9 drying-wetting cycles.</i>	99
<i>Figure 4.20 Stress-strain relationship of Soil Q treated with 6.25% L after 9 drying-wetting cycles.</i>	100

<i>Figure 4.21 Stress-strain relationship of Soil Q treated with 6.25% L-18.75% BA after 12 drying-wetting cycles.</i>	100
<i>Figure 4.22 Stress-strain relationship of Soil Q treated with 6.25% L after 12 drying-wetting cycles.</i>	101
<i>Figure 4.23 Effect of drying-wetting cycles on residual strength index (R) of Soil Q treated with different admixture contents.</i>	102
<i>Figure 4.24 Soil C samples start collapsing when submerged in water.</i>	104
<i>Figure 4.25 Effect of wetting-drying cycles on residual strength index (R) of Soil C treated with different admixture contents.</i>	105
<i>Figure 4.26 Effect of BA on the relationship between penetration and load of Soil Q at 7 days of curing.</i>	107
<i>Figure 4.27 Effect of BA on the relationship between penetration and load of Soil Q at 28 days of curing.</i>	108
<i>Figure 4.28 Effect of BA on the relationship between penetration and load of Soil Q at 7 days soaked in water after 28 days of curing.</i>	108
<i>Figure 4.29 Effect of lime on the relationship between penetration and load of Soil Q at 7 days of curing.</i>	109
<i>Figure 4.30 Effect of lime on the relationship between penetration and load of Soil Q at 28 days of curing.</i>	110
<i>Figure 4.31 Effect of lime on the relationship between penetration and load of Soil Q at 7 days soaked in water after 28 days of curing.</i>	110
<i>Figure 4.32 Effect of L-BA on the load and penetration relationship for soil Q at 7 days of curing.</i>	111
<i>Figure 4.33 Effect of L- BA on the load and penetration relationship for Soil Q at 28 days of curing.</i>	112
<i>Figure 4.34 Effect of L- BA on the relationship of penetration and load for Soil Q at 7 days soaked in water after 28 days of curing.</i>	112
<i>Figure 4.35 CBR values of Soil Q treated with L- BA and L only at different conditions.</i>	113
<i>Figure 4.36 Load-penetration curves corresponding to control Soil C.</i>	115
<i>Figure 4.37 Load-penetration curves corresponding to different conditions of Soil C- 4.5% L.</i>	116

<i>Figure 4.38 Load-penetration curves corresponding to unsoaked and soaked conditions of Soil C-4.5% L treated with 9% and 13.5% BA at 28 days of curing.</i>	116
<i>Figure 4.39 Load-penetration curves corresponding to different conditions of Soil C-6.25% L.</i>	117
<i>Figure 4.40 Load-penetration curves corresponding to unsoaked and soaked condition of Soil C-6.25% L treated with 12.5% BA at 7 and 28 days of curing.</i>	117
<i>Figure 4.41 Load-penetration curves corresponding to unsoaked and soaked conditions of Soil C-6.25% L treated with 18.75% BA at 7 and 28 days curing.</i>	118
<i>Figure 4.42 Time versus free swelling of Soil Q with different percentages of BA at 3 days curing.</i>	120
<i>Figure 4.43 Time versus free swelling of Soil Q with different percentages of BA at 7 days of curing.</i>	120
<i>Figure 4.44 Effect of curing time on swelling of Soil Q treated with BA at 3 and 7 days of curing.</i>	121
<i>Figure 4.45 Time versus free swelling of Soil Q treated with different percentages of lime at 7 days of curing.</i>	121
<i>Figure 4.46 Time versus free swelling of Soil Q treated with different percentages of L-BA at 7 days of curing.</i>	122
<i>Figure 4.47 Free swelling value of Soil Q treated with different L-BA and L contents at 7 days of curing.</i>	122
<i>Figure 4.48 Time versus free swelling of control Soil C.</i>	123
<i>Figure 4.49 Time versus free swelling of Soil C treated with different percentages of L-BA at 7 days of curing.</i>	124
<i>Figure 4.50 Effect of different contents of bagasse ash, lime and combination of lime and bagasse ash on swell pressure of Soil Q.</i>	126
<i>Figure 4.51 Void ratio versus stress of control Soil Q.</i>	126
<i>Figure 4.52 Displacement versus log time of control Soil Q with stress ranging from 240 to 480 kPa.</i>	127
<i>Figure 4.53 Displacement versus log time of control Soil Q with stress ranging from 640 to 800 kPa.</i>	127
<i>Figure 4.54 Void ratio versus stress of Soil Q treated with 6% BA.</i>	129

<i>Figure 4.55 Void ratio versus stress of Soil Q treated with 10% BA.....</i>	<i>130</i>
<i>Figure 4.56 Void ratio versus stress of Soil Q treated with 18% BA.....</i>	<i>130</i>
<i>Figure 4.57 Void ratio versus stress of Soil Q treated with 25% BA.....</i>	<i>131</i>
<i>Figure 4.58 Void ratio versus stress of Soil Q treated with different BA content.....</i>	<i>131</i>
<i>Figure 4.59 Void ratio versus stress of Soil Q treated with 1.5% L.....</i>	<i>132</i>
<i>Figure 4.60 Void ratio versus stress of Soil Q treated with 2.5% L.....</i>	<i>132</i>
<i>Figure 4.61 Void ratio versus stress of Soil Q treated with 4.5% L.....</i>	<i>133</i>
<i>Figure 4.62 Void ratio versus stress of Soil Q treated with 6.25% L.....</i>	<i>133</i>
<i>Figure 4.63 Void ratio versus stress of Soil Q treated with different L content.....</i>	<i>134</i>
<i>Figure 4.64 Void ratio versus stress of Soil Q treated with 2.5% L-7.5% BA.....</i>	<i>134</i>
<i>Figure 4.65 Void ratio versus stress of Soil Q treated with 4.5% L-13.5% BA.....</i>	<i>135</i>
<i>Figure 4.66 Void ratio versus stress of Soil Q treated with 6.25% L-18.75% BA.....</i>	<i>135</i>
<i>Figure 4.67 Void ratio versus stress of Soil Q treated with different L-BA content.....</i>	<i>136</i>
<i>Figure 4.68 Pre-consolidation pressure versus lime content of Soil Q treated with 6.25% L-18.75% BA and 6.25% L.....</i>	<i>136</i>
<i>Figure 4.69 Coefficient of consolidation of control and treated Soil Q with 6.25% L and 6.25% L-18.75% BA.....</i>	<i>137</i>
<i>Figure 4.70 Void ratio versus stress of control Soil C.....</i>	<i>138</i>
<i>Figure 4.71 Calculation of C_v of the control Soil C at different stresses changing from 225 to 450 kPa, using (a) log of time and (b) square root of time.....</i>	<i>139</i>
<i>Figure 4.72 Calculation of C_v of the control Soil C at different stresses changing from 450 to 900 kPa, using (a) log of time and (b) square root of time.....</i>	<i>140</i>
<i>Figure 4.73 Calculation of C_v of control Soil C at stress change from 900 to 1810 kPa using (a) log of time and (b) square root of time.....</i>	<i>141</i>
<i>Figure 4.74 Void ratio versus stress of Soil C treated with 4.5% L.....</i>	<i>143</i>
<i>Figure 4.75 Void ratio versus stress of Soil C treated with 6.25% L.....</i>	<i>143</i>
<i>Figure 4.76 Void ratio versus stress of Soil C, treated with 6.25% L-12.5% BA.....</i>	<i>144</i>
<i>Figure 4.77 Void ratio versus stress of Soil C treated with 6.25% L-18.75% BA.....</i>	<i>144</i>
<i>Figure 4.78 Void ratio versus stress of Soil C treated with different L and L-BA contents.....</i>	<i>145</i>
<i>Figure 5.1 Schematic of direct shear cell sample (Knappetta and Craig 2012).....</i>	<i>150</i>

<i>Figure 5.2 Simple shear deformation of Type I and Type II soils (Budhu 2009).</i>	151
<i>Figure 5.3 The effect of different additive contents and curing times on a) cohesion,</i>	153
<i>Figure 5.4 The effect of fly ash (FA) contents and curing times on a) cohesive strength,</i>	154
<i>Figure 5.5 Influence of different additive contents at 28 days curing on the peak of a) internal friction angle, and b) cohesion (Gay and Schad 2000).</i>	156
<i>Figure 5.6 Variation of internal friction angle with a) gray soil, and b) red soil (Harichane et al. 2011).</i>	157
<i>Figure 5.7 Variation of cohesion with a) gray soil, and b) red soil (Harichane et al. 2011).</i>	157
<i>Figure 5.8 A specially designed mould to prepare the soil specimens in this study.</i>	159
<i>Figure 5.9 Shear stress versus horizontal displacement of Soil Q: (a) untreated soil, (b) treated with 6.25% L, and (c) treated with 25% L-BA at different vertical stress.</i>	162
<i>Figure 5.10 Peak shear strength versus normal stress of untreated.</i>	163
<i>Figure 5.11 The shape of Soil Q treated with 6.25% L after completion of the test.</i>	164
<i>Figure 5.12 Variation of brittleness index of untreated and treated Soil Q.</i>	165
<i>Figure 5.13 Variations of shear stresses and volumetric strains of untreated and treated Soil Q with shear strain under effective normal stress (a) 25 kPa, (b) 50 kPa, and (c) 100 kPa.</i>	166
<i>Figure 5.14 Effect of additives on secant modulus at 50% shear strength (E₅₀) of Soil Q.</i>	167
<i>Figure 5.15 Shear stress versus horizontal displacement of Soil C: (a) untreated soil, (b) treated with 6.25% L, and (c) treated with 25% L-BA at different vertical stresses.</i>	170
<i>Figure 5.16 Peak and residual shear strength versus normal stress for (a) untreated soil, (b) treated with 6.25% L and (c) treated with 25% L-BA.</i>	171
<i>Figure 5.17 Failure patterns of untreated and treated specimens made of Soil C.</i>	172
<i>Figure 5.18 Variations of shear stresses and volumetric strains of Soil C versus shear strain for (a) untreated, (b) treated with 6.25% L, and (c) treated with 25% L-BA.</i>	174
<i>Figure 5.19 Effect of additives on secant modulus at 50% shear strength (E₅₀) of Soil C.</i>	175
<i>Figure 6.1 Illustration of zoning on soil water characteristic curve (Fredlund, 2006).</i>	180
<i>Figure 6.2 Calibration suction-water content curves for wetting of filter paper (ASTM D- 5298).</i>	180

Figure 6.3 Soil-water characteristic curves of studied colluvium soils (Feuerharmel et al., 2006).	181
Figure 6.4 SWCC-w of over consolidated soils with $P_c' < s_{ae}$, for the case of $p_{net} = 0$ and $S_{res} = 0$, with possible miscalculated AEVs: (a) λp different from G_{swae} ; (b) $\lambda p \cong G_{swae}$ (Pasha et al, 2015).	185
Figure 6.5 The procedure to measure soil matric suction using filter paper technique.	188
Figure 6.6 Similarity and differences among SWCC models of untreated Soil Q.	189
Figure 6.7 Soil water characteristic curve of untreated Soil Q.	190
Figure 6.8: Soil water characteristic curve of treated Soil Q with 6.25% L.	191
Figure 6.9 Soil water characteristic curve of treated Soil Q with 6.25% L-18.78% BA.	191
Figure 6.10 Fitting soil water characteristic curves of untreated and treated Soil Q.	192
Figure 6.11 The degree of saturation versus soil suction of untreated and treated Soil Q.	193
Figure 6.12 Soil water characteristic curves of untreated Soil C.	194
Figure 6.13 Soil water characteristic curves of Soil C treated with 6.25% L.	195
Figure 6.14 Soil water characteristic curves of Soil C treated with 6.25% L-18.75% BA.	195
Figure 6.15 Fitting soil water characteristic curves of untreated and treated Soil C.	196
Figure 6.16 The degree of saturation versus soil suction of untreated and treated Soil C.	197
Figure 7.1 Typical geometry of road embankment with Soil Q treated with L or L-BA (The treated thickness of Soil Q layer thickness is ranging from 0.5 m to 2 m).	201
Figure 7.2 Geometry model of a 1m thickness layer of treated Soil Q treated with lime.	204
Figure 7.3 Finite element mesh with nodes of a 1m thickness layer of Soil Q treated with lime.	205
Figure 7.4 Calculation steps using PLAXIS program.	206
Figure 7.5 Finite element mesh with stress points for the geometry model of a typical 1m thickness layer of Soil Q treated with lime (a) after traffic load step, and (b) after pore water pressure (PWP) =1 kPa.	207
Figure 7.6 Deformation mesh of 1m thickness layer of Soil Q treated with lime.	208
Figure 7.7 Vertical settlement of 1m thickness layer of Soil Q treated with lime.	208

<i>Figure 7.8 Vertical displacements of untreated and lime-treated soil Q with different thicknesses.....</i>	<i>209</i>
<i>Figure 7.9 Total incremental displacements model illustrating the critical failure surface, shown by the red area.</i>	<i>210</i>
<i>Figure 7.10 Slope stability of fill embankment under untreated and treated Soil Q with different thickness layer of lime.</i>	<i>211</i>
<i>Figure 7.11 Slope stability of fill embankment under untreated and treated Soil Q with different thickness layer of lime, the date from SLOPE/W software.....</i>	<i>212</i>
<i>Figure 7.12 Apply volume strain with untreated Soil Q above water table.....</i>	<i>213</i>
<i>Figure 7.13 Effect of volumetric strain of untreated Soil Q (while only a layer with a thickness of 1m of Soil Q treated with lime).</i>	<i>214</i>
<i>Figure 7.14 Vertical incremental displacement after volumetric strain applied.....</i>	<i>214</i>
<i>Figure 7.15 Vertical displacement of untreated and treated Soil Q with different thickness layer of lime treatment after adding the volumetric strain parameter.</i>	<i>215</i>
<i>Figure 7.16 Slope stability of fill embankment under untreated and treated Soil Q with different thickness layer of lime after adding the volumetric strain parameter.....</i>	<i>216</i>
<i>Figure 7.17 Comparison between the Soil Q treated with 6.25% L and Soil Q treated with 6.25% L-18.75% BA a) with 0.5 and 1 m thickness layer b) with 1.5 and 2 m thickness layer.</i>	<i>217</i>
<i>Figure 7.18 Vertical displacement results of 4 m height fill embankment with different thicknesses of soil treatment with lime and bagasse ash.</i>	<i>219</i>
<i>Figure 7.19 Slope stability results for 4 m height fill embankment with a slope of 1: 2 for different thicknesses of Soil Q treated with L-BA.</i>	<i>219</i>
<i>Figure 7.20 Vertical displacement of Soil Q treated with 1-m thickness layer using lime – bagasse ash with and without inclusion of geogrid reinforcement.....</i>	<i>220</i>
<i>Figure 7.21 Slope stability results of 1 thickness layer of Soil Q treated with lime – bagasse ash with and without adding geogrid reinforcement.</i>	<i>221</i>

List of Tables

<i>Table 2.1 Typical soil properties versus expansion potential (Day 2010).</i>	11
<i>Table 2.2 Clay activity based on clay minerals (Skempton, 1953).</i>	19
<i>Table 2.3 Shrinkage potential of soils based on plasticity index (PI) and clay fraction (BRE, 1993).</i>	19
<i>Table 2.4 Classification of expansion potential using free swell ratio (FSR) (Prakash and Sridharan, 2004).</i>	22
<i>Table 2.5 Classification of expansive soils based on the standard absorption moisture content (SAMC), plasticity index (PI) and free swell values (CMC, 2004).</i>	22
<i>Table 2.6 Ranges of COLE to govern soil expansion potential (USDA-NRCR, 2005).</i>	23
<i>Table 2.7 Expansive soil treatment alternatives (Nelson and Miller, 1992).</i>	25
<i>Table 2.8 Chemical composition of bagasse ash determined from different studies.</i>	44
<i>Table 2.9 Studies utilized bagasse ash (BA) to improve geotechnical properties of different soils.</i>	48
<i>Table 3.1 Notation of materials used in the experimental program.</i>	57
<i>Table 3.2 Chemical component of hydrated lime (Adelaide Brighton Cement Ltd).</i>	58
<i>Table 3.3 Summary of mixed soils, lime (L) and bagasse ash (BA).</i>	60
<i>Table 3.4 Specific Gravity of materials.</i>	62
<i>Table 3.5 Effect of lime (L) and bagasse ash (BA) on Soil C after 1 day of curing.</i>	62
<i>Table 3.6 Effect of bagasse ash (BA) and lime (L) on the dry density of Queensland soil at 36.5% water content.</i>	67
<i>Table 3.7 Effect of bagasse ash (BA) and lime (L) on the dry density of Soil C at 30% water content.</i>	68
<i>Table 3.8 Summary of unconfined compressive of mixing soil with various admixture contents at different curing time.</i>	71
<i>Table 3.9 Summary of durability test for soils treated with different admixture content.</i>	73
<i>Table 3.10 CBR test outline of soils at unsoaked and soaked condition after 7 and 28 days of curing with different lime and bagasse ash contents.</i>	76
<i>Table 3.11 Free swelling test of soils treated with various additive content.</i>	77
<i>Table 3.12 Summary of swell pressure and consolidation tests.</i>	79

<i>Table 3.13 Properties of expansive soils.</i>	81
<i>Table 4.1 Linear shrinkage of Soil Q mixed with various additives at 7 and 28 days of curing.</i>	84
<i>Table 4.2 Summary of linear shrinkage results of Soil C treated with special admixture contents at different curing days.</i>	85
<i>Table 4.3 Free swell ratio (FSR) and expansivity of control and treated Soil Q with different contents of lime-bagasse ash.</i>	86
<i>Table 4.4 UCS data of Soil Q treated with different admixture contents after several drying-wetting cycles.</i>	101
<i>Table 4.5 Data of average UCS and residual strength index (R) of Soil C treated with different admixture contents after several wetting-drying cycles.</i>	105
<i>Table 4.6 CBR values of the control soil and Soil Q treated with different percentages of bagasse ash.</i>	109
<i>Table 4.7 CBR values of Soil Q treated with different percentages of lime.</i>	111
<i>Table 4.8 CBR values of Soil Q treated with different percentages of L-BA.</i>	113
<i>Table 4.9 Summary of CBR results of control and treated Soil C at different conditions.</i>	118
<i>Table 4.10 Summary of compression and swell indices of Soil Q treated with BA and L-BA.</i>	137
<i>Table 4.11 Summary of compression and swell indices of Soil Q treated with L and L-BA.</i>	137
<i>Table 4.12 Summary of swell pressure (Ps), compression index (Cc), swell index (Cs), pre-consolidation pressure (σ_c') and coefficient of consolidation (Cv) of Soil C treated with different admixture content.</i>	146
<i>Table 5.1 Shear strength parameters of soft clay with different cement contents and</i>	152
<i>Table 5.2 Direct shear tests for Halawa soil (Ding 2000).</i>	155
<i>Table 5.3 Comparison between peak and residual shear strength parameters of Soil.</i>	164
<i>Table 5.4 Comparison between peak and residual shear strength parameters of Soil C.</i>	172
<i>Table 6.1 Fredlund and Xing's model parameters of untreated and treated Soil Q taken from the SWCC (the gravimetric water content versus soil suction in logarithmic scale).</i>	190
<i>Table 6.2 Fredlund and Xing's model parameters of untreated and treated Soil Q taken from SWCC (the degree of saturation versus soil suction in logarithmic scale).</i>	192

<i>Table 6.3 Fredlund and Xing’s model parameters of untreated and treated Soil C taken from SWCC based on the gravimetric water content versus soil suction.....</i>	<i>196</i>
<i>Table 6.4 Fredlund and Xing’s model parameters of untreated and treated Soil C taken from SWCC based on the degree of saturation versus soil suction.....</i>	<i>196</i>
<i>Table 7.1 Summary of pavement material properties (Khan and Abbas, 2014).....</i>	<i>202</i>
<i>Table 7.2 Summary of finite element model parameters for materials used.....</i>	<i>203</i>
<i>Table 7.3 Safety factor of embankment with different thickness layer of Soil Q treated with lime.....</i>	<i>211</i>