

Characterisation of Expansive Soils Treated with Hydrated Lime, Bottom Ash and Bagasse Ash

By Minh Thang Le

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

June 2021

CERTIFICATE OF ORIGINAL AUTHORSHIP

I, Minh Thang Le 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 at the University of Technology Sydney. This thesis is wholly my own work unless otherwise referenced or acknowledge. 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.

Production Note:
Signature: Signature removed prior to publication.

Date: 30/06/2021

DEDICATION

I would like to dedicate this Doctoral dissertation:

To my respective mother, Nguyen Thi Ha Mat and my passed-away father, Le Mau Thao

For their endless love, supports, inspiration and sacrifices.

To my supportive wife, Le Diem Thu

For her patient love, sacrifices, supports and understanding

To my lovely sister, Le Thi Nhu Quynh

For her encouragement and supports

ABSTRACT

Expansive soil is regarded as a kind of problematic soil that has a low bearing capacity and excessive volume change (shrinkage or swelling) under climate change or changes of ambient moisture. These characteristics are seen as pivotal factors that pose a threat to the foundations of civil structures, such as pavements, highways, light buildings, and canal linings and beds. Hence, it has a necessity of reducing the shrinkage-swelling potential of expansive soil and enhancing its strength so that the improvement can minimise adverse impacts of soil. To stabilise expansive soil, lime treatment is a common technique to limit its shrinkage-swelling potentials because the treatment significantly alters the hydromechanical and physical features of the soil. When the treatment includes ash materials, the modification from both lime and the silicate materials in soil properties becomes stronger than each binder does.

In this study, readily available waste by-products rich in silica, including bottom ash and bagasse ash collected in Australia, were utilised to mix with hydrated lime for stabilising expansive soils. The study includes extensive programs of experiments in electrical, physical, mechanical and micro-structural properties of stabilised soils, followed by a numerical analysis on an embankment on soft soils in Australia. Particularly, electrical conductivity methods were carried out to determine the optimum ratio of ash to lime in their treatments, based on pozzolanic reactivity of ash mixtures. The methods are novel because there is a lack of studies on predicting behaviours of two-ash-lime treated soils by using electrical conductivity tests. For this purpose, modified electrical conductivity (EC) methods were proposed to estimate the changes in loss of conductivity when bottom ash and bagasse ash were added to lime-soil suspensions. Due to the testing credibility, a homogeneous expansive soil was artificially constituted from kaolinite (65%), bentonite (30%) and sand (5%). When mixing ash with soil and lime, three EC tests were suggested, namely Tests A, B and C. While Test A was used for bagasse ash in various maximum particle sizes (i.e., 75, 150 and 425 μm), Test B was designed for bottom ash excluded from the gravel size particles. When it comes to combining bottom ash and bagasse ash for soil stabilisation, Test C was employed, in which the optimal ratio of bottom ash to bagasse ash was determined in their aqueous solutions. As testing results, the findings showed that with 5% hydrated lime, the optimal content for each ash was 25% for bottom ash and 15% for bagasse ash. However, when two ashes were combined, the ratio was 17.5% for bottom ash and 7.5% for bagasse ash. The combination ratios are based on the total dry mass of dry soil and ash, resulting in 75% for soil content.

As for the characterisation of soils treated with lime, bottom ash, and bagasse ash, soil samples with 5% lime and 25% bottom ash were superior to other treated soils in most mechanical results. Bottom-ash-lime-treated soil had the lowest swelling ratio of 2.6%, the highest pre-consolidation pressure of 463 kPa, unconfined compressive strength (*UCS*) of 2.1 MPa, unsoaked California bearing ratio (*CBR*) of 84%, soaked *CBR* of 128% after 62 days of saturation, and the stable and largest small-strain shear modulus (G_{\max}) of 653 MPa after one year curing for saturated samples. Meanwhile, the soil specimens with 5% lime, 17.5% bottom ash and 7.5% bagasse ash had the lowest linear shrinkage of 12.2 %, the highest 90-day matric suction of 298 kPa, and the largest G_{\max} of 675 MPa in saturated specimens after 28 days of curing. These improvements have been explained via scanning electron microscope (SEM) analysis. The analysis indicated a formation of reticular networks, where calcium silicate hydrate (CSH), ettringite and lime coexist in the interfacial transition zone between bagasse ash and bottom ash. Meanwhile, the soils stabilised with 5% lime and 15% bagasse ash still have their advantages in triaxial properties with high values of friction angle and cohesion. As a result, these beneficial properties assisted in reducing the lateral movement of a working platform on the topsoil layer under a modelled embankment in Ballina, NSW, Australia. The numerical outcomes from the PLAXIS program suggested that using both bagasse ash for lime treatment on the soil surface and bottom ash for lime-treated soil columns is the optimal solution to effectively decrease the settlement and horizontal deformation of the ground under the embankment. This study also provides a detailed discussion on the relationships of electrical conductivity results with swell-shrinkage and strength behaviours of ash-lime-treated soils and the evolution of G_{\max} . In summary, this investigation can facilitate comprehending the complex behaviour of expansive soils treated with hydrated lime, bottom ash and bagasse ash, incorporating the electrical conductivity measurements and predicting their behaviour in the field through modelling analysis.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Foremost, I would like to express my profound gratitude to my principal supervisor, A/Prof Hadi Khabbaz, and my co-supervisor, A/Prof Behzad Fatahi, for their valuable guidance and continuous supports in my doctoral study, allowed me to be able to grow as a researcher in geotechnical engineering discipline. It would not have been possible to complete this thesis without their motivations and immense knowledge. Their valuable guidance gave me great inspiration in all time of my study, especially the precious and unforgettable period for conducting the experimental program and writing the dissertation.

I am indebted to the Vietnamese government and the University of Technology Sydney (UTS) for granting me the PhD scholarships. Without those scholarship offers, I could not have the chance to enrol the doctoral course and enhance my academic research skills and experience.

I also owe my sincere respect and earnest thankfulness to Dr Anh-Minh Tang, Dr Lam Dinh Nguyen, Mr Scott Graham, Mr Rami Haddad, Mr Antonio Reyno, Mr Herbert Yuan, Dr Mark Lockrey, Dr Thang Pham Ngoc, Mr Peter Brown, Mr Muller Hailu, Dr Johir Mohammed and other Civil Engineering laboratory staff for their assistance, supports and knowledge that they gave me. Under their guidance, my first glance of doctoral research was enlightened, which made me engaged in a relentless pursuit of geotechnical research career.

I also wish to thank my best colleagues, Dr Liet Chi Dang and Ms Reem Omar Alqaisi, who not only helped me a lot in experiments but also gave me great constructive comments and inspirations. I will not forget the time we carried out tests and the moments for stimulating our interesting discussion in the last four years.

I would like to offer my sincere gratitude to Prof David McGloin and Ms Van Le for their great advice and support. They have been really indispensable supporters for me to carry on investigations and complete the dissertation on time. I also would like to thank all my friends at the University of Technology Sydney for their consideration, sympathy and assistance in my research. They are Mohammad Adnan Farooq, Glen Burton, Tran Huyen Vu, Huu Sam Doan, Harry Nguyen, Habib Rasouli and Hossein Haddad.

Last but not least, I would like to express that I am eternally indebted to my parents and my sister. Because of them, I have had more power and passion to pursue my dream to study abroad. Finally, I would like to give my special thanks to Le Diem Thu, my beloved wife, whose patient love enabled me to complete this work.

LIST OF PUBLICATIONS

- Le, M.T., Dang, L.C., & Khabbaz, H. (2018). Combined effects of bottom ash and lime on behaviour of expansive soil. *GeoMEast conference 2018*, Cairo, Egypt, vol. 10, pp. 28-44.
- Le, M.T., Dang, L.C., & Khabbaz, H. (2019). Strength characteristics of lime and bottom ash reinforced expansive soils. *Geo-Congress conference 2019*, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, USA, 309, 352-362.
- Le, M.T., Fatahi B., & Khabbaz, H. (2022a). A modified electrical conductivity test to predict shrinkage-swelling behaviour of expansive soil treated with hydrated lime and bottom ash. *Géotechnique* (ready to be submitted).
- Le, M.T., Fatahi B., & Khabbaz, H. (2022b). Assessment of mechanical properties of expansive soils treated with hydrated lime, bottom ash and bagasse ash. *Géotechnique* (ready to be submitted).
- Le, M.T., Fatahi B., & Khabbaz, H. (2022c). Size effects of bagasse ash on the mechanical properties of bagasse-ash-lime-treated expansive soils. *Engineering Geology* (ready to be submitted).

RELATED PUBLICATIONS

- Le, M.T., & Khabbaz, H. (2019). Predicting consolidation coefficient of soft clay by time-displacement-velocity methods. *16th Asian Regional Conference on Soil Mechanics and Geotechnical Engineering conference*, Taipei, Taiwan, TF-1, 1-4.
- Alqaisi, R., Le, M.T., & Khabbaz, H. (2019). Applications of recycled sustainable materials and by-products in soil stabilization. In *International Congress and Exhibition " Sustainable Civil Infrastructures "*, 91-117, Springer, Cham.
- Alqaisi, R., Le, M.T., & Khabbaz, H. (2021). Combined effects of eggshell powder and hydrated lime on the properties of expansive soils. *Australian Geomechanics Journal*, 56(1).

Table of Contents

ABSTRACT	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	v
LIST OF PUBLICATIONS	vi
LIST OF FIGURES	xiii
LIST OF TABLES	xxiv
NOTATIONS	xxvi
<i>CHAPTER 1 - Introduction</i>	1
1.1 Background.....	1
1.2 Scope and objectives of research.....	3
1.3 Thesis organisation	4
<i>CHAPTER 2 - Literature Review</i>	9
2.1 Expansive soil.....	9
2.2 Stabilisation methods for expansive soil	11
2.2.1 Problems from expansive soil.....	11
2.2.2 Chemical stabilisation method.....	12
2.2.3 Lime stabilisation.....	13
2.3 Agricultural-industrial wastes for soil stabilisation.....	14
2.3.1 Agricultural-industrial waste materials.....	14
2.3.2 Classification.....	14
2.3.3 Brief history	16
2.4 Agricultural wastes for soil stabilisation	17
2.4.1 Bagasse ash	17
2.4.2 Egg shell ash	18
2.4.3 Rice husk ash	18
2.4.4 Wood ash	19
2.4.5 Coconut fibre	19
2.4.6 Bagasse fibre.....	19
2.4.7 Summary of agricultural wastes.....	20
2.5 Industrial wastes for soil stabilisation	21
2.5.1 Bottom ash	21
2.5.2 Fly ash.....	23
2.5.3 Pulp paper	24
2.5.4 Quarry dust.....	25
2.5.5 Silica fume	25
2.5.6 Steel slag.....	26

2.5.7 Carpet fibre	26
2.5.8 Tyre rubber.....	26
2.5.9 Glass cullet.....	27
2.5.10 Summary of industrial wastes.....	27
2.6 Combinations of binders for soil stabilisation.....	28
2.7 Expansive soils treated with hydrated lime, bagasse ash from agricultural wastes, and bottom ash from industrial wastes	30
2.8 Expansive soils treated with hydrated lime and bagasse ash in a variation of ash size and burning temperature.....	32
2.9 Influencing factors on engineering properties of treated expansive soil by bottom ash, lime, bagasse ash or fibre.....	34
2.9.1 Introduction.....	34
2.9.2 Linear shrinkage (LS)	34
2.9.3 Swelling behaviour	37
2.9.4 Unconfined compressive strength (<i>UCS</i>).....	41
2.9.5 Indirect tensile strength (<i>ITS</i>)	44
2.9.6 California bearing ratio (<i>CBR</i>).....	45
2.9.7 Consolidation behaviour	47
2.9.8 pH values	49
2.10 Electrical conductivity test for evaluating pozzolanic performance of ash.....	51
2.11 Numerical analysis in a case study of embankment on soft ground in Australia.....	54
2.12 Gap identification, problem statement and hypotheses	58
2.13 Summary.....	60
CHAPTER 3 - Materials and Methods	63
3.1 Introduction	63
3.2 Materials	63
3.2.1 Expansive soil	64
3.2.2 Hydrated lime (L)	67
3.2.3 Bottom ash (BA).....	67
3.2.4 Bagasse ash (BA).....	69
3.2.5 Comparison between bottom ash and bagasse ash for their combination in soils	72
3.2.6 Summary	76
3.3 Sample preparation and mixing designations	76
3.3.1 Introduction.....	76
3.3.2 Materials and soil sample preparation	77
3.4 Experimental program for testing categories.....	85
3.4.1 Electrical tests	86

3.4.2 Physical tests.....	99
3.4.3 Mechanical tests.....	102
3.4.4 Microstructural tests.....	111
3.5 Experimental program for various types of mixing ratios.....	114
3.5.1 Introduction.....	114
3.5.2 Mixing ratio based on dry mass of soil (S-ratio in UCS tests)	115
3.5.3 Mixing ratio based on total dry weight (T-ratio in ITS tests).....	115
3.5.4 Mixing ratio based on dry weight of soil and bottom ash (SB-ratio in UCS and CBR tests)	116
3.5.5 Experimental program for shrinkage-swelling behaviour of bottom-ash-lime-treated soils in relationship with electrical conductivity.....	118
3.5.6 Experimental program for behaviour of bagasse-ash-lime-treated soils in relationship with electrical conductivity.....	120
3.6 Summary.....	121
<i>CHAPTER 4 - Characterisation of Expansive Soils Treated with Hydrated Lime</i>	123
4.1 Introduction	123
4.2 Chemical properties of soil materials untreated and treated with hydrated lime	124
4.2.1 pH tests of soil and lime.....	124
4.2.2 Electrical conductivity of bentonite solution	125
4.2.3 Electrical conductivity of bentonite-kaolinite mixtures.....	125
4.2.4 Electrical conductivity of KBS soil (bentonite – kaolinite – sand mixture).....	126
4.2.5 Change in thermoelectric coefficient of studied soil components	127
4.2.6 Electrical conductivity of lime solution.....	130
4.2.7 Electrical conductivity tests of soil in lime solution.....	132
4.3 Physical and mechanical properties of soil untreated or treated with hydrated lime	136
4.3.1 Atterberg limits	136
4.3.2 Linear shrinkage.....	137
4.3.3 Standard compaction.....	138
4.3.4 Swelling-consolidation tests	138
4.3.5 Unconfined compressive strength test	144
4.3.6 Indirect tensile strength tests.....	145
4.3.7 California bearing ratio tests.....	145
4.3.8 Triaxial shearing tests	147
4.3.9 Bender element tests	151
4.3.10 Matric suction tests	151
4.4 Micro-structural analysis on soil treated with hydrated lime	152

4.5 Summary.....	153
CHAPTER 5 - Electrical Conductivity Tests for Expansive Soils Treated with Hydrated Lime and Bottom Ash	157
5.1 Introduction	157
5.2 Mechanical behaviour of ash-lime-treated soils with various mixing-ratio types.....	158
5.2.1 UCS tests with S-ratio.....	158
5.2.2 ITS tests with S-ratio and T-ratio.....	162
5.2.3 UCS and CBR tests with T-ratio and SB-ratio	166
5.2.4 Bender element and matric suction tests with SB ratio	167
5.3 Shrinkage-swelling results.....	170
5.3.1 Linear Shrinkage	171
5.3.2 Free swelling ratio.....	171
5.4 Electrical conductivity tests.....	172
5.5 Comparison of LC_0 , linear shrinkage and free swelling ratio with bottom ash content ...	173
5.6 Microstructural analysis	173
5.6.1 XRD analysis	173
5.6.2 SEM analysis	174
5.7 Discussion on electrical conductivity results.....	178
5.7.1 Correlations between electrical conductivity and shrinkage-swelling results	178
5.7.2 Correlations between electrical conductivity and strength results.....	182
5.8 Summary.....	183
CHAPTER 6 - Electrical Conductivity Tests for Expansive Soils Treated with Hydrated Lime and Bagasse Ash	187
6.1 Introduction	187
6.2 Experimental results	188
6.2.1 Electrical conductivity tests	188
6.2.2 Linear shrinkage tests	189
6.2.3 Unconfined compressive strength tests.....	191
6.2.4 Small-strain shear modulus (G_{max}).....	192
6.2.5 Scanning Electron Microscopy (SEM) tests	194
6.3 Discussion.....	196
6.4 Summary.....	200
CHAPTER 7 - Characterisation of Expansive Soils Treated with Hydrated Lime, Bottom Ash and Bagasse Ash	202
7.1 Introduction	202
7.2 Combination of bottom ash and bagasse ash in lime-treated soils	204

7.2.1 Introduction.....	204
7.2.2 Compaction characteristics	205
7.2.3 Unconfined compressive strength tests.....	206
7.2.4 Electrical conductivity in the combination of bottom and bagasse ash	206
7.3 Characterisation of bottom-bagasse-ash-lime treated soils and discussion.....	210
7.3.1 Particle size distribution curves	210
7.3.2 Liquid limit	210
7.3.3 Linear shrinkage.....	212
7.3.4 Compaction properties	212
7.3.5 Free swelling ratio.....	214
7.3.6 Consolidation behaviour	216
7.3.7 Unconfined compressive strength (<i>UCS</i>).....	218
7.3.8 California bearing ratio (<i>CBR</i>).....	219
7.3.9 Shear strength properties using triaxial tests	222
7.3.10 Small-strain shear modulus (G_{max}).....	225
7.3.11 Matric suction	232
7.4 Microstructural analysis on soil treated with lime, bottom ash and bagasse ash	233
7.4.1 Bottom-bagasse-ash-lime-treated soil samples compacted at <i>OMC</i>	234
7.4.2 Bottom-bagasse-ash-lime-treated soil samples compacted at the wet side of <i>OMC</i>	237
7.5 Summary.....	239
<i>CHAPTER 8 - Numerical Analysis of a Road Embankment on Soft Soils Treated with Hydrated Lime, Bottom Ash and Bagasse Ash</i>	243
8.1 Five treated-soil models.....	243
8.2 Validation of numerical model of soil layers under the Ballina embankment	247
8.2.1 Selection of input parameters for modelling soil profile under studied embankment	248
8.2.2 Stages of embankment construction on soft soil.....	251
8.2.3 Results and discussion	252
8.3 Implementation of five treated-soil models to the case of Ballina embankment	254
8.3.1 Input parameters of materials for suggested models.....	254
8.4 Results and discussion on five models of embankment on treated ground	255
8.4.1 Model 1 - Top soil layer treated with hydrated lime, bottom ash and bagasse ash ..	255
8.4.2 <i>Model 2 - Road embankment with short columns of soil treated with hydrated lime, bottom ash and bagasse ash.....</i>	<i>257</i>
8.4.3 Model 3 - Road pavement with short columns of soil treated with hydrated lime, bottom ash and bagasse ash.....	259
8.4.4 Model 4 - Road embankment with lime-bottom-ash-treated soil top layer and columns	260

8.4.5 Model 5 - Road embankment with top layer of lime- bagasse-ash-treated soil and columns made of various treated materials under operation loads.....	262
8.5 Summary.....	265
CHAPTER 9 - Conclusions and Recommendations	268
9.1 Conclusions	268
9.1.1 Hypotheses.....	268
9.1.2 Electrical conductivity tests for ash-lime-treated soils	269
9.1.3 Characterisation of soils treated with hydrated lime, bottom ash and bagasse ash ..	271
9.1.4 Numerical analysis on road embankment on soft soil treated with hydrated lime, bottom ash and bagasse ash.....	275
9.2 Recommendations for future studies	276
References.....	279

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1.1 A damaged building in Melbourne caused by shrinkage settlement of foundation over-drying expansive soil after Considine (1984)	2
Figure 1.2 Thesis structure from Chapter 4 to Chapter 8	6
Figure 2.1 A clay micelle (after Nelson et al. 2015)	9
Figure 2.2 Distribution of expansive soil in Australia (Richards et al., 1983).....	11
Figure 2.3 Proportion of waste material in a total of 57.9 million tons disposed in Australia from 2006 to 2010 (DEE report 2010).....	15
Figure 2.4 Comparison of studies on different types of binders in terms of (a) powder and (b) fibre	16
Figure 2.5 Bottom ash utilisation in the percentage of total recycling usage (Association, 2008)	21
Figure 2.6 Particle size distribution curves of several bottom ash resources (Katz & Kovler, 2004; Kim & Prezzi, 2008; Kumar & Vaddu, 2004; Moulton, 1973)	22
Figure 2.7 Chemical composition of bottom ash samples from various power plants in the US (Andrade et al., 2007; Kim et al., 2005; Kumar & Vaddu, 2004; Moulton, 1973; Özkan et al., 2007)	23
Figure 2.8 Effect of lime content on linear shrinkage of expansive soils.....	35
Figure 2.9 Effect of ash-lime content on linear shrinkage of expansive soils.....	36
Figure 2.10 Effect of ash content on linear shrinkage of expansive soil.....	36
Figure 2.11 Effect of bagasse fibre-lime content on linear shrinkage of expansive soils, BF: Bagasse fibre (Dang et al., 2016a).....	37
Figure 2.12 Effect of curing time on linear shrinkage of treated expansive soils (Dang et al., 2015; Hasan et al., 2016a).....	37
Figure 2.13 Effect of lime and cement content on swell potential (Phanikumar et al., 2015)	38
Figure 2.14 Effect of lime content on the free swell index of black cotton soil (Sivapullaiah et al., 2000)	39
Figure 2.15 Effect of the fibre content on the swell percentage of fibre-lime treated soil specimens after 7 days of curing (Cai et al., 2006)	40
Figure 2.16 Effect of lime and fly ash on swelling pressure (Phanikumar, 2009)	40
Figure 2.17 Variation of swelling pressure of expansive soil mixed with various content of fly ash and lime without curing or with 7 days of curing (Zha et al., 2008)	40
Figure 2.18 Effect of lime content and curing time on the UCS of expansive soils (Bell, 1996; Ghobadi et al., 2014).....	41
Figure 2.19 Effect of lime, bagasse ash content and curing time on the UCS of expansive soil in Queensland, Australia (Dang et al., 2015; Hasan et al., 2016a)	42
Figure 2.20 Stress-strain relationship for samples stabilised with different contents of coal ash in 5%-cement-treated soil after 28 days of curing (Kamei et al., 2013)	42
Figure 2.21 Effect of rice husk ash (RHA) and bagasse ash (BA) contents on UCS values of lime-treated expansive soils after 28 curing days (Dang et al., 2015; Sharma et al., 2008)	43

Figure 2.22 Effect of bagasse fibre alone, bagasse fibre-lime combination and their curing time on the UCS of expansive soil in Australia (Dang et al., 2016a)	43
Figure 2.23 Effect of fibre content on the UCS of untreated coir fibre (UCF) or treated coir fibre (TCF) black cotton (BC) soil with or without optimum lime content (OLC) of 3% (Jairaj et al., 2018)	44
Figure 2.24 Variation of splitting tensile strength with different contents of lime and fly ash after 28 days of curing (Kumar et al., 2007)	44
Figure 2.25 Variation of splitting tensile strength with different content of fibres in 8%lime-15% fly ash treated soil (Kumar et al., 2007).....	45
Figure 2.26 Variation of splitting tensile strength of treated soil with different content of lime-cement and curing time (Okyay & Dias, 2010)	45
Figure 2.27 Effects of bagasse ash (BA) and combination of hydrated lime (L) and BA with the ratio of 1 to 3 on unsoaked and soaked CBR of treated expansive soil after 7 curing days (Dang et al., 2016b).....	46
Figure 2.28 Combined effect of bagasse ash (BA), lime (L) and curing time on CBR of treated artificial expansive soil (Hasan et al., 2016b)	46
Figure 2.29 Effect of fly ash (FA), bagasse ash (BA) and curing time on CBR of treated clayey soil (Anupam & Kumar, 2013)	47
Figure 2.30 Void ratio versus effective stress of soil treated with varying lime content after 28 days of curing (Jha & Sivapullaiah, 2015)	48
Figure 2.31 Void ratio – pressure curves for natural soil and soil treated with lime, fly ash and fly ash-lime (Nalbantoglu & Tuncer, 2001)	48
Figure 2.32 Effect of lime and curing period on compression index C_c of soil (Jha & Sivapullaiah, 2015)	49
Figure 2.33 Effective stress – void ratio curves of varying lime content in 0.5% bagasse fibre treated expansive soils (Dang et al., 2017)	49
Figure 2.34 pH values with the different content of additives in treated soils (Solanki et al., 2009)	50
Figure 2.35 Alkalinity of soil treated with various lime content after different periods of curing (Jha & Sivapullaiah, 2015).....	50
Figure 2.36 pH values of treated soil samples with various content of gypsum (G) (Aldaood et al., 2014)	51
Figure 2.37 Effect of curing time on pH value with various content of incinerated sewage sludge ash (ISSA) and cement (C) in subgrade soil (Chen & Lin, 2009)	51
Figure 2.38 Conductivity response using electrical conductivity method with unsaturated hydrated lime solution (McCarter & Tran, 1996)	52
Figure 2.39 Longitudinal section of embankment post-construction in Ballina, NSW, Australia (Kelly et al., 2018)	55
Figure 2.40 A typical cross-section of the case-study embankment on soft soil (Kelly et al., 2018)	55
Figure 2.41 Settlement predictions from numerical analysis conducted by Rezanian et al. (2018)	56

Figure 3.1 Flowchart for studied materials.....	64
Figure 3.2 Microscopic images of (a) kaolinite, (b) bentonite and (c) Sydney fine sand	65
Figure 3.3 XRD analysis on components of studied soil	65
Figure 3.4 Particle distribution curve of studied soil and fine sand	66
Figure 3.5 Linear shrinkage of studied soil with 5% sand and various bentonite-kaolinite content	66
Figure 3.6 XRD analysis on studied hydrated lime.....	67
Figure 3.7. Particle distribution of studied soil and bottom ash	68
Figure 3.8 XRD analysis on bottom ash.....	68
Figure 3.9 images of bottom ash in: (a) a microscopic colour image, (b) the width of 993 μm , (c) the width of 252 μm (granular and spherical particles are marked by red asterisks and yellow crosses, respectively), and (d) a width of 29 μm to a broken bottom ash.....	69
Figure 3.10 Particle size distribution curves of soil and bagasse ash in different sizes (75, 150, 425 μm and full size)	70
Figure 3.11 Colour microscopic images of bagasse ash with the maximum size of (a) 425 μm , (b) 150 μm , and (c) 75 μm	70
Figure 3.12 SEM images on 425- μm bagasse ash in magnification of (a) 113x, (b) 484x; and bagasse ash in the size of (c) 150 μm and (d) 75 μm (Quartz and cellular particles are marked by red asterisks and yellow crosses, respectively)	71
Figure 3.13 X-ray diffraction results on bagasse ash in the size of 425, 150 and 75 μm	72
Figure 3.14 Particle distribution curve of soil, bottom ash and 425- μm -sized bagasse ash.....	73
Figure 3.15 EDX analysis on (a) bottom ash and (b) bagasse ash	75
Figure 3.16 Maximum sizes of studied materials	77
Figure 3.17 Schematic diagram for soil preparation	78
Figure 3.18 Soil sample preparation.....	78
Figure 3.19 Quartering method for selecting representative samples of bottom ash	79
Figure 3.20 Sample preparation for bagasse ash	79
Figure 3.21 Preparation for making UCS samples	80
Figure 3.22 Preparation for making CBR samples.....	80
Figure 3.23 (a) Static compaction for swelling-consolidation samples and (b) determination of static compaction velocity.....	81
Figure 3.24 Snapshots of sample preparation for suction, bender element and triaxial tests.....	81
Figure 3.25 Moisturisation for treated soil samples	82
Figure 3.26 Snapshots of waxing preparation for bender element samples	82
Figure 3.27 Snapshots of waxing preparation for CBR samples.....	83
Figure 3.28 Freezing-and-drying line on the pressure-temperature plot	84
Figure 3.29 Snapshots of SEM sample preparation	84

Figure 3.30 Snapshots of storing samples in humidity containers	84
Figure 3.31 Experimental program in the study	85
Figure 3.32 Photographs of the equipment for pH tests	87
Figure 3.33 (a) Schematic diagram of the experimental setup and (b) photo of equipment for electrical conductivity test.....	88
Figure 3.34 Details of (a) conductivity cell and (b) conductimeter.....	89
Figure 3.35 Test-A procedure of mixing solutions for the vessel of 400mL: Subtest A1-(a) Preparation and EC measurement of 400mL lime solution, (b) Mixing soil-ash mixture into 400mL lime solution, (c) Measurement of EC at 40°C; Subtest A2- (d) Mixing soil/ash mixture into 400mL distilled water and measuring EC at 40°C.....	92
Figure 3.36 Results from the electrical conductivity test for determining initial loss in conductivity (LC ₀).....	93
Figure 3.37 Determination of the rate of electrical conductivity (RC).....	93
Figure 3.38 Test-B procedure of mixing solutions for the vessel of 400mL: Subtest B1-(a) Preparation and EC measurement of 200 mL lime and 200mL clay solutions, (b) Combination of two solutions and sand/ash mixture, (c) Measurement of EC at 25°C; Subtest B2-(d) Mixing sand/ash mixture into 400mL distilled water and measuring EC at 25°C.....	95
Figure 3.39 Test-C1 procedure of mixing solutions for the vessel of 400mL: Subtest C1-(a) Mixing and measuring EC of two ashes into 400mL water at 25°C; Subtest C2- (b) Preparation and EC measurement of 200 mL lime and 200mL clay solutions; (c) Combination of two solutions and sand-two-ashes mixture, (d) Measurement of EC at 25°C; Subtest C3-(e) Mixing and measuring EC of sand/two ashes mixture at 25°C	97
Figure 3.40 Three pycnometers for specific gravity tests.....	100
Figure 3.41 Plastic limit tests	100
Figure 3.42 Liquid limit tests	101
Figure 3.43 Compaction tests	102
Figure 3.44 Linear Shrinkage tests	103
Figure 3.45 Unconfined compressive strength tests	104
Figure 3.46 Indirect tensile strength test	105
Figure 3.47 California bearing ratio test.....	106
Figure 3.48 Snapshots of swelling-consolidation tests: (a) conventional cell in oedometer systems, (b) conventional cell in the loading frame, (c) CBR mould in the loading frame and (d) hydraulic Rowe cell	107
Figure 3.49 Triaxial shear test	109
Figure 3.50 Bender element test for samples in the diameter of 50 mm	109
Figure 3.51 Bender element test for CBR sample	110
Figure 3.52 Filter paper tests	111
Figure 3.53 Equipment and analysis codes in software for X-ray diffraction test	112
Figure 3.54 Microscopic imaging test device.....	113

Figure 3.55 SEM and EDX tests on Zeiss EVO LS15 SEM (LHS) and Zeiss Supra 55VVP SEM (RHS)	114
Figure 3.56. A flow chart to present the testing structure and ratios for comparison	115
Figure 3.57 Flowchart for ratio designation	117
Figure 3.58. Dry density and moisture content of samples with T-ratio and SB-ratio (the corresponding water contents in red numbers given for samples S0-SB40)	118
Figure 3.59. Standard Proctor compaction curves for soil and lime-treated soil	118
Figure 4.1. Change in pH of soils treated with lime in various contents and curing days	124
Figure 4.2. Change of electrical conductivity with bentonite concentration (Note: intercept of EC in the study conducted by Castelbaum et al. (2010) was modified to zero)	125
Figure 4.3. EC change of bentonite-kaolinite mixture with various content of bentonite.....	126
Figure 4.4 Change of EC with temperature of bentonite-kaolinite and soil mixtures (KBS) at bentonite concentration of 0.24 g/L	127
Figure 4.5. EC change with temperature in bentonite suspension with various bentonite concentrations from 1 to 18 g/L.....	128
Figure 4.6. Change of temperature compensation coefficient with concentrations of studied bentonite.....	128
Figure 4.7. EC change with temperature in the solution of 30% bentonite and 65% kaolinite with various bentonite concentrations from 0.24 g/L to 9.6 g/L.....	129
Figure 4.8. Change of temperature compensation coefficient with concentration of 30% bentonite – 65% kaolinite in bentonite concentrations from 0.24 g/L to 9.6 g/L	129
Figure 4.9 Change of EC with temperature in 4% bentonite – 96% kaolinite with various sand contents from 0% to 15%.....	130
Figure 4.10 Change of EC with temperature in 2% bentonite - 98% kaolinite with various sand content from 0% to 15%	130
Figure 4.11 Change in EC of lime solution with lime concentration	131
Figure 4.12 Change of EC with temperature with various concentrations of lime solution from 0.1 g/L to 10 g/L	132
Figure 4.13 Variation of temperature compensation coefficient T_c with lime concentration C_L	132
Figure 4.14. Changes of electrical conductivity with time in 5%-lime-soil solution at 40°C (compensated to 25°C with $T_c=1.9\%$).....	133
Figure 4.15. EC evolution in soil-lime solution in different temperatures (temperature-compensated at 25°C with $T_c=1.89\%$)	135
Figure 4.16. Change in EC with the temperature of lime-soil solution with lime concentration of 0.8 g/L equivalent to the lime content of 5%.....	135
Figure 4.17 Loss in conductivity (LC_0) in lime-soil solution from 0 to 1,000 minutes	135
Figure 4.18 Loss in conductivity (LC_0) in lime-soil solution from 0 to 240 minutes	136
Figure 4.19 Liquid limit of studied soil with various content of bentonite	136

Figure 4.20 Change in linear shrinkage of the studied soil with (a) various contents of bentonite; (b) 7 and 28 curing days with or without 5% hydrated lime.....	137
Figure 4.21 Compaction of the test results established for untreated soil and soil treated with hydrated lime.....	138
Figure 4.22 Free swelling ratio of the studied soil (pre-loading pressure=0 and seating loading=6.25 kPa) with different degrees of saturation (S_r)	139
Figure 4.23 Swelling-consolidation curves of expansive soils with various pre-loading pressures from 12 kPa to 200 kPa.....	140
Figure 4.24 Swelling-consolidation curves of studied soil samples with various seating pressures, methods (CRS and IL) and cells (oedometer and hydraulic Rowe cell).....	141
Figure 4.25 Swelling pressure with zero volume change (no displacement allowed) with different cell diameters ($D = 50$ mm and 152 mm)	142
Figure 4.26 Zero-swelling consolidation tests of studied soil with various testing methods (CRS and IL), cell types (oedometer, CBR and hydraulic Rowe) and diameters ($D=50, 63, 75, 152$ mm)	142
Figure 4.27 Swelling ratio of soil treated with 5% lime with various moisture content (w) and curing time (1 hour and 28 days)	143
Figure 4.28 Consolidation curves of soil treated with 5% hydrated lime with various water content and curing time.....	144
Figure 4.29 Unconfined compressive strength of soil treated with hydrated lime with various content and curing time.....	144
Figure 4.30 Indirect tensile strength of soil treated with hydrated lime with various contents at different curing times	145
Figure 4.31 Unsoaked and soaked CBR of untreated soil and soil treated with 5% lime	146
Figure 4.32 Water contents of lime-treated soil CBR samples at top, middle and bottom sample layers.	147
Figure 4.33 Shearing stress-strain relationship of untreated soil and soil treated with 5% hydrated lime under the confined pressure of 50, 100 and 200 kPa	148
Figure 4.34 Pore-water-pressure-strain relationship of soil untreated and treated with 5% hydrated lime under the confined pressure of 50, 100 and 200 kPa	149
Figure 4.35 Effective stress failure envelope of soil untreated and treated with 5% hydrated lime	150
Figure 4.36 Internal friction angle and cohesion of untreated soil and soil treated with 5% hydrated lime.....	150
Figure 4.37 Change in G_{max} of soil sample untreated and treated with 5% hydrated lime with curing time.....	151
Figure 4.38 Change in matrix suction of soil samples untreated and treated with 5% hydrated lime with curing time	152
Figure 4.39 SEM and EDS on soil samples treated with 5% hydrated lime after 56 days of curing	153

Figure 5.1 Effect of bottom ash and hydrated lime on UCS of expansive soil samples after 7 days of curing (S-ratio).....	158
Figure 5.2 Effect of bottom ash and lime on UCS of treated expansive soil at 7 days and 28 days of curing (S-ratio).....	160
Figure 5.3 Effect of curing time on UCS of expansive soil stabilised with different contents of bottom ash (0% Lime with S-ratio).....	161
Figure 5.4 Effect of curing time on UCS of 5% lime treated expansive soil with different contents of bottom ash (S-ratio)	161
Figure 5.5 Indirect tensile strength of bottom ash-lime-soil mixtures based on S-ratio after 28 days: (a) stress-strain relationships, (b) halves of samples after tests	164
Figure 5.6 Indirect tensile strength of bottom ash-lime-soil mixtures based on the total dry weight (T-ratio) after 28 days: (a) stress-strain relationships, (b) halves of samples after tests.....	165
Figure 5.7 Indirect tensile strength of bottom ash-5% lime-soil samples by soil weight W_s (S-ratio) and total weight W_T (T-ratio) after 7 and 28 days	166
Figure 5.8 Unconfined compressive strength and California bearing ratio after compaction: (a) UCS test with T-ratio; (b) UCS test with SB-ratio; (c) soaked CBR test with T-ratio; (d) unsoaked CBR test with SB-ratio.	167
Figure 5.9 Variation of G_{max} with curing time for untreated soil and soil treated with hydrated lime and bottom ash	168
Figure 5.10. Change in G_{max} of soil treated with 5% hydrated lime and 25% bottom ash (compacted at the wet side of the optimal moisture content)	169
Figure 5.11 Matric suction of soil samples treated by hydrated lime and bottom ash	170
Figure 5.12 Photographs of the samples during linear shrinkage tests.....	171
Figure 5.13 (a) Liquid Limit (LL) and (b) Linear shrinkage (LS) with various bottom ash contents N_{BO}	171
Figure 5.14 Swelling ratio versus (a) elapsed time and (b) bottom ash content.....	172
Figure 5.15 Change of LC_0 with various bottom ash contents	172
Figure 5.16 Summary of studied parameters in relationship with bottom ash contents.....	173
Figure 5.17 Variation of XRD results from EC samples with various contents of bottom ash (Note: Mont.=Montmorillonite, Mull.=Mullite)	174
Figure 5.18 SEM photos on samples at low bottom ash contents (5% – 20%).....	175
Figure 5.19 SEM photos on at high bottom ash contents (25% – 40%).....	176
Figure 5.20. SEM analysis on soil samples treated with hydrated lime and bottom ash after 28 days on (a) UCS samples, (b) on CBR samples indicating CSH (P), and (c) on CBR samples indicating CSH(P)	177
Figure 6.1 Electrical conductivity evolution of soil solution with 5% hydrated lime and bagasse ash in various content and size.....	188
Figure 6.2 Change in electrical conductivity per minute of soil solution with 5% lime and bagasse ash in various content and sizes (75, 150 and 425 μm)	189

Figure 6.3 (a) Liquid limit and (b) linear shrinkage of soil treated with 5% lime and 15% bagasse ash in various sizes after 7 days	190
Figure 6.4 Unconfined compressive strength of soil samples treated with bagasse ash in different sizes and various curing times	192
Figure 6.5 Changes in shear modulus G_{max} of soil treated with lime and bottom ash or bagasse ash with various sizes over curing time.....	194
Figure 6.6 SEM analysis on UCS soil samples treated with 5% hydrated lime and 15% bottom ash in the size of 425, 150 and 75 μm after 28 days, and lime-treated soil after 56 days.....	195
Figure 6.7. Relationship between LS and UCS of studied samples after 7 days of curing	198
Figure 7.1 The structure of Chapter 7.....	204
Figure 7.2 Changes in density of soil samples treated with 5% lime, bottom ash and bagasse ash in various contents	205
Figure 7.3 Unconfined compressive strength of 25%-bottom-ash-5%-lime treated soils with various contents of bagasse ash	206
Figure 7.4 Revolution of electrical conductivity of bottom ash	207
Figure 7.5 Evolution of electrical conductivity of bottom-bagasse ash solution	207
Figure 7.6 Electrical conductivity of bottom-bagasse ash mix with different contents of ash....	208
Figure 7.7 Evolution of initial loss in conductivity of soil treated with lime, bottom ash and bagasse ash in various content of ash	209
Figure 7.8 Particle size distribution curve of bottom ash, bagasse ash and their combination ...	210
Figure 7.9 Comparison of liquid limits of untreated soil and soil treated with lime, bottom ash and bagasse ash.....	211
Figure 7.10 Liquid limits of soils treated with hydrated lime, bottom ash and bagasse ash	211
Figure 7.11 Linear shrinkage of untreated soil and soil treated with lime, bottom ash and bagasse ash	212
Figure 7.12 Compaction curves of studied soils untreated and treated with lime, bottom ash and bagasse ash.....	213
Figure 7.13 Maximum dry density of untreated soil and soil treated with lime, bottom ash and bagasse ash.....	214
Figure 7.14 Optimum moisture content of soil untreated or treated with lime, bottom ash and bagasse ash.....	214
Figure 7.15 Swelling ratio of (a) lime-treated soils with a variety of bottom ash content with 15% bagasse ash (after 1 day for curing) and (b) soils untreated and treated with hydrated lime, bottom ash and bagasse ash, and cured for 1 day.	215
Figure 7.16 Swelling ratio of untreated soil and soil treated with hydrated lime and bottom ash and bagasse ash.....	216
Figure 7.17 Consolidation curves of soils treated with hydrated lime, bottom ash and bagasse ash	217
Figure 7.18 Pre-consolidation pressure of soil treated with hydrated lime, bottom ash and bagasse ash	217

Figure 7.19 Compression indices of soil treated with hydrated lime, bottom ash and bagasse ash	218
Figure 7.20 Unconfined compressive strength of soil treated with hydrated lime, bottom ash and bagasse ash.....	219
Figure 7.21 Unsoaked California bearing ratio of soils treated with hydrated lime and bottom ash or bagasse ash.....	220
Figure 7.22 Unsoaked California bearing ratio (CBR_u) of soil treated with hydrated lime, bottom ash and bagasse ash after 28 days for curing: (a) CBR values and (b) stress-displacement curves	221
Figure 7.23 Soaked California Bearing Ratio (CBR_s) of soil treated with hydrated lime, bottom ash and bagasse ash after 28 days for curing and 62 days for saturation: (a) CBR values and (b) stress-displacement curve.....	222
Figure 7.24 Shearing stress-strain and pore-water-pressure-strain relationships of untreated soil and soil treated with hydrated lime, bottom ash and bagasse ash.....	223
Figure 7.25 Effective stress failure envelope of untreated soil and soil treated with hydrated lime, bottom ash and bagasse ash	224
Figure 7.26 Internal friction angle and cohesion of soil treated with hydrated lime, bottom ash and bagasse ash.....	225
Figure 7.27 Small-strain shear modulus (G_{max}) of soil treated with hydrated lime, bottom ash and bagasse ash (fully saturated and cured for 28 days), Note: BO = Bottom ash, BA = Bagasse ash, and BB = bottom ash and bagasse ash.....	226
Figure 7.28 Variation of small-strain shear modulus (G_{max}) of soil treated with hydrated lime, bottom ash and bagasse ash (CBR samples unsoaked in 28 days and then soaked in 62 days)	227
Figure 7.29 Change in small-strain shear modulus G_{max} of soil treated with hydrated lime, bottom ash and bagasse ash (compacted at optimum moisture content) with time.....	229
Figure 7.30 Change in small-strain shear modulus G_{max} of soil treated with 5% hydrated lime, 17.5% bottom ash and 7.5% bagasse ash (compacted at different water contents) with time	230
Figure 7.31 Variation of G_{max} of soil treated with 5% hydrated lime, 17.5% bottom ash and 7.5% bagasse ash with various sizes of bagasse ash (425, 150 and 75 μm)	231
Figure 7.32 Variation of G_{max} of soil treated with hydrated lime, bottom ash and bagasse ash with various sizes of bagasse ash (in comparison with lime-bagasse-ash-treated soils): (a) 425 μm , (b) 150 μm , and (c) 75 μm	232
Figure 7.33 Matric suction of untreated soil and soil treated with hydrated lime, bottom ash and bagasse ash over 90 days	233
Figure 7.34 SEM and EDS results on soil sample treated with 5% lime, 17.5% bottom ash and 7.5% bagasse ash after 7 curing days, with a photo at (a) bottom ash and (b) bagasse ash	235
Figure 7.35 SEM and EDS results on soil sample treated with 5% lime, 17.5% bottom ash and 7.5% bagasse ash after 21 curing days, with a photo captured at a bagasse ash	235
Figure 7.36 SEM and EDS results on soil sample treated with 5% lime, 17.5% bottom ash and 7.5% bagasse ash after 28 curing days.....	236

Figure 7.37 SEM and EDS results on soil sample treated with 5% lime, 17.5% bottom ash and 7.5% bagasse ash after 63 curing days.....	236
Figure 7.38 SEM and EDS results on soil sample treated with 5% lime, 17.5% bottom ash and 7.5% bagasse ash after 90 curing days.....	237
Figure 7.39 SEM analysis on soil samples treated with hydrated lime, bottom ash and bagasse ash compacted at wet side after 28 curing days	238
Figure 7.40 Schematic diagram of Interfacial transition zone in expansive soil treated with hydrated lime, bottom ash and bagasse ash compacted at the wet side of optimum moisture (after Hilal (2016)).	239
Figure 8.1 Diagram of the proposed models for numerical simulations	245
Figure 8.2 PLAXIS models for treated soil columns and subgrade.	246
Figure 8.3 Profiles of compression (C_c), recompression (C_s) and creep (C_α) indices with selected values in the selected case study (after Pineda et al. (2016)).....	249
Figure 8.4 Vertical settlement and horizontal displacement of embankment on soft soils: (a) settlement of M_0 point in embankment at the centre with time, (b) settlement of M_1 point under embankment at the centre with time, (c) lateral displacement of embankment toes with depth after 1200 days	253
Figure 8.5 Total pore water pressure prediction and measurements	254
Figure 8.6 (a) Effective stress failure envelope and (b) internal friction angle and cohesion of soil untreated and treated with binders	255
Figure 8.7 Model 1-Vertical settlement and horizontal displacement of embankment on soft soils with lime-treated soil top layer: (a) settlement of M_0 point in embankment at the centre with time, (b) settlement of M_1 point under embankment at the centre with time, (c) lateral displacement of embankment toes with depth after 1200 days	257
Figure 8.8 PLAXIS model for soil columns distributed in alluvium and estuarine silty clay layer in Model 2	258
Figure 8.9 Model 2-Vertical settlement and horizontal displacement of embankment on soft soils with lime-bottom-bagasse-ash treated soil top layer and ash fill: (a) settlement of M_0 point in embankment at the centre with time, (b) settlement of M_1 point under embankment at the centre with time, (c) lateral displacement of embankment toes with depth after 1200 days	259
Figure 8.10 Model 3-Vertical settlement and horizontal displacement of embankment on soft soils with lime-treated soil top layer: (a) settlement of M_0 point in the embankment at the centre with time, (b) settlement of M_1 point under embankment at the centre with time, (c) lateral displacement of embankment toes with depth after 1200 days	260
Figure 8.11 Model 4-Vertical settlement and horizontal displacement of embankment on soft soils with top soil layer and columns treated with hydrated lime, bottom ash and bagasse ash: (a) settlement of M_0 point in embankment at the centre with time, (b) settlement of M_1 point under embankment at the centre with time, (c) lateral displacement of embankment toes with depth after 1200 days	262
Figure 8.12 Model 5-Vertical settlement and horizontal displacement of embankment on soft soils with bagasse-ash-lime-treated topsoil layer and soil columns treated with hydrated lime, bottom ash, and bagasse ash (no applied operation loads): (a) settlement of M_0 point in the	

embankment at the centre with time, (b) settlement of M_1 point under embankment at the centre with time, (c) lateral displacement of embankment toes with depth after 1200 days263

Figure 8.13 Model 5-Vertical settlement and horizontal displacement of embankment on soft soils with bagasse-ash-lime-treated topsoil layer and soil columns treated with hydrated lime, bottom ash and bagasse ash under operational loading: (a) settlement of M_0 point in embankment at the centre with time, (b) settlement of M_1 point under the embankment at the centre with time, (c) lateral displacement of embankment toes with depth after 1200 days265

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1 Comparison of agricultural wastes for soil stabilisation	20
Table 2.2 Physical and mechanical properties of bottom ash (Lovell et al., 1991; Majizadeh et al., 1979; Moulton, 1973; Prakash & Sridharan, 2006; Rogbeck & Knutz, 1996; Siddiki et al., 2004; Tanyu et al., 2004)	22
Table 2.3 Comparison in chemical composition between Class F and C fly ash (Cokca, 2001; Fatahi & Khabbaz, 2013; Punthutaecha et al., 2006).....	24
Table 2.4 Comparison of industrial wastes for soil stabilisation.....	28
Table 2.5 Comparisons in outcomes of binding agents (Sarkar et al., 2016).....	29
Table 2.6 Summary of the study performed on widely-used natural and synthetic fibres to reinforce soil (Hejazi et al., 2012).	30
Table 2.7. Evaluation of pozzolanicity of materials (Luxan et al., 1989)	53
Table 2.8 Comparison between results from Class A and C in the study done by Gong and Chok (2018).....	57
Table 3.1 Chemical composition of hydrated lime (Adelaide Brighton Cement Ltd)	67
Table 3.2. Geotechnical properties of the studied expansive soil, bottom ash and bagasse ash ...	76
Table 3.3. Quantity of conducted tests	86
Table 3.4 Testing program for pH tests	87
Table 3.5 Tests A, B and C of electrical conductivity for studied materials.....	98
Table 3.6 Testing program of electrical conductivity with various curing time	98
Table 3.7 Testing program of electrical conductivity with various temperatures	99
Table 3.8 Testing program for plastic limit.....	101
Table 3.9 Testing program for liquid limit	101
Table 3.10 Testing program for compaction tests	102
Table 3.11 Testing program for linear shrinkage tests	103
Table 3.12 Testing program for UCS tests	104
Table 3.13 Testing program for ITS tests.....	105
Table 3.14 Testing program for CBR tests.....	107
Table 3.15 Testing program for swelling-consolidation tests	108
Table 3.16 Testing program for triaxial test	109
Table 3.17 Testing program for bender element tests	110
Table 3.18 Testing program for filter paper (suction) tests	111
Table 3.19 Testing program for X-ray diffraction tests.....	112
Table 3.20 UCS mixture ratios based on dry mass of soil (S-ratio).....	115
Table 3.21 Mixture ratios for ITS tests.....	116
Table 3.22 SB ratios for mechanical tests	116

Table 3.23 Swelling-consolidation testing program.....	120
Table 3.24 Electrical conductivity testing program.....	120
Table 3.25 Mechanical testing program	121
Table 4.1 Atterberg limits of studied materials	137
Table 8.1 Material properties of embankment and soil profile	250
Table 8.2 Permeability parameters for soil profile	251
Table 8.3. Stages of filling embankment (Kelly et al., 2018).....	252
Table 8.4. Material properties of treated soils	255
Table 8.5. Parameters for pavement and vehicle load on the embankment	264
Table 9.1. Summary for responses of five hypotheses	269

NOTATIONS

Latin notations

C	Concentration
C_c	Compression index
C_s	Swelling index
C_α	Creep index
c_k	Change in permeability
e	Void ratio
e_0	Initial void ratio
E	Young's modulus
EC	Electrical conductivity
I_p	Plastic index
G_{\max}	Small-strain shear modulus
G_s	Specific gravity
K_0	At-rest earth pressure coefficient
k_x	Vertical permeability
k_y	Horizontal permeability
LC_0	Initial loss in conductivity
n	Porosity
pH	Potential of hydrogen
PI	Plastic index
PL	Plastic limit
RC	Rate of electrical conductivity
S_r	Degree of saturation
t	Time

T	Temperature
T_c	Temperature compensation coefficient
V_s	Shear wave velocity
LL	Liquid limit

Greek notations

γ	Unit weight
κ	Kappa
λ	Lambda
ν	Poisson's ratio
σ'_v	Effective stress
Φ'	Friction angle

Acronyms

CBR	California bearing ratio
CRS	Constant rate of strain
CSH	Calcium silicate hydrate
CASH	Calcium aluminum silicate hydrate
BA	Bagasse ash
BO	Bottom ash
BB	Bottom ash – bagasse ash
EDX	Energy dispersive x-ray spectroscopy
<i>ITS</i>	Indirect tensile strength
IL	Incremental loading
KBS	Kaolinite – bentonite – sand
L	Lime
LVDT	Linear variable differential transformer

MC Mohr Coulomb
MCC Modified cam clay
MDD Maximum dry density
MSH Magnesium silicate hydrate
OCR Over consolidation ratio
OMC Optimum moisture content
PVDs Prefabricated vertical drains
UCS Unconfined compressive strength
SEM Scanning Electron Microscopy
SSC Soft soil creep
XRD X-ray diffraction