



IJRASET

International Journal For Research in
Applied Science and Engineering Technology



INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL FOR RESEARCH

IN APPLIED SCIENCE & ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY

Volume: 12 **Issue:** VI **Month of publication:** June 2024

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.22214/ijraset.2024.63259>

www.ijraset.com

Call:  08813907089

E-mail ID: ijraset@gmail.com

Strength Improvement of Black Cotton Soil by using Different Materials

Mr. Alpesh K Sankhat¹, Shivani Joshi², Vijay Baraiya³

¹Professor, Department of Civil Engineering, GMB Polytechnic-Rajula (GTU), India

^{2,3}Department of Civil Engineering, Gujarat Technological University


Abstract: This study examines the effect of geotextiles, plastic rings, plastic shavings and fibres on soil California bearing capacity (CBR). The experiment evaluates the effectiveness of these additions to improve the bearing capacity and reduce the sedimentation of the soil samples. Geotextiles are introduced to improve soil compaction and reduce lateral movement. Plastic rings and chips are added to create voids and improve drainage, which can reduce water content and improve strength. Polypropylene Fibres were added to study their effect on soil reinforcement and stress distribution improvement. CBR tests are performed on soil samples with hand without these additives to quantify the improvement in strength and deformation properties. The results of this study should provide valuable information on the potential benefits of using geotextiles, plastic rings, plastic chips and polypropylene fibres in pavement construction to improve soil CBR of soils in pavement applications

Keywords: CBR Test , Geotextiles, plastic chips, plastic rings, polypropylene fibres,

I. INTRODUCTION

- 1) Black Cotton Soil :Black cotton soil, also known as regur soil, is a type of soil found in the Deccan Plateau region of India. It is characterized by its brown-black color, high clay content, and high shrink-swell properties.
- 2) CBR Test : CBR (California Bearing Ratio) testing is performed primarily to provide information for pavement design. It was first developed by the California State Highway Department. It is a penetration or subsidence test under load, mainly used to evaluate the base strength of roads, pavements and foundations..
- 3) Geotextiles: Geotextiles are essentially strong fabrics used in construction projects. They are the most Versatile type of geosynthetic material, with a wide range of applications. Due to the variety of Geotextiles available, choosing the right one for a specific project is crucial.
- 4) Polypropylene Fibres: Experiments were conducted using different Percentages of polypropylene fibres mixed with compacted soil samples. The tests measured the Soil's strength, bearing capacity, and swelling behaviour. While the detailed results aren't provided. This research suggests that fibre reinforcement has promise for improving problematic soils.
- 5) Plastic bottle : The project involves mixing the soil with various percentages of these plastic strips. Tests like Compaction and California Bearing Ratio (CBR) will then be conducted to analyse the impact on Soil properties

II. METHODOLOGY



III. TESTS AND RESULTS


To determine the properties of soil tests we conducted on soil are:

1) Free Swell Index

FREE SWELL INDEX (As per IS2720 part - 40)					
Lab Job No.:	235	Date of Sampling:	25/02/24		
Sample Description:	Black Cotton Soil	Date of Testing:	26/02/24		
Source/Location:	130+700 LHS	Sampled By:	Jointly		
Proposed Use:	Embankment/Subgrade	Tested By:	Jointly		
Sr. No	Determination		Test-1	Test-2	Average
1	Volume of Specimen in Graduated Cylinder Containing Distilled Water after 24 hrs = (ml)	Vd	20	21	/
2	Volume of Specimen in Graduated Cylinder Containing Kerosene after 24 hrs = (ml)	Vk	13	13	/
3	Difference of Volume in Water & Kerosene (ml)	Vd-Vk	7	8	/
4	Free Swelling Index, [%] =	$\frac{[(Vd-Vk)/Vk] \times 100}{}$	53.85	61.54	57.70

2) Liquid Limit And Plastic Limit Tests

ATTERBERG LIMITS (As Per IS 2720 - Part 5) (By Casagrande Apparatus)							
Lab Job No.:	235	Date of Sampling:	25/02/24				
Sample Description:	Black Cotton Soil	Date of Testing:	26/02/24				
Source/Location:	130+700 LHS	Sampled By:	Jointly				
Proposed Use:	Emb/Sub.	Tested By:	Jointly				
Sr. No.	Determination	Liquid Limits				Plastic Limits	
		1	2	3	5	1	2
1	No. of Blows	32	27	22	18	-	-
2	Container Number	2	3	4	5	6	7
3	Weight of container (gm) W1	18.62	19.02	17.85	16.83	18.65	18.78
4	Wt. of Cont. + Wet Sample (gm) W2	46.83	49.32	49.49	48.25	28.08	30.40
5	Wt. of Cont. + Oven dry Sample W3	35.81	37.44	36.67	35.62	26.17	27.76
6	Wt. of Water W4 = W2-W3	11.02	11.88	12.82	12.63	1.91	2.64
7	Wt. of Dry Sample W5 = W3-W1	17.19	18.42	19.42	18.79	7.52	8.98
8	% Moisture content W4/WSX100	64.11	64.50	66.01	67.22	25.40	29.40
	Average					27.40	



LL: Moisture Content @ 25 Blows

RESULTS

Liquid Limit LL (%) = 65.50
 Plastic Limit PL (%) = 27.40
 Plasticity Index PI (%) = 38.10 (LL-PL)


3) Grain Size Analysis

GRAIN SIZE ANALYSIS (As per IS 2720 (Part - 4))					
Lab Job No.:	235	Date of Sampling:	25/02/24		
Sample Description:	Black Cotton Soil	Date of Testing:	26/02/24		
Source/Location:	130+700 LHS	Sampled By:	Jointly		
Proposed Use:	Emb/Sub.	Tested By:	Jointly		
Wt. of Sample (gm)	1000 grams				
IS Sieve Size (mm)	Weight Retained (gm)	Cumulative Weight Retained (gm)	Cumulative Percentage Retained (%)	Cumulative Percentage Passing (%)	Remarks
100					
75					
19	0	0	0	100	
4.75	16	16	1.6	98.4	
2.0	9	25	2.50	97.5	
0.425	47	72	7.2	92.8	
0.075	53	125	12.5	87.5	
Pan					
DESCRIPTION OF PARTICLE	SIEVE SIZE (mm)		PERCENTAGE		
Gravel	Coarse	75 - 19	-		1.60
	Fine	19 - 4.75	1.60		
Sand	Coarse	4.75 - 2.00	0.90		10.9
	Medium	2.00 - 0.425	4.7		
	Fine	0.425 - 0.075	5.3		
Silt & Clay	Passing through 0.075				87.5

4) Modified Proctor Test

MODIFIED PROCTOR COMPACTION TEST						
As Per IS 2720 [Part - 8]						
Lab Job No.	235			Date of Sampling	25/02/24	
Sample Description	Black Cotton Soil			Date of Testing	26/02/24	
Source/Location	130+700 LHS			Sampled By	Jointly	
Proposed Use	Emb/Sub.			Tested By	Jointly	
Mould No.	Wt of Mould, W ₁ (gm)			Volume of mould, V (cc)		
% of Water	18%	20%	22%	24%	26%	
Wt. of Wet Sample + mould, W ₂	(gm) 5786	5979	6058	5956	5891	
Wt. of Wet Sample, W ₂ =(W ₂ -W ₁)	(gm) 1296	1989	2068	1966	1881	
Wet density, γ _w = W ₂ /V	(gm/cc) 1.796	1.989	2.068	1.966	1.881	
Container No.	56			57		
Wt. of container, W ₃	(gm) 40.30	46.4	43.57	48.25	48.15	
Wt. of wet soil + cont., W ₄	(gm) 146.99	161.89	166.61	170.47	171.92	
Wt. of dry soil + cont., W ₅	(gm) 130.60	142.80	145.14	146.5	146.3	
Wt. of water, W ₆ =(W ₄ -W ₅)	(gm) 16.39	19.09	21.47	23.97	25.62	
Wt. of dry soil, W ₇ =(W ₅ -W ₃)	(gm) 90.30	96.40	93.57	98.25	98.15	
Moisture content w = W ₆ /W ₇ × 100	(%) 18.15	19.80	22.00	24.40	26.10	
Dry density γ _d = W ₇ /(1+w/100)	(gm/cc) 1.520	1.660	1.695	1.580	1.492	

Test Results	
MDD (gm/cc)	1.695
OMC (%)	22.00



5) California Bearing Ratio Test

a) CBR Test With Normal Black Soil


Laboratory Job No.	235		Date of Sampling	25/02/24	
Location/Source	130+700 LHS		Sampled by	Jointly	
Type of Material	Normal Black soil		Tested by	Jointly	
Proposed use			Date of Casting	28/02/24	
Period of Soaking	96 Hours		Date of Testing	03/03/24	

No. of layers	Mould No. 25		Mould No. 25		Mould No. 26	
	Before soaking	After soaking	Before soaking	After soaking	Before soaking	After soaking
10	10	10	10	10	10	10
Wt. of Mould, W ₁ (gm)	69.95	69.95	79.60	79.60	68.85	68.85
Wt. of Wet Sample + Mould, W ₂ (gm)	1107.7	1127.2	123.90	124.24	114.11	114.93
Wt. of Wet Sample, W ₂ =(W ₂ -W ₁) (gm)	407.7	410.7	44.30	44.64	45.26	46.08
Volume of mould, V (cc)	2250	2250	2250	2250	2250	2250
Wet Density, γ _w = W ₂ /V (gm/cc)	1.812	1.834	1.969	1.984	2.025	2.048

Container No.	2		4		6	
	Before soaking	After soaking	Before soaking	After soaking	Before soaking	After soaking
Wt. of container, W ₃ (gm)	47.31	48.90	48.71	46.21	46.29	48.87
Wt. of Wet Sample + Cont., W ₄ (gm)	241.15	245.55	248.35	250.34	253.45	252.33
Wt. of Dry Sample + Cont., W ₅ (gm)	281.31	287.90	293.71	292.31	298.29	261.87
Wt. of water, W ₆ =(W ₄ -W ₅) (gm)	57.84	57.65	54.64	58.03	55.16	90.46
Wt. of Dry Sample, W ₇ =(W ₅ -W ₃) (gm)	234.0	239.0	245.0	246.0	252.0	213.0
Moisture content w = W ₆ /W ₇ (%)	24.72	24.12	22.30	23.59	21.89	42.49
Dry Density γ _d = W ₇ /(1+w/100) (gm/cc)	1.492	1.498	1.610	1.605	1.661	1.656


Sr. No.	Penetration (mm)	Mould No. 25		Mould No. 25		Mould No. 26	
		Proving ring Reading	Corrected load (kg)	Proving ring Reading	Corrected load (kg)	Proving ring Reading	Corrected load (kg)
1	0.5	2	3.25	2	10.05	3	10.05
2	1.0	3	6.70	5	16.75	6	20.10
3	1.5	4	10.05	7	23.45	8	26.60
4	2.0	5	13.40	8	26.80	10	33.50
5	2.5	6	16.75	10	33.50	12	40.20
6	3.0	7	20.10	11	36.85	13	43.55
7	4.0	8	23.45	14	46.90	16	53.80
8	5.0	9	26.80	16	53.80	18	60.30
9	7.5	10	33.50	19	63.65	21	70.35
10	10.0	11	36.85	20	69.0	24	73.70
11	12.5	12	36.85	22	73.7	25	77.05

Mould No.	Corrected Load in kg			CBR % reported
	2.5 mm	5.0 mm	2.5 mm	
25	16.75	26.80	1.32	2.82
26	23.45	33.50	1.44	2.82
26	40.20	50.30	2.72	2.82
Average				




b) CBR Test with Geotextile

CALIFORNIA BEARING RATIO (IS 1713 (PART 1) & 4571:10-1-11)							
Laboratory Job No.	235		Date of Sampling	25/02/24			
Location/Source	130+700 LHS		Sampled by	Jointly			
Type of Material	with Geotextile		Tested by	Jointly			
Proposed use			Date of Casting	4/03/24			
Period of Soaking	96 Hours		Date of Testing	8/03/24			
MOISTURE CONTENT AND UNIT WEIGHT OF TEST SAMPLES							
	Mould No. 25		Mould No. 26		Mould No. 34		
No. of layers	5	5	5	5	5	5	
No. of blows per layer	10	10	30	30	65	65	
CONDITION OF SAMPLE							
WT. of Mould, W	Before soaking	After soaking	Before soaking	After soaking	Before soaking	After soaking	
WT. of Wet Sample, W ₁ (W ₁ W ₁) (gm)	6741	6741	6880	6880	7070	7070	
WT. of Wet Sample + Mould, W ₂ (gm)	10913	11016	11246	11403	11613	11620	
Volume of mould, V (cc)	4172	4275	4466	4523	4543	4550	
WT. of Wet Sample, W ₃ (W ₃ W ₃) (gm)	2250	2250	2250	2250	2250	2250	
WT. Density, γ _w = W ₃ /V (gm/cc)	1.854	1.900	1.985	2.010	2.109	2.022	
MOISTURE DETERMINATION							
Container No.	5	6	22	26	25	22	
WT. of container, W ₄ (gm)	45.30	46.80	42.61	48.70	48.71	46.23	
WT. of Wet Sample + Cont., W ₅ (gm)	292.56	292.06	310.58	353.95	307.01	303.79	
WT. of Dry Sample + Cont., W ₆ (gm)	248.86	242.65	262.37	294.55	261.25	253.12	
WT. of water, W ₅ (W ₅ W ₅) (gm)	43.70	49.41	48.21	59.40	45.76	46.67	
WT. of Dry Sample, W ₆ (W ₆ W ₆) (gm)	205.16	193.25	214.16	245.15	215.49	206.45	
Moisture content, W = W ₅ /W ₆ (%)	21.47	25.73	22.53	24.16	21.53	22.13	
Dry Density γ _d = W ₆ /(1+W/100) (gm/cc)	1.526	1.517	1.627	1.619	1.661	1.656	
LOAD-PENETRATION TEST DATA:							
Proving Ring Calibration Factor:							
Sr No.	Penetration (mm)	Mould No. 25		Mould No. 26		Mould No. 34	
		Proving ring Reading	Corrected load (kg)	Proving ring Reading	Corrected load (kg)	Proving ring Reading	Corrected load (kg)
1	0.5	3	3.35	4	10.05	3	10.05
2	1.0	5	10.05	5	13.40	6	20.10
3	1.5	6	13.40	7	16.75	9	30.15
4	2.0	8	16.75	8	20.10	11	36.85
5	2.5	9	20.10	9	23.45	13	43.55
6	3.0	11	23.45	11	26.80	14	46.90
7	4.0	14	26.80	13	30.15	16	53.60
8	5.0	18	30.15	15	33.50	18	60.30
9	7.5	23	33.50	18	36.85	21	67.05
10	10.0	30	36.85	19	40.20	23	73.80
11	12.5	38	40.20	20	43.55	24	80.40
CBR CALCULATION							
Mould No.	Corrected Unit Load in gm/cm ² (gm/cm ²)	CBR%	CBR % reported				
25	20-10	30.5	1.47	3.05			
26	20-10	30.5	1.47				
34	20-10	30.5	1.47				
Average:				CBR Value @ 97% MDD 1.69 gm/cc = 42.00%			




c) CBR Test with Fibre

CALIFORNIA BEARING RATIO (IS 1713 (PART 1) & 4571:10-1-11)							
Laboratory Job No.	235		Date of Sampling	05/02/24			
Location/Source	130+700 LHS		Sampled by	Jointly			
Type of Material	with fibre		Tested by	Jointly			
Proposed use			Date of Casting	08/03/24			
Period of Soaking	96 Hours		Date of Testing	12/03/24			
MOISTURE CONTENT AND UNIT WEIGHT OF TEST SAMPLES							
	Mould No. 32		Mould No. 31		Mould No. 35		
No. of layers	5	5	5	5	5	5	
No. of blows per layer	10	10	30	30	65	65	
CONDITION OF SAMPLE							
WT. of Mould, W	Before soaking	After soaking	Before soaking	After soaking	Before soaking	After soaking	
WT. of Wet Sample, W ₁ (W ₁ W ₁) (gm)	6959	6959	7910	7910	7005	7005	
WT. of Wet Sample + Mould, W ₂ (gm)	11097	11164	12277	12334	11521	11575	
Volume of mould, V (cc)	4138	4205	4367	4424	4576	4568	
WT. of Wet Sample, W ₃ (W ₃ W ₃) (gm)	2250	2250	2250	2250	2250	2250	
WT. Density, γ _w = W ₃ /V (gm/cc)	1.839	1.869	1.941	1.966	2.007	2.030	
MOISTURE DETERMINATION							
Container No.	28	27	26	33	39	38	
WT. of container, W ₄ (gm)	40.80	48.15	48.87	48.69	47.37	47.37	
WT. of Wet Sample + Cont., W ₅ (gm)	330.34	316.85	334.15	317.36	368.67	352.28	
WT. of Dry Sample + Cont., W ₆ (gm)	279.94	263.2	282.49	265.27	310.62	293.88	
WT. of water, W ₅ (W ₅ W ₅) (gm)	50.40	53.65	51.66	52.09	58.05	58.40	
WT. of Dry Sample, W ₆ (W ₆ W ₆) (gm)	230.14	215.05	234.12	216.58	262.25	246.5	
Moisture content, W = W ₅ /W ₆ (%)	21.90	24.95	21.85	24.05	22.05	23.69	
Dry Density γ _d = W ₆ /(1+W/100) (gm/cc)	1.609	1.496	1.593	1.585	1.644	1.641	
LOAD-PENETRATION TEST DATA:							
Proving Ring Calibration Factor:							
Sr No.	Penetration (mm)	Mould No. 32		Mould No. 31		Mould No. 35	
		Proving ring Reading	Corrected load (kg)	Proving ring Reading	Corrected load (kg)	Proving ring Reading	Corrected load (kg)
1	0.5	3	3.35	3	3.35	3	10.05
2	1.0	5	10.05	4	10.05	5	16.75
3	1.5	6	13.40	5	13.40	7	23.45
4	2.0	8	16.75	6	16.75	8	26.80
5	2.5	9	20.10	7	20.10	10	33.50
6	3.0	11	23.45	8	23.45	11	36.85
7	4.0	14	26.80	9	30.15	14	46.90
8	5.0	18	30.15	10	33.50	15	50.25
9	7.5	23	33.50	13	36.85	18	60.30
10	10.0	30	36.85	14	40.20	19	67.05
11	12.5	38	40.20	14	43.55	20	73.80
CBR CALCULATION							
Mould No.	Corrected Unit Load in gm/cm ² (gm/cm ²)	CBR%	CBR % reported				
32	20-10	30.5	1.47	2.45			
31	20-10	30.5	1.47				
35	20-10	30.5	1.47				
Average:				CBR Value @ 97% MDD 1.67 gm/cc = 44.00%			




d) CBR Test Black with Plastic Bottle Chips

CALIFORNIA BEARING RATIO (BY TEST METHOD AASTHO-T-193)											
Laboratory Job No.		235		Date of Sampling:		25/02/24					
Location/Source		130 + 700 LHS		Sampled by:		Taiminthy					
Type of Material:		Black Soil + Plaster chips		Tested by:		Taiminthy					
Proposed use:				Year of Casting:		28/02/24					
Period of Soaking:		96 Hours		Date of Testing:		03/03/24					
MOISTURE CONTENT AND UNIT WEIGHT OF TEST SAMPLES											
No. of layers	Mould No. 20		Mould No. 21		Mould No. 25						
	Before soaking	After soaking	Before soaking	After soaking	Before soaking	After soaking	Before soaking	After soaking	Before soaking	After soaking	
WT. of Moist. W	7072	7072	6795	6795	6925	6925	6925	6925	6925	6925	
WT. of Wet Sample + Moist. W ₁ (gm)	11149	11228	11266	11318	11490	11511	11511	11511	11511	11511	
WT. of Wet Sample + Cont. W ₂ (gm)	4147	4226	4471	4523	4565	4565	4565	4565	4565	4565	
Volume of moist. V (cc)	2250	2250	2250	2250	2250	2250	2250	2250	2250	2250	
Wet Density, γ _w = W ₁ /V (gm/cc)	1.852	1.878	1.987	2.010	2.009	2.009	2.009	2.009	2.009	2.009	
MOISTURE DETERMINATION											
Container No.	21		25		28		27		30		
WT. of container, W ₃ (gm)	48.21	50.20	47.37	48.21	48.40	47.39	47.39	47.39	47.39	47.39	
WT. of Wet Sample + Cont. W ₄ (gm)	274.71	288.09	285.23	292.8	293.78	293.78	293.78	293.78	293.78	293.78	
WT. of Dry Sample + Cont. W ₅ (gm)	236.77	248.79	243.22	246.84	246.84	246.84	246.84	246.84	246.84	246.84	
WT. of water, W ₆ = (W ₄ - W ₅) (gm)	37.94	39.30	42.01	46.06	46.94	46.94	46.94	46.94	46.94	46.94	
WT. of Dry Sample, W ₇ = (W ₅ - W ₆) (gm)	198.83	209.49	201.21	200.78	200.90	200.90	200.90	200.90	200.90	200.90	
Moisture content, w = W ₆ /W ₇ (%)	20.12	23.56	21.45	23.15	23.50	23.50	23.50	23.50	23.50	23.50	
Dry Density γ _d = W ₇ /V (gm/cc)	1.534	1.520	1.636	1.632	1.67	1.67	1.67	1.67	1.67	1.67	
LOAD - PENETRATION TEST DATA:											
Proving Ring Calibration Factor: 3.35											
S. No.	Penetration (mm)	Mould No. 20		Mould No. 21		Mould No. 25					
		Proving ring Reading	Corrected load (kg)	Proving ring Reading	Corrected load (kg)	Proving ring Reading	Corrected load (kg)	Proving ring Reading	Corrected load (kg)	Proving ring Reading	Corrected load (kg)
1	0.5	4	13.40	5	16.05	7	23.45				
2	1.0	6	20.10	9	30.15	10	33.50				
3	1.5	9	30.15	12	40.20	15	50.25				
4	2.0	12	40.20	15	50.25	17	56.95				
5	2.5	14	46.90	17	56.95	19	63.65				
6	3.0	16	53.60	19	63.65	20	67.00				
7	4.0	18	60.30	20	67.00	22	73.70				
8	5.0	19	63.65	22	73.70	24	80.40				
9	7.5	21	70.35	24	80.40	27	90.45				
10	10.0	22	73.70	24	80.40	28	93.80				
11	12.5	22	73.70	24	80.40	28	93.80				
CBR CALCULATION											
Mould No.	20	21	25								
Corrected Unit Load in 2.5 mm	60.30	3.18	2.93								
Corrected Unit Load in 5.0 mm	67.00	3.40	3.26								
Average	63.65	3.44	3.57								
CBR %		4.0									
Notes: 1) Graph for load vs penetration attached 2) CBR = (corrected load/standard load) x 100 3) Standard unit load: @ 2.5mm Penetration = 1370 kg @ 5.0mm Penetration = 2055 kg CBR Value @ 97% MDD 1.635 gm/cc = 4.00%											



e) CBR test with Plastic Bottle Ring

CALIFORNIA BEARING RATIO (BY TEST METHOD AASTHO-T-193)											
Laboratory Job No.		235		Date of Sampling:		25/02/24					
Location/Source		130 + 700 LHS		Sampled by:		Taiminthy					
Type of Material:		with Plastic Rings		Tested by:		Taiminthy					
Proposed use:				Year of Casting:		28/02/24					
Period of Soaking:		96 Hours		Date of Testing:		03/03/24					
MOISTURE CONTENT AND UNIT WEIGHT OF TEST SAMPLES											
No. of layers	Mould No. 20		Mould No. 21		Mould No. 25						
	Before soaking	After soaking	Before soaking	After soaking	Before soaking	After soaking	Before soaking	After soaking	Before soaking	After soaking	
WT. of Moist. W	7000	7000	7060	7060	6800	6800	6800	6800	6800	6800	
WT. of Wet Sample + Moist. W ₁ (gm)	11095	11167	11482	11511	11116	11116	11116	11116	11116	11116	
WT. of Wet Sample + Cont. W ₂ (gm)	41095	4167	4482	4484	4516	4516	4516	4516	4516	4516	
Volume of moist. V (cc)	2250	2250	2250	2250	2250	2250	2250	2250	2250	2250	
Wet Density, γ _w = W ₁ /V (gm/cc)	1.820	1.852	1.982	1.982	1.916	1.916	1.916	1.916	1.916	1.916	
MOISTURE DETERMINATION											
Container No.	21		25		22		22		26		
WT. of container, W ₃ (gm)	47.21	48.4	48.77	48.31	48.15	48.15	48.15	48.15	48.15	48.15	
WT. of Wet Sample + Cont. W ₄ (gm)	282.27	300.60	306.48	312.71	312.87	312.87	312.87	312.87	312.87	312.87	
WT. of Dry Sample + Cont. W ₅ (gm)	243.22	251.20	261.13	261.76	265.28	265.28	265.28	265.28	265.28	265.28	
WT. of water, W ₆ = (W ₄ - W ₅) (gm)	39.05	49.40	45.35	50.95	47.59	47.59	47.59	47.59	47.59	47.59	
WT. of Dry Sample, W ₇ = (W ₅ - W ₆) (gm)	198.83	202.4	212.46	210.81	217.69	217.69	217.69	217.69	217.69	217.69	
Moisture content, w = W ₆ /W ₇ (%)	21.30	24.12	21.35	24.18	21.84	21.84	21.84	21.84	21.84	21.84	
Dry Density γ _d = W ₇ /V (gm/cc)	1.500	1.492	1.619	1.612	1.663	1.663	1.663	1.663	1.663	1.663	
LOAD - PENETRATION TEST DATA:											
Proving Ring Calibration Factor: 3.35											
S. No.	Penetration (mm)	Mould No. 20		Mould No. 21		Mould No. 25					
		Proving ring Reading	Corrected load (kg)	Proving ring Reading	Corrected load (kg)	Proving ring Reading	Corrected load (kg)	Proving ring Reading	Corrected load (kg)	Proving ring Reading	Corrected load (kg)
1	0.5	2	6.70	3	10.05	4	13.40				
2	1.0	3	10.05	5	16.75	8	23.45				
3	1.5	5	16.75	8	23.45	10	33.50				
4	2.0	7	23.45	10	33.50	12	40.20				
5	2.5	8	26.80	12	36.85	14	46.90				
6	3.0	9	30.15	13	43.55	15	50.25				
7	4.0	10	33.50	14	46.90	17	56.95				
8	5.0	11	36.85	16	50.25	19	63.65				
9	7.5	12	40.20	18	53.60	22	73.70				
10	10.0	12	40.20	18	53.60	24	80.40				
11	12.5	12	40.20	18	53.60	24	80.40				
CBR CALCULATION											
Mould No.	20	21	25								
Corrected Unit Load in 2.5 mm	33.50	1.71	1.63								
Corrected Unit Load in 5.0 mm	40.20	1.69	2.91								
Average	36.85	1.70	2.27								
CBR %		3.45									
Notes: 1) Graph for load vs penetration attached 2) CBR = (corrected load/standard load) x 100 3) Standard unit load: @ 2.5mm Penetration = 1370 kg @ 5.0mm Penetration = 2055 kg CBR Value @ 97% MDD 1.635 gm/cc = 3.45%											



IV. RESULT ANALYSIS

A. Free Swell Index Result Analysis

Here's an analysis of the Free Swell Index test results :

- Free Swell Index: The Free Swell Index of the soil sample is 57.70%. A free swell index greater than 30% indicates a high swelling potential
- Interpretation:

The high Free Swell Index suggests that the soil sample has a high potential to swell when saturated with water. This can cause problems with foundations and other structures built on this soil, as the swelling soil can cause cracking and movement.

B. Liquid Limit Result Analysis

Atterberg Limits

- Liquid Limit (LL): The Liquid Limit is 65.50%. This is the moisture content at which the soil changes from a liquid state to a plastic state
- Plastic Limit (PL): The Plastic Limit is 27.40%. This is the moisture content at which the Soil changes from a plastic state to a brittle state .
- Plasticity Index (PI): The Plasticity Index (PI) is calculated as the difference between the
- Liquid Limit (LL) and the Plastic Limit (PL). In this case, the PI is $65.50\% - 27.40\% = 38.10\%$. A higher PI value indicates a more plastic soil.

C. Grain Size Analysis Result Analysis

Here's an analysis of the grain size distribution:

- Gravel(75-19 mm): 1.60% of the sample falls into the gravel size category.
- Sand (4.75-0.075 mm): 10.9% of the sample falls into the sand size category. This can be Further broken down into: Coarse sand (4.75-2.00 mm): 0.90% ,Medium sand (2.00-0.425 mm): 4.7% & Fine sand (0.425-0.075 mm): 5.3%
- Silt and Clay (particles smaller than 0.075 mm): 87.5% of the sample falls into the silt And clay size category.

D. Modified Proctor Test Result Analysis

- Dry Density (g/cm^3): The data sheet shows the Dry Density for five different moisture Content values. The Dry Density increases as the moisture content increases up to a certain Point, and then starts to decrease. The highest Dry Density is 1.695 g/cm^3 at a moisture Content of 22.00%, which is considered the Maximum Dry Density (MDD).
- Optimum Moisture Content (OMC): The Optimum Moisture Content (OMC) is the Moisture content at which the Maximum Dry Density (MDD) is achieved. In this case, the OMC is 22.00%

E. Cbr Test Result Analysis Noramal Black Soil

The report shows the results of the CBR test for three soil samples (moulds 24, 25, and 26).

The CBR values for the three samples are:

- Mould 24: 16.75 corrected load at 2.5 mm penetration, 26.80 corrected load at 5.0 mm Penetration
- Mould 25: 33.50 corrected load at 2.5 mm penetration, 53.60 corrected load at 5.0mm penetration
- Mould 26: 40.20 corrected load at 2.5 mm penetration, 60.30 corrected load at 5.0 mm penetration
- The CBR values are all relatively low, which indicates that the soils are weak and may not be Suitable for use in pavements without additional treatment. The report does not specify what The soils will be used for, but the CBR values are typically used to design the thickness of Pavement layers.
- CBR VALUE IS :- 2.82%

F. CBR Test Result Analysis Black Soil + Geotextile

The report shows the results of the CBR test for three soil samples (moulds, 25, 26, and 34). The

CBR values for the three samples are:

- Penetration Mould 25: 20.10corrected load at 2.5 mm penetration, 30.15 corrected Load at 5.0 mm
- Penetration Mould 26: 30.15 corrected load at 2.5 mmpenetratiooa50.25 corrected Load at 5.0 mm
- Penetration Mould 34: 43.55 corrected load at 2.5 mm penetration, 60.30 corrected Load at 5.0 mm
- Penetration The CBR values are all relatively low, which indicates that the soils are weak and

May not be suitable for use in pavements without additional treatment. The report does not

Specify what the soils will be used for, but the CBR values are typically used to design the

Thickness of Pavement layers

CBR VALUE IS :- 3.05%

G. CBR Test Result Analysis Black Soil + Fiber

The report shows the results of the CBR test for three soil samples (moulds, 33, 31, and 35). The CBR values for the three samples are:

- Penetration Mould 33: 16.75 corrected load at 2.5 mm penetration, 26.80 corrected load at 5.0 mm
- Penetration Mould 31: 20.10 corrected load at 2.5 mm penetration, 33.50 corrected load at 5.0 mm
- Penetration Mould 35: 33.50 corrected load at 2.5 mm penetration, 50.25 corrected load at 5.0 mm
- Penetration The CBR values are all relatively low, which indicates that the soils are weak and may not be suitable for use in pavements without additional treatment. The report does not specify what the soils will be used for, but the CBR values are typically used to design the thickness of Pavement layers
- CBR VALUE IS :- 2.40%

H. CBR Test Result Analysis Black Soil + Plastic Chips

The report shows the results of the CBR test for three soil samples (moulds, 20, 21, and 25). The CBR values for the three samples are:

- Penetration Mould 20: 43.55 corrected load at 2.5 mm penetration, 60.30 corrected load at 5.0 mm
- Penetration Mould 21: 46.90 corrected load at 2.5 mm penetration, 67.00 corrected load at 5.0 mm
- Penetration Mould 25: 56.95 corrected load at 2.5 mm penetration, 73.70 corrected load at 5.0 mm
- Penetration The CBR values are all relatively low, which indicates that the soils are weak and may not be suitable for use in pavements without additional treatment. The report does not specify what the soils will be used for, but the CBR values are typically used to design the thickness of Pavement layers
- CBR VALUE IS : 4.00 %

I. CBR Test Result Analysis Black Soil + Plastic Rings

The report shows the results of the CBR test for three soil samples (moulds, 30, 34, and 31). The CBR values for the three samples are:

- Penetration Mould 25: 23.45 corrected load at 2.5 mm penetration, 33.50 corrected load at 5.0 mm
- Penetration Mould 26: 36.85 corrected load at 2.5 mm penetration, 60.30 corrected load at 5.0 mm
- Penetration Mould 34: 46.90 corrected load at 2.5 mm penetration, 63.65 corrected load at 5.0 mm
- Penetration The CBR values are all relatively low, which indicates that the soils are weak and May not be suitable for use in pavements without additional treatment. The report does not Specify what the soils will be used for, but the CBR values are typically used to design the Thickness of Pavement layers
- CBR VALUE IS :- 3.35 %

V. CONCLUSION

Black cotton soil, despite its weakness, can be boosted for embankments using plastic waste. Crushed plastic or strips mixed in the soil improve its strength and reduce swelling. This creates a Stronger, more stable material for building embankments. However, this method doesn't address the core issue for subgrades – shrinkage and swelling with Moisture changes. Embankments sit above ground with less water exposure, but subgrades are Directly impacted by seasonal variations. The treated soil might still experience these drastic volume Changes, causing cracks and compromising the structural integrity of the road or building above.

In short, plastic waste strengthens black cotton soil for embankments, but it doesn't address the Moisture sensitivity that plagues subgrades.

REFERENCES

- [1] Tingle, J. S. And Jersey, S. R. (2005). "Cyclic plate load testing of geosynthetic reinforced Unbounded aggregate roads." Transportation Research Record: Journal of the Transportation Research Board, No. 1936, Transportation Research Board of the National Academies, Washington ,D.C., pp. 60-69
- [2] MILAD SAGHEBFAR (2014). "PERFORMANCE OF GEOTEXTILE-REINFORCED BASES FOR PAVED ROADS". Transportation Research Record: Journal of the Transportation Research Board. Upload by Milad saghebfar.
- [3] Bayomy, F. M., Al-Shaikh, A. M., and Abduljawwad, S. N. (1996). "Effect of geotextile on Permanent deformation in salt-encrusted subgrade soils." Transportation Research Record: Journal of The Transportation Research Board, No. 1534, Transportation Research Board, Washington, D.C., pp.40-49.
- [4] Bhutta, S. A. (1998). "Mechanistic-empirical pavement design procedure for geosynthetically Stabilized flexible pavements." Ph.D. dissertation, Virginia Tech., Blacksburg, VA



- [5] Brandon, T. L., Al-Qadi, L. L., Lacina, B. A., and Bhutta, S. A. (2005). "Construction and Instrumentation of geosynthetically stabilized secondary road test sections." Transportation Research Record: Journal of the Transportation Research Board, No. 1534, Transportation Research Board, Washington, D.C. pp.50-57.
- [6] BHBouacha, N.; Bouguerra, A.; Bouafia, (2023) Improving the Resilience Of the Road Network in Algeria A Comparative Analysis of Flexible, Geosynthetically Reinforced, and Rigid 14426.<https://doi.org/10.3390/Su151914426>
- [7] Dr. Umesh Sharma, Abhishek Kanaoungob, And Ankita Khatri (2018). Application of Geotextiles In Pavement Drainage Systems" International Journal of Civil Engineering Research. ISSN 2278-3652 Volume 5, Number 4 (2014), pp. 385- 390 Research India Publications <http://www.ripublication.com/ijcer.html>
- [8] Dr. P. Senthil Kumar, R. Rajkumar (2012). "Effect of Geotextile on CBR Strength of Unpaved Road with Soft Subgrade". Electronic Journal of Geotechnical Engineering, Volume 17. Uploaded by rajkumar Ramasamy.
- [9] R. M. Tailor, M.D. Desai and N. C. Shah, (2011) "Geotextile as reinforcement in flexible Pavement for swelling" Proceedings of Indian Geotechnical Conference December 15-17, 2011, Kochi(PaperNo.J-230.).
- [10] Nikhil Verma, Prateek Malik (2015). "Use of Geosynthetic Material To Improve the Properties of Subgrade Soil" ISSN: 2278-0181, Vol. 4
- [11] Debasree Paul, Tarikul Islam, Mir Muhammad Fahad and Engr. Md. Eanamul Haque Nizam (2017), "Geotextiles-A Potential Technical Textile Product". The Journal of Scientific and Engineering Research November 2017.uploaded by Tarikul Islam.
- [12] Ravindra Kumar, Utsav Singh, Priyanshu Saini, Varun Sharma and Matloob Ali (2020). A Study Review on Geosynthetics use on Flexible Pavement Design ".Published by International Journal of Engineering Research & Technology (IJERT) ISSN: 2278-0181. Vol. 9 Issue 06, June-2020
- [13] Natika Farooq, Er. Manish Kaushal(2022). "Use of Geosynthetic to improve the property of flexible Pavements". International Journal of Engineering Research & Technology (IJERT). Volume 10



10.22214/IJRASET



45.98



IMPACT FACTOR:
7.129



IMPACT FACTOR:
7.429



INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL FOR RESEARCH

IN APPLIED SCIENCE & ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY

Call : 08813907089  (24*7 Support on Whatsapp)