

# Sustainable Study of Local Lateritic Soils Compressibility

Robert Medjo Eko<sup>1</sup>, Lezin Seba Minsili<sup>2\*</sup>, Etone Maka Alexandre Dodo<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Senior Geotechnical Engineer, Ph.D., Associate Professor, Department of Earth Sciences, Faculty of Sciences, The University of Yaoundé I

<sup>2</sup> IABSE Member, Senior Structural Engineer, Ph.D., Senior Lecturer; LMM Laboratory, ENSP, The University of Yaoundé I; P.O. Box 8390 Yaoundé Cameroon

<sup>3</sup> Postgraduate Student, Ms. Sc. in Geotechnical Engineering, Department of Earth Sciences, Faculty of Sciences, The University of Yaoundé I

---

## ABSTRACT

An investigation on the compressibility and settlement duration of a lateritic soil of Yaoundé, Cameroon, was performed to check on its ease to carry loads of civil engineering structures. The increase in settlement with water content is more accentuated with a stronger load than a weaker one. The compaction also considerably decreases the compressibility of these soils, rendering the action of water almost null on the variation of settlement except when the compaction is not made with the optimum Proctor. These significant observations compel us to consider only, for a lateritic soil or another soil, the compressibility characteristics under immersion conditions. The findings of this work agree with the principle of the oedometric test described in the French Standard NF P 94 900.

*Keywords: lateritic, water content, compression index, compaction, consolidation.*

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Lateritic soils are in abundance in the intertropical zones. They are soft soils with color varying from red to yellow, rich in alumina and iron oxides and which harden when they are exposed to free air [1 – 3]. These soils represent a significant source of materials for the works of engineering structures such as roads, bridges and dams [4]. Their strong thickness places them naturally as the principal support of civil engineering works. When their initial structure is changed through external effects, these soils are called compressible and the process results in their settlement. This settlement phenomenon of soils sometimes causes damages on buildings like cracking of walls, collapse of buildings, and sometimes rutting of roadways. One of the various causes of this phenomenon is the variation of the water content in soils due to the variability of the country yearly water fall and the change in velocities of water absorption of different sub-soils. Several studies on the behavior of lateritic soils only take into account the saturated state to tackle the variation in soil settlement [5 – 7].

This research work employs alternative experimental approaches such as compressibility and settlement of local available lateritic soils in order to solve their engineering related problems.

\* Tel.: +237 77922659; fax: +237 22224547.

E-mail address: [lezinsm@yahoo.com](mailto:lezinsm@yahoo.com).

## 2. METHODOLOGY

Compaction tests carried out employed odometer compression rules in accordance with standards and regulations defined by AFNOR (Association Française de NORMALisation, French Standard Agency). The odometer compression test was equally carried out as one of the major tests in this study. This test, performed in the loading stage (24 hours), consisted of:

- Putting the sample in a rigid envelope;
- Exerting a vertical pressure on its upper end using a piston;
- Measuring, at the end of each loading stage after consolidation, the depression leading to the determination of various characteristics of compressibility pertaining to the analyzed soil sample [8 – 10].

These tests were carried out on an undisturbed samples (US) taken from a lateritic profile of Yaoundé (Fig. 1), and on compacted samples (CS) carried out in the laboratory using results of Proctor compaction tests. The analysis of these samples with the odometer was done at different water content. For US, two cases of water content were retained: the natural water content (i.e. without water addition in the odometric cell) and the saturated state. In the case of compacted samples, the samples were prepared using three values of the optimal water content ( $w_{opm}$ ): 80%, 100% and 120%.




Fig. 1 . Experimental setup: a) Sampling site; b) US sampling process; c) Conservation of US; d) Battery of odometers.

### 2.1 Experimental Setup.

The tests were carried out on two categories of samples, by means of a battery of three loading sets with weight automatics odometers (Fig. 1.d). Each apparatus comprises a cell made up with a laterally rigid ring with smooth interior walls. The ring is equipped with a cylindrical case that can receive a test-tube of 50 mm diameter and 20 mm thickness, placed between two porous stones. The whole system is placed inside a rigid vat at the bottom of which rests a lower porous stone. The vertical load is applied to the test-tube by means of a piston, on the base of which is fixed the upper porous stone. The piston slides on the ring with a weak play and a negligible friction and the load, applied by means of a weight, which is then transmitted to the test-tube by a rigid lever which takes support on the head of the piston.

### 2.2 Experimental Protocol

The execution of each test was made in accordance with the procedure recommended by Mieussens et al. [8]. However, some adjustments were made with respect to unsaturated compacted samples to accommodate the sizes of test tubes in the odometric ring.

### 3. RESULTS AND INTERPRETATION

#### 3.1 Classification of samples

The Anglo-Saxon classification HRB (Highway Research Board), based on the Atterberg limit values and the granulometry data [11], allowed us to classify the analyzed samples into A-7-5 (17), A-7-5 (6) and A-7-5 (4) classes for sample sites EK I, EK II and EK III respectively. Physical parameters obtained and the granulometric distribution of these samples are presented in Fig. 2 and Table 1.




**Fig. 2 . Granulometric curves of analyzed samples**

**Table 1. Parameters identification of analyzed samples**

| PHYSICAL PARAMETERS                 |       |       |        |
|-------------------------------------|-------|-------|--------|
|                                     | EK I  | EK II | EK III |
| $W_L$                               | 73,61 | 67,76 | 62,4   |
| $I_p$                               | 40,27 | 34,47 | 18,33  |
| $d_a$                               | 1,32  | 1,48  | 1,29   |
| $d_r$                               | 2,71  | 2,84  | 2,67   |
| $w$ (%)                             | 27,74 | 14,27 | 21,67  |
| $\gamma_h$ (kN/m <sup>3</sup> )     | 16,8  | 16,9  | 15,7   |
| $\gamma_d$ (kN/m <sup>3</sup> )     | 13,2  | 14,8  | 12,9   |
| $\gamma_s$ (kN/m <sup>3</sup> )     | 27,1  | 28,4  | 26,7   |
| $\gamma_{sat}$ (kN/m <sup>3</sup> ) | 18,3  | 19,6  | 18,1   |
| $e$                                 | 1,06  | 0,92  | 1,07   |
| $n$ (%)                             | 51    | 48    | 52     |
| $c$ (%)                             | 49    | 52    | 48     |
| $w_{sat}$ (%)                       | 39,02 | 32,27 | 39,95  |
| $S_r$ (%)                           | 79,46 | 37,14 | 61,72  |

$W_L$ = liquid limit ;  $I_p$ = plasticity index ;  $d_a$ = apparent density;  $d_r$ = real density;  $\gamma_h$ = wet voluminal weight;  $\gamma_d$ = dry voluminal weight;  $\gamma_s$ = voluminal weight of solid constituents;  $\gamma_{sat}$ = voluminal weight of saturated soil; **e= void ratio**;  $n$ = porosity;  $c$ = compacity;  $w_{sat}$ = saturation water content;  $S_r$ = saturation degree.

### 3.2 Compaction

A compaction test is done to simulate the conditions under which the utilized material would be used for the construction of platforms or fills. According to BCEOM (Bureau Central d'étude pour les Equipements d'Outre-Mer, *Central Studies Office for Overseas Infrastructures*) and CEBTP (Centre Expérimental de recherche et d'étude des Bâtiments et Travaux Publiques, *Experimental Research and Study Centre for Buildings and Public Works*), values of CBR (California Bearing Ratio), presented in Table 2, place the soils of Yaounde in classes S2 (EK I and EK III) and S4 (EK II). These research offices estimated that materials of class S2 ( $5 < CBR < 10$ ) can be used for the construction of embankments, while those of class S4 ( $15 < CBR < 30$ ) could be well used for the construction of the foundation and roadbed for light traffics [12, 13].

**Table 2. Values of compaction tests**

|         | EK I                            |           | EK II                           |           | EK III                          |           |
|---------|---------------------------------|-----------|---------------------------------|-----------|---------------------------------|-----------|
|         | $\gamma_{dmax}$<br>( $kN/m^3$ ) | $W_{opm}$ | $\gamma_{dmax}$<br>( $kN/m^3$ ) | $W_{opm}$ | $\gamma_{dmax}$<br>( $kN/m^3$ ) | $W_{opm}$ |
| Proctor | 17,15                           | 20.5      | 19,2                            | 15,9      | 18,6                            | 14,8      |
| CBR     | 8%                              |           | 23%                             |           | 9%                              |           |

### 3.3 Compressibility

Tables 3 and 4 shows that, the water content increment in studied lateritic soils causes an increase of compression ( $C_c$ ) and swelling index ( $C_g$ ) [14, 15] with a reduction in the **void ratio** ( $e$ ) under constant load. Moreover, this variation of water content seems not to affect the consolidation stress ( $\sigma'_p$ ) in the case of **US** and not **CS**. This variation of the consolidation stress with water content for compacted samples could be the result of compaction errors. These errors are possibly due to human factors of the experimenter while performing the Proctor test.

**Table 3. Results of US compressibility**

| Characteristics of compressibility | EK I  |       | EK II |       | EK III |       |
|------------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------|-------|
|                                    | sat   | Usat  | sat   | Usat  | sat    | Usat  |
| $C_c$                              | 0.376 | 0.348 | 0.376 | 0.199 | 0.294  | 0.282 |
| $C_g$                              | 0.014 | 0.009 | 0.009 | 0.003 | 0.019  | 0.010 |
| $\sigma'_p$ (bars)                 | 0.55  | 0.55  | 1,00  | 1,00  | 1,40   | 1,40  |
| $e$                                | 0.970 | 1,140 | 0.898 | 0.960 | 0.855  | 1,010 |

**Table 4. Results of CS compressibility.**

| Characteristics of | EK I |      |      |      | EK II |      |      |      | EK III |      |      |      |
|--------------------|------|------|------|------|-------|------|------|------|--------|------|------|------|
|                    | 90%  | 110% | 100% | 100% | 90%   | 110% | 100% | 100% | 90%    | 110% | 100% | 100% |

| compressibility    | $W_{opm}$<br>(usat) | $W_{opm}$<br>(usat) | $W_{opm}$<br>(usat) | $W_{opm}$<br>(sat) | $W_{opm}$<br>(usat) | $W_{opm}$<br>(usat) | $W_{opm}$<br>(usat) | $W_{opm}$<br>(sat) | $W_{opm}$<br>(usat) | $W_{opm}$<br>(usat) | $W_{opm}$<br>(usat) | $W_{opm}$<br>(sat) |
|--------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|--------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|--------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|--------------------|
| Cc                 | 0.048               | 0.060               | 0.049               | 0.051              | 0.081               | 0.074               | 0.068               | 0.074              | 0.061               | 0.076               | 0.066               | 0.054              |
| Cg                 | 0.004               | 0.007               | 0.008               | 0.009              | 0.007               | 0.007               | 0.006               | 0.006              | 0.014               | 0.018               | 0.007               | 0.011              |
| $\sigma'_p$ (bars) | 0.74                | 0.50                | 0.35                | 0.70               | 1.00                | 0.70                | 0.85                | 0.70               | 0.37                | 0.45                | 1.20                | 0.90               |
| e                  | 0.759               | 0.596               | 0.586               | 0.547              | 0.578               | 0.534               | 0.460               | 0.458              | 0.516               | 0.602               | 0.458               | 0.452              |




**Fig. 3.** curves of compressibility for (a) **US** and (b) **CS**

### 3.4 Settlement Analysis

Settlement calculations are done according to the Terzaghi law.

$$s = \frac{H_0}{1 + e_0} \left[ Cg \times \log \left( \frac{\sigma'_p}{\sigma'_{v0}} \right) + Cc \times \log \left( \frac{\sigma'_{v0} + \Delta \sigma'}{\sigma'_p} \right) \right]$$

where  $H_0$  is the average thickness of the horizon and  $\sigma'_{v0}$  is the original constraint. Their values are respectively 0.168 bar and 200 cm for EK I, 0.76 bar and 250 cm for EK II, and 1.22 bar and 400 cm for EKIII.

The settlement variation curves, as function of the load, shows that the settlement value increases with water content and especially that, this increase is as larger as the value of the **load**. This implies that the settlement induced by lower pressure (stresses) on the soil is less affected by the water content variation than that of the settlement induced by high pressure on the soil. With regard to compacted samples, the curves of Figure 4.a show that the ground with high CBR (EK II) is least affected by the variation of settlement when we change from one state of water content to another (saturated or unsaturated). The thickness of the compacted bed taken at 70 cm according to Bufalo *et al* [16], the curves of Fig. 4.a (CS EK III) show that the settlement is higher when the compaction is not made with the Proctor optimum [17]. The time of settlement here is given by the relation:  $t = \frac{H_0^2 \times Tv}{4 \times Cv}$ .




**Fig. 4.** Settlement (s) diagrams as function of load (a), and of time (b).

150

151 Fig. 4.b gives the evolution of settlement in these soils as function of time ( $T_v$ = time  
152 factor;  $C_v$ = consolidation ratio). Concerning the **US**, **we** note that, the duration of settlement

\* Tel.: +237 77922659; fax: +237 22224547.  
E-mail address: [lezinsm@yahoo.com](mailto:lezinsm@yahoo.com).

under weak loads (1 bar) is higher than under high loads (4 bars) when the soil is saturated. This progression of the settlement duration is related to the degree of lubrication of the grains of the soil. When the soil is saturated, friction between the grains is almost null, so under heavy loads, the grains will move faster during settlement. However, the contact area between the grains being higher, the resistance of the soil to settlement might nullify the settlement increment under low pressure. In general, whatever the load, these curves show that the settlement duration increases with the water content. For the CS, we note in general that, the time of settlement is slightly higher for the compactions with 100%  $w_{opm}$  (more precisely for the saturated cases).

#### 4. CONCLUSION

This research work assessed both undisturbed and compacted in-situ local lateritic soils as low cost engineering materials. The results obtained display important geotechnical properties which are widely influenced by environmental, loading conditions and human factors. Considered natural soil samples were saturated and unsaturated, disturbed and undisturbed, and they displayed the following behaviors affecting compaction and settlement:

- the compression and swelling indexes increase with the increment of the water content, and with the reduction in the void ratio under constant load;
- the settlement value increases with water content;
- the settlement induced by lower pressure on the soil is less affected by the water content variation than the one induced by high pressure;
- the duration of settlement under weak loads is higher than the one under high loads when the soil is saturated and undisturbed;
- CS with high CBR are least affected by the variation of settlement when we change from one state of water content to another.

It appears very important and straight forward, for a lateritic soil foundation below an infrastructure, to decrease the pressure exerted on these soils by redesigning dimensions of load application surface, or applied loads intensity and settlement amplitudes, when the soil is saturated in order to comply with existing safety requirements. For the design and construction of traffic loads above platforms, the materials with strong CBR would be adapted due to the fact that, their settlement varies very little depending on whether they are compacted with the optimum Proctor or not.

#### REFERENCES

1. Aubert G. Les sols latéritiques. Extrait des actes et comptes rendu du Ve congrès international de la science du sol, Léopoldville, 16 – 21 août 1954, volume I, pp.103 – 118.
2. Maignien R. Compte rendu des recherches sur les sols latéritiques, 1964. pp. 243.
3. Bilong P. Caractères des sols ferrallitiques à plinthe et à pétroplinthe développés sur roches acides dans la région forestière du sud Cameroun. Comparaison avec les sols développés sur roches basiques. *Cah. Orstom, sér. Pédol.*, vol. XXVII, n°2, 1992 p.203 – 224.
4. Sikali F. et Djalal Mir-Emarati. Utilisation des latérites en technique routière au Cameroun. *Article de revue du labogénie*, n° 16 février 1988, pp. 288.

- 202 5. Bougeon G. et Gunnell Y. La latérite de Buchanan. *Extrait de l'étude et gestion des sols*,  
203 *volume, 12, 2, 2005, pp. 87 – 100.*
- 204 6. Nguetnkam J.-P., Kamga R., Villieras F., Ekodeck G. E. et Yvon J. Altération du granite  
205 en zone tropicale. Exemple de deux séquences étudiées au Cameroun. *Extrait de l'étude*  
206 *et gestion des sols, volume, 14, 1, 2007, pp. 31 – 41.*
- 207 7. Anuchit Uchaipichat. An Elasto-Plastic Model for Unsaturated Soils Including Effect of  
208 Drying and Wetting on Loading Collapse Curve. *Electronic Journal of Geotechnical*  
209 *Engineering, Vol. 16 [2011], Bund. D. p.476-498.*
- 210 8. Mieussens C., Magnan J. P. et Soyez B. Essai de compressibilité à l'œdomètre,  
211 procédures recommandées par les laboratoires des ponts et chaussées, *bulletin liaison*  
212 *labo P. et Ch. 139, sept – oct. 1985, réf 3034.*
- 213 9. Khemissa M. et Magnan J.-P. Variabilité des résultats d'essais œdométrique sur l'argile  
214 molle de Guiche. *Bulletin des laboratoires des ponts et chaussée – 227 – juillet – août*  
215 *2000. réf 4326 – pp. 41 – 50.*
- 216 10. Gao Lei, Zhou Qiu-yue, Yu Xiang-juan, Chen Zhi-hui. Analysis and model prediction of  
217 subgrade settlement for Linhai highway in China. *Electronic Journal of Geotechnical*  
218 *Engineering, Vol. 19 [2014], Bund. A. p.11-2.*
- 219 11. Callaud M. Cours de mécanique des sols – tome 1. *2iE, 2004. pp.137.*
- 220 12. Anonyme. Manuel sur les routes dans les zones tropicales et désertiques. Ministère de  
221 la coopération BECEOM-CEBTP-France. 1975. *Pp 48.*
- 222 13. Ghassemi, Ali Pak, Hadi Shahir. Numerical study of the coupled hydro-mechanical  
223 effects in dynamic compaction of saturated granular soils. *Computers and Geotechnics*,  
224 *Vol. 37 .2010 p.10–24.*
- 225 14. Bakarri A. Observation et modélisation d'ouvrage en terre soumis à des processus de  
226 séchage et 'humidification. *Thèse ENPC. 2007, p.253.*
- 227 15. Fidelis O. OKAFOR and Ugochukwu. N. OKONKWO. Effects of Rice Husk Ash on Some  
228 Geotechnical Properties of Lateritic Soil. *Leonardo Electronic Journal of Practices and*  
229 *Technologies, Issue 15, July-December 2009, p.67-74.*
- 230 16. Bufalo M., Gandile D., Vezole P. Guide pour la réalisation des terrassements des  
231 plateformes de bâtiments et d'aires industrielles dans le cas des sols sensibles à l'eau.  
232 *Syndicat Professionnel des Terrassiers de France. (2009). Pp.42.*
- 233 17. Meissa Fall. Notes sur les matériaux latéritiques et quelques résultats sur les latérites de  
234 Sénégal. *Extrait de thèse de doctorat INPL Nancy-France, 1993.*  
235