

**DETERMINATION OF PLASTIC LIMIT OF SOIL USING MODIFIED CONE
PENETRATION METHOD**

AHMAD SAFUAN BIN A RASHID

UNIVERSITI TEKNOLOGI MALAYSIA

**DETERMINATION OF PLASTIC LIMIT OF SOIL USING MODIFIED CONE
PENETRATION METHOD**

AHMAD SAFUAN BIN A RASHID

**A master's project submitted in fulfillment of the
requirement for award of the degree of
Master of Engineering (Civil-Geotechnic)**

**Faculty of Civil Engineering
Universiti Teknologi Malaysia**

NOVEMBER 2005

Dedicated to my beloved mother, father, family and...especially for my wife

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

First of all, in humble way I wish to give all the Praise to Allah, the Almighty God for with His mercy has given me the strength, blessing and time to complete this work.

I am deeply indebted to Assoc. Prof. Dr. Khairul Anuar Kassim, my supervisors, his patience, supervision, encouragement and thoughtful guidance towards the completion of this thesis. Without his continued support and interest, this thesis would not have been the same as presented here.

I am also wish to express special appreciation to all staff of geotechnical laboratory for their guidance, advices and motivation especially to En Zulkiflie and Pak Samad.

Last but not list, I would like to acknowledge to my beloved mother, Mrs. Sharipah bte Wan Ismail, my father, Mr A Rashid bin Omar, and my family whose, patience and love enabled me to complete this research. And especially grateful for someone who very supportive and caring to me, my lovely wife Suhaila Bte Borhamdin, thank you so much.

ABSTRACT

Plastic limit is an important property of fine-grained soils. The standard thread-rolling method for determining the plastic limit has long been criticized for requiring considerable judgments from the operator. Therefore, this study is conducted to introduce a new method on determining the plastic limit value using the cone penetration method similar to the liquid limit test but with slight modification on the size and the weight of cone. This is to overcome the inconsistency in the standard thread-rolling method to achieve the plastic limit. Three different types of cone with different sizes and weight have been fabricated and tested to determine the plastic limit values. These values were compared with the standard thread-rolling method. Cone (i) is based on the current study with the cone weight of 101.47g and cone angle of 20°. Cone (ii) is proposed by Wood and Wroth (1978) with the cone weight of 240g and cone angle of 30°. Cone (iii) proposed by Tao-Wei Feng (2004) is based on the weight of cone of 80g and angle of cone of 30° with small container; 20-mm diameter and 20-mm deep. Four soil samples from different part of Johor with Plasticity Index (PI) values ranging from 15 to 30 were tested. The soils are Kota Tinggi black clay, Kulai white clay, Kota Tinggi red clay and kaolin clay. Results indicated that, the regression analyses between plastic limit values obtained from thread rolling method and all the cone penetration methods were ranged from 0.9163 to 0.9943. This indicates that all the cones are feasible of performing the plastic limit test. However cone (i) gives the best correlation with the standard thread rolling method compared to other cone methods.

ABSTRAK

Had plastik merupakan sifat yang penting bagi tanah butiran halus. Ujian had plastik piawai yang digunakan dalam menentukan had plastik tanah telah mendapat kritikan kerana kesukaran operator dalam menentukan had plastik tanah. Oleh demikian, kajian ini dijalankan untuk memperkenalkan kaedah baru dalam menentukan nilai had plastik dengan menggunakan kaedah penusukan kon yang seakan-akan sama dengan ujian had cecair tetapi dengan sedikit pengubahsuaian pada saiz dan berat kon. Ini bertujuan untuk mengatasi ketidakkonsistenan dalam kaedah piawai Tiga jenis kon yang berbeza dari segi saiz dan berat telah direka dan digunakan untuk menentukan nilai had plastik. Nilai had plastik tersebut akan dibandingkan dengan kaedah piawai. Kon (i) merupakan kon utama bagi kajian ini, dengan berat bagi kon 101.47 g dan sudut bagi kon 20° . Kon (ii) merupakan kon yang diperkenalkan oleh Wood dan Wroth (1978) dengan berat bagi kon 240 g dan sudut bagi kon 30° . Kon (iii) merupakan kon yang diperkenalkan oleh Tao-Wei Feng (2004) dengan berat bagi kon 80 g dan sudut bagi kon 30° dengan menggunakan bekas yang kecil; diameter 20 mm dan kedalaman 20 mm. Empat jenis sampel tanah dari pelbagai kawasan di Johor dengan nilai Indeks Keplastikan (PI) dalam lingkungan 15 hingga 30 telah digunakan dalam ujikaji ini. Tanah-tanah tersebut adalah tanah liat hitam Kota Tinggi, tanah liat putih Kulai, tanah liat merah Kota Tinggi dan tanah liat kaolin. Berdasarkan daripada analisa, didapati nilai regerasi antara nilai had plastik yang diperoleh dari ujian piawai had plastik dengan ujian penusukan adalah dalam lingkungan 0.9163 hingga 0.9943. Ini bermakna, semua ujian penusukan sesuai digunakan bagi menentukan had plastik dengan kon (i) memberikan hubungkait yang terbaik dengan kaedah piawai berbanding dengan kon yang lain.

TABLE OF CONTENT

| CHAPTER | TITLE | PAGE |
|----------|-------------------------------|-------------|
| | SUPERVISOR DECLARATION | i |
| | TITLE | ii |
| | DECLARATION | iii |
| | DEDICATION | iv |
| | ACKNOWLEDMENT | v |
| | ABSTRACT | vi |
| | ABSTRAK | vii |
| | TABLE OF CONTENT | viii |
| | LIST OF TABLE | xi |
| | LIST OF FIGURE | xiii |
| 1 | INTRODUCTION | |
| | 1.0 Introduction | 1 |
| | 1.1 Objectives | 2 |
| | 1.2 Project Background | 3 |
| | 1.3 Scope of Study | 3 |
| 2 | LITERATURE REVIEW | |
| | 2.1 Introduction | 4 |
| | 2.2 Water Content | 5 |

| | | |
|----------|---|----|
| 2.3 | Liquid and Plastic Limits | 7 |
| 2.3.1 | Liquid Limit Test | 8 |
| 2.3.2 | Plastic Limit Test | 9 |
| 2.4 | Plasticity Chart | 9 |
| 2.5 | Consistency of Clays | 11 |
| 2.6 | Activity of Clays | 12 |
| 2.7 | Cone Penetration Theory | 14 |
| 2.7.1 | Analysis to Determine Bearing Capacity, N_c and N_{ch} | 15 |
| 2.7.2 | The Effect of Heave | 18 |
| 2.7.3 | The Fall Cone Factor, K | 19 |
| 2.7.4 | Determination of ξ | 20 |
| 2.8 | The Fall Cone to Measure the Plastic Limit | 23 |
| 2.8.1 | Previous Study on Cone Penetration Method | 23 |
| a) | Wood and Wroth (1978) | 23 |
| b) | Tao-Wei Feng (2004) | 24 |
| 3 | METHODOLOGY | |
| 3.0 | Introduction | 26 |
| 4 | EQUIPMENT AND TESTING PROCEDURES | |
| 4.1 | Sieve Analysis | 29 |
| 4.2 | Pretreatment | 30 |
| 4.3 | Hydrometer Analysis | 31 |
| 4.4 | Liquid Limit Test | 33 |
| 4.5 | Plastic Limit Test (Standard Method) | 34 |
| 4.6 | Plastic Limit Test (Modified Cone) | 36 |
| 5 | RESULT AND ANALYSIS | |
| 5.1 | Introduction | 39 |
| 5.2 | Result: Soil Particle Size Distribution | 40 |

| | | |
|----------|--|----|
| 5.2.1 | Soil Particle Size Distribution | 45 |
| 5.2.2 | Plasticity Index (PI) | 46 |
| 5.2.3 | Uniform Soil Classification System (USCS) | 47 |
| 5.3 | Result: Liquid Limit | 48 |
| 5.4 | Result: Plastic Limit | 52 |
| 5.5 | Result: Modified Cone Test for Determine Plastic Limit Value | 54 |
| 5.5.1 | Determine of Plastic Limit Value Using Cone (i) | 54 |
| 5.5.1.1 | Calculation on determine the value of d for cone (i) | 56 |
| 5.5.1.2 | Result: Plastic Limit Using Cone (i) | 57 |
| 5.5.2 | Determine Plastic Limit Value Using Cone (ii) | 62 |
| 5.5.2.1 | Result: Plastic Limit Using Cone (ii) | 63 |
| 5.5.3 | Determine Plastic Limit Value Using Cone (iii) | 69 |
| 5.5.3.1 | Calculation on determine the value of d for Cone (iii) | 69 |
| 5.5.3.2 | Result: Plastic Limit Using Cone (iii) | 70 |
| 5.6 | Analysis | 74 |
| 5.6.1 | Comparison between the Plastic Limits Obtained from Standard Method and Modified Cone. | 74 |
| 6 | CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION | |
| 6.1 | Conclusion | 79 |
| 6.2 | Recommendation | 80 |

REFERENCES

LIST OF TABLES

| TABLE NO. | TITLE | PAGE |
|-----------|--|------|
| 2.1 | Average Value of Relative Sizes, Thicknesses and Specific Surface of Four Common Clay Minerals (After Yong and Warkentin 1975) | 6 |
| 2.2 | Activity of Clays | 13 |
| 2.3 | Activity of Various Minerals (After Skempton, 1953; and Mithcell, 1993) | 13 |
| 4.1 | Three Different Fall Cone Methods Used In This Study | 36 |
| 5.1 | Three Different Fall Cone Methods Used In This Study | 40 |
| 5.2 | Value of Uniformity Coefficient, C_U and Coefficient of Gradation C_C for All Samples | 46 |
| 5.3 | Value of Plasticity Index for All Samples | 46 |
| 5.4 | Soil Classification using USCS for All Samples | 47 |
| 5.5 | Penetration of the Cone with Moisture Content for Sample A | 48 |
| 5.6 | Penetration of the Cone with Moisture Content for Sample B | 48 |
| 5.7 | Penetration of the Cone with Moisture Content for Sample C | 49 |
| 5.8 | Penetration of the Cone with Moisture Content for Sample D | 49 |
| 5.9 | Value of Liquid Limit According to Equation from Graph in Figure 5.5 and 5.6 | 49 |
| 5.10 | Plastic Limit (Standard Method) Sample A | 52 |

| | | |
|------|---|----|
| 5.11 | Plastic Limit (Standard Method) Sample B | 52 |
| 5.12 | Plastic Limit (Standard Method) Sample C | 53 |
| 5.13 | Plastic Limit (Standard Method) Sample D | 53 |
| 5.14 | Penetration of the Cone (i) With Moisture Content for Sample A | 58 |
| 5.15 | Penetration of the Cone (i) With Moisture Content for Sample B | 58 |
| 5.16 | Penetration of the Cone (i) With Moisture Content for Sample C | 59 |
| 5.17 | Penetration of the Cone (i) With Moisture Content for Sample D | 59 |
| 5.18 | Value of Plastic Limit According to Equation from Graph in Figure 5.8, 5.9 | 59 |
| 5.19 | Penetration of the Cone (ii) With Moisture Content for Sample A | 63 |
| 5.20 | Penetration of the Cone (ii) With Moisture Content for Sample B | 63 |
| 5.21 | Penetration of the Cone (ii) With Moisture Content for Sample C | 64 |
| 5.22 | Penetration of the Cone (ii) With Moisture Content for Sample D | 64 |
| 5.23 | Value of Plastic Limit According to Equation Plasticity Index (PI) | 64 |
| 5.24 | Penetration of the Cone (iii) With Moisture Content for Sample A | 70 |
| 5.25 | Penetration of the Cone (iii) With Moisture Content for Sample B | 70 |
| 5.26 | Penetration of the Cone (iii) With Moisture Content for Sample C | 71 |
| 5.27 | Penetration of the Cone (iii) With Moisture Content for Sample D | 71 |
| 5.28 | Value of Plastic Limit According to Equation from Graph in Figure 5.15, 5.16 | 71 |
| 5.29 | Comparison between the Plastic Limits Obtained from Standard Method and Cone (i) | 74 |
| 5.30 | Comparison between the Plastic Limits Obtained from Standard Method and Cone (ii) | 75 |
| 5.31 | Comparison between the Plastic Limits Obtained from Standard Method and Cone (iii) | 75 |

LIST OF FIGURES

| FIGURE NO. | TITLE | PAGE |
|------------|--|------|
| 2.1 | Schematic Side View Representation of a Typical Particle of Koalinite with Its Adsorbed Layer and Double Layer | 7 |
| 2.2 | Variation of Consistency of Fine Grained Soil with Water Content | 8 |
| 2.3 | Plasticity Chart | 11 |
| 2.4 | Relation Between Plasticity Index and Clay Fraction (After Skempton, 1953) | 13 |
| 2.5 | Schematic Diagram of Fall Cone Test | 14 |
| 2.6 | Slip Line Fields for Cones of Angle (a) 30°, (b) 60° and (c) 90° | 16 |
| 2.7 | Calculated Bearing Capacity Factors for Smooth and Rough Cones | 17 |
| 2.8 | Limiting Case of Heave Solution As Angle Approaches 180° | 17 |
| 2.9 | Relationship Between Angle of Heaved Surface, δ , and Cone Angle | 18 |
| 2.10 | Variation of $\lambda = N_{ch}/N_c$ with Cone Angle | 19 |
| 2.11 | Variation of Normalised Shear Strength with Strain Rate | 22 |
| 2.12 | Results of Cone Penetrometer Tests on Cambrigde Gault Clay | 24 |
| 2.13 | Small Container by Tao-Wei Feng (2004) | 25 |
| 3.1 | Study Methodology Diagram | 28 |
| 4.1a | Cone (i) | 36 |

| | | |
|------|--|----|
| 4.1b | Measurement of Cone (i) | 37 |
| 4.2 | Cone (ii) | 37 |
| 4.3a | Measurement of Container for Cone (iii) | 38 |
| 4.3b | Container for Cone (iii) | 38 |
| 5.1 | Particle Size Distribution for Sample A | 41 |
| 5.2 | Particle Size Distribution for Sample B | 42 |
| 5.3 | Particle Size Distribution for Sample C | 43 |
| 5.4 | Particle Size Distribution for Sample D | 44 |
| 5.5 | Cone Penetration, mm Versus Water Content, % for Sample A and Sample B | 50 |
| 5.6 | Cone Penetration, mm Versus Water Content, % for Sample C and Sample D | 51 |
| 5.7 | Graph ($s_u / s_u (1\%/h)$) versus ($\gamma : \% / h$) | 55 |
| 5.8 | Cone Penetration, mm Versus Water Content, % for Sample A and Sample B using Cone (i) | 60 |
| 5.9 | Cone Penetration, mm Versus Water Content, % for Sample C and Sample D using Cone (i) | 61 |
| 5.10 | Diagram of Fall Cone Results with Different Cone Weight | 62 |
| 5.11 | Water Content, % Versus Cone Penetration, In mm for Sample A using Cone (ii) | 65 |
| 5.12 | Water Content, % Versus Cone Penetration, In mm for Sample B using Cone (ii) | 66 |
| 5.13 | Water Content, % Versus Cone Penetration, In mm for Sample C using Cone (ii) | 67 |
| 5.14 | Water Content, % Versus Cone Penetration, In mm for Sample D using Cone (ii) | 68 |
| 5.15 | Cone Penetration, mm Versus Water Content, % for Sample A and Sample B Using Cone (iii) | 72 |
| 5.16 | Cone Penetration, mm Versus Water Content, % for Sample C and Sample D Using Cone (iii) | 73 |

| | | |
|------|--|----|
| 5.17 | Comparison of Plastic Limit Values Obtained from Cone (i) Penetration and Thread Rolling Method | 76 |
| 5.18 | Comparison of Plastic Limit Values Obtained from Cone (ii) Penetration and Thread Rolling Method | 77 |
| 5.19 | Comparison of Plastic Limit Values Obtained from Cone (iii) Penetration and Thread Rolling Method | 78 |

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.0 Introduction

The soil can be remolded in the presence of some moisture without crumbling, when clay minerals are represented in fine-grained soil. This cohesive nature caused by the adsorbed water surrounding the clay particles causes. In the early 1900s, a Swedish scientist named Atterberg developed a method to describe the consistency of fine-grained soils with varying moisture contents. Soil behaves more like a solid at very low moisture content and may flow like a liquid when the moisture content is very high. Therefore, the soil behavior is depending on the moisture content level. Hence, on an arbitrary basis, depending on the moisture content, the behavior of soil can be divided into four basic states. They are solid, semisolid, plastic and liquid.

The moisture content, in percent, at which the transition from solid to semisolid state takes place, is defined as the shrinkage limit. The plastic limit is the moisture content at the point of transition from semisolid to plastic state is, and from plastic to liquid state

is the liquid limit. These are also known as Atterberg limits. The plastic limit defined as the moisture content in percent, at which the soil crumbles, when rolled into threads of 3 mm in diameter. The plastic limit is the lower of the stage of soil. The plastic limit test is simple and is performed by repeated rolling of an ellipsoidal-size soil mass by hand on a ground glass plate. However, there have been criticisms about this test since the operator is required to judge the state of crumbling and a 3-mm diameter of the thread. (Tao-Wei Feng 2004)

The purpose of this study is to introducing an alternative method on determines the plastic limit value of soil and to overcome the inconsistence result in determine plastic limit by using standard method that stated in BS 1377 (Thread Rolling Method).

1.1 Objectives

There are several objectives for this project:

- i) To establish the fundamental criteria for plastic limit using cone penetration method.
- ii) To get the similarity between the standard method on the determination of plastic limit with the new Modified Cone Penetration Method.
- iii) To compare the plastic limit obtain using cone penetration method with the pervious study.

1.2 Project Background

The plastic limit is an important property of fine-grained soils. According to Tao-Wei Feng (2004), the standard thread-rolling method for determining the plastic limit has long been criticized for requiring considerable judgements from the operator. The standard thread-rolling method is not an easier way to judge the state of crumbling and a 3 mm diameter of the thread accurately for determine the value of Plastic Limit. Despite that, the standard method needs a lot of time and our conscientious.

Therefore, in developing a less operator-dependent method for determining the plastic limit, it is noticed that the fall-cone liquid limit test is rather simple and require very simple and requires very little judgement from the operator. It would be ideal if the plastic limit could be determined by using fall cone apparatus.

1.3 Scope of Study

- 4 types of soil will be tested to determine the impressive of modified cone penetration method.
- Plasticity Index (PI) value for the soil range from 10 to 40.
- For this project, 4 tests will be conducted:
 - i. Soil Particle Size Distribution Test
 - ii. Liquid Limit Test (Standard Cone Penetration Test)
 - iii. Plastic Limit Test (Standard Test)
 - iv. Plastic Limit Test (Modified Cone Penetration Test)

6.2 Recommendation

Further recommendation study stated as below:

- Use more soil samples and focus only for one cone to ensure the validity of the method.
- Conduct a test on undrained shear strength of soil to obtain the average value of it for comparing the value that been proposes by Wood and Wroth 1975 (1.7 kN/m^2 for liquid limit).

REFERENCES

- Bardet J.P (1997). *Experimental Soil Mechanics*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall
- Belviso R., Ciampoli S., Cotecchia V., and Federico A (1985) Use of the cone penetrometer to determine consistency limits. *Ground Engineering*, **18**(5), 21-22
- British Standard Institution (BSI). 1990. *Method of tests for soils for civil engineering purposes*. London.: BS 1377
- Harison J.A. (1988) Using the BS cone penetrometer for the determination of the plastic limit of soils. *Geotechnique*, **38**(3), 443-438
- Houlsby G.T. (1982) Theoretical analysis of the fall cone test. *Geotechnique*, **32**(2), 111-118
- M.Das Braja (2002) *Principles of Geotechnical Engineering*. Boston : Brooks/Cole
- Tao-Wei Feng (2001). A linear log d-log w model for the determination of consistency limits of soils. *Canadian Geotechnical Journal*, **38**: 1335-1342
- Tao-Wei Feng (2004). Using small ring and a fall-cone to determine the plastic limit. *Journal of Geotechnical and Geoenvironmental Engineering*, **130**(6), 630-635

Wasti Y., and Bezirci M.H (1985). Determination of the consistency limits of soils by the fall cone test. *Canadian Geotechnical Journal*, **23**(2), 241-246

Wood D.M and Wroth C.P. (1978). The use of the cone penetrometer to determine the plastic limit of soils. *Ground Engineering*, **11**(3), 37

Wroth C.P and Wood D.M. (1978). The correlation of index properties with some basic engineering properties of soils. *Canadian Geotechnical Journal*, **15**, 137–145