



# Impact of Lime, Cement, and Clay Treatments on the Internal Erosion of Compacted Soils

Abdelwadoud Mehenni, Olivier Cuisinier, Farimah Masrouri

## ► To cite this version:

Abdelwadoud Mehenni, Olivier Cuisinier, Farimah Masrouri. Impact of Lime, Cement, and Clay Treatments on the Internal Erosion of Compacted Soils. *Journal of Materials in Civil Engineering*, 2016, 28 (9), pp.04016071. 10.1061/(ASCE)MT.1943-5533.0001573 . hal-01409044

**HAL Id: hal-01409044**

**<https://hal.univ-lorraine.fr/hal-01409044>**

Submitted on 5 Jul 2019

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

# Impact of lime, cement and clay treatments on the internal erosion of compacted soils

**Author 1: Abdelwadoud Mehenni**<sup>1,2</sup>

Affiliation 1: PhD Student - Laboratoire d'Energétique et de Mécanique Théorique et Appliquée, UMR 7563  
CNRS - Université de Lorraine  
2 rue du Doyen Marcel Roubault  
TSA 70605  
54518 VANDOEUVRE LES NANCY  
France

Affiliation 2: DTP - Bouygues Construction  
Challenger, 1 avenue Eugène Freyssinet  
Guyancourt  
78061 St-Quentin-en-Yvelines  
France

*a.mehenni@bouygues-construction.com*

**Author 2: Olivier Cuisinier**

Affiliation: Associate Professor - Laboratoire d'Energétique et de Mécanique Théorique et Appliquée, UMR  
7563 CNRS - Université de Lorraine  
2 rue du Doyen Marcel Roubault  
TSA 70605  
54518 VANDOEUVRE LES NANCY  
France

*olivier.cuisinier@univ-lorraine.fr*

**Author 3: Farimah Masrouri**

Affiliation: Professor - Laboratoire d'Energétique et de Mécanique Théorique et Appliquée, UMR 7563 CNRS -  
Université de Lorraine  
2 rue du Doyen Marcel Roubault  
TSA 70605  
54518 VANDOEUVRE LES NANCY  
France

*farimah.masrouri@univ-lorraine.fr*

## Keywords

Soil stabilization, internal erosion, lime, cement, clay treatment

## **Abstract**

The aim of this paper is to study the impact of certain soil treatments on the internal erosion characteristics of treated compacted silt. The experiments measured the internal erosion using the hole erosion test (HET). This study aims to describe the effects of clay, lime and cement soil treatments on the internal erosion, specifically with regard to the amount of treatment used and the curing time. The internal erosion resistance was quantified by the coefficient of soil erosion and the critical shear stress. The results demonstrated that clay treatment could reduce the coefficient of soil erosion depending on the nature and percentage of clay added to the soil. The results also showed that lime and cement treatment primarily increased the critical shear stress of the tested silt. This increase was higher with cement treatment and was dependent on the amount of the added product. The impact of the curing time (up to 30 days) on the evolution of the erosion characteristics was not relevant for the lime-treated silt, whereas that of the cement-treated silt was dependent on the amount of cement added to the soil.

## Introduction

Soil treatment with different types of clays, lime or cement is widely used in geotechnical engineering to improve soil characteristics and thus achieve a higher design strength, elastic modulus, and lower hydraulic conductivity, among other features. The main effects of these treatments on the geotechnical characteristics of compacted soils are relatively well known.

Clayey soils are often used as treatment product specifically to reduce the hydraulic conductivity of soils in order to reach a target design. The reduction of the hydraulic conductivity depends on the percentage and the nature of the clayey soil employed (e.g., Sivapullaiah et al., 2000, Chapuis, 2002). Several authors (e.g., Eades and Grim 1966, Brandl, 1981, Bell 1996) showed that lime treatment improves mainly the soil workability as well as the soil strength. Lime effects on the hydraulic conductivity of soils depend on the compaction conditions (McCallister and Petry 1991, Le Runigo et al., 2009, Cuisinier et al., 2011). Several studies showed the enhancement of mechanical characteristics of soils after cement treatment (e.g., Al-Amoudi 2002, Sariosseiri and Muhunthan 2009). The addition of cement is often related to a decrease of the hydraulic conductivity. However some authors (e.g., Bellezza and Fratalocchi, 2006) showed that the evolution of the hydraulic conductivity is mainly related to the nature of soil, and may increase or decrease after treatment.

Nevertheless, using compacted treated soils to build hydraulic earth structures (e.g., earth dams, levees, water retaining structures) raises some specific issues. Several objectives must be met simultaneously; specifically, low permeability and the overall stability of the earth structure are paramount. Moreover, these structures can be affected by different internal or external erosion phenomena. Erosion may affect soils, reducing the life of the structure or even leading to its destruction. Soil treatment with clays, lime or cement could be of interest to increase the strength and reduce soil erodibility, extending the service life of an earth structure. Therefore, the impact of these common treatments on erosion characteristics must

be determined. After the description of the erosion process and its experimental characterization, a literature review on the effects of treatments on the internal erosion characteristics is presented.

## **Background**

Erosion phenomena occurring on hydraulic earth structures can be classified into two categories: external erosion and internal erosion. External erosion concerns the outer surfaces of structures, whereas internal erosion occurs within the body of the structure. This study is focused on piping, which is an internal erosion mechanism. According to Fell et al. (2003), the process of internal erosion and piping can be divided into four phases: the initiation of erosion on a concentrated leak, the continuation of erosion, the progression of erosion by the enlargement of the concentrated leak to form a pipe, and the formation of a breach leading to the destruction of the structure.

To study internal erosion and piping, Wan and Fell (2002, 2004) developed the hole erosion test (HET), which was derived from other experimental erosion devices, such as the pinhole test (Sherard et al., 1976; ASTM D-4647), the drill hole test (Lefebvre et al., 1985 and Rohan et al., 1986), and the flow pump test (Reddi et al., 2000). The HET characterizes the behavior of soils only once a pipe is completely formed. The test does not allow for the study of the initial phase of the internal erosion process (i.e., the formation of the pipe in the soil). In fact, in the HET, a preformed hole in a soil sample is created to simulate a pipe; erosion of the pipe is then studied by subjecting the hole to a flow of water. The growth of the diameter of the hole is monitored by measuring hydraulic parameters (i.e., the pressure drop between the areas upstream and downstream of the sample and the flow through the hole). The results determine the empirical erosion law of the material, which can be expressed as follows:

$$\dot{\varepsilon} = k_{er} (\tau - \tau_c) \quad (1)$$

108 where:

109  $\dot{\epsilon}$  is the erosion rate per unit surface area of the hole at time  $t$  (kg/s/m<sup>2</sup>),

110  $\tau$  is the hydraulic shear stress along the hole at time  $t$  (Pa),

111  $k_{er}$  is the coefficient of soil erosion (s/m),

112  $\tau_c$  is the critical shear stress (Pa).

113 The HET yields two parameters that characterize the soil erosion behavior: *i*) the critical shear  
114 stress  $\tau_c$ , corresponding to the minimum shear stress necessary to initiate the departure of soil  
115 particles; and *ii*) the coefficient of soil erosion  $k_{er}$ , which expresses the erosion rate during  
116 the erosion process.

117 To compute  $\dot{\epsilon}$  and  $\tau$ , it is necessary to determine the variation of the diameter of the hole  
118 during the test; several assumptions are made following this measurement. It is assumed that  
119 erosion occurs on a uniform circular cross section along the length of the soil sample during  
120 the test. Wan and Fell (2004) proposed a method to determine the growth of the hole diameter  
121 during erosion based on the friction factor. This method required the determination of the  
122 final hole diameter after erosion, which is typically difficult to evaluate because the final  
123 shape of the hole is often irregular. Wan and Fell (2004) assumed that the friction factor in  
124 laminar or turbulent flow varies linearly with time. Two problems with this approach can be  
125 noted: 1) during the drilling step, the hole is disturbed, and thus, the initial friction factor used  
126 in the calculations is not representative of the real situation; and 2) the hypothesis of the linear  
127 variation of the friction factor on the hole during the test is not realistic (Haghighi et  
128 al., 2013). Another method uses the turbidity signal to compute the growth of the hole  
129 diameter during the test (Pham, 2008; Indraratna et al., 2009; Benahmed and Bonelli, 2012;  
130 Haghighi et al., 2013).

131 To classify soils by their resistance to internal erosion, authors often use the method proposed  
132 by Wan and Fell (2004), which is based on  $k_{er}$ . The Erosion Rate Index is calculated as  $ERI =$

$-\log(k_{er})$ , and soils are classified by extremely rapid erosion (1) to extremely slow erosion (6), as shown in Table 1. However, this method does not consider  $\tau_c$ , which qualifies the shear stress needed to initiate soil erosion along the pipe; this parameter is not included because the HET does not yield good repeatability of  $\tau_c$  (Wan and Fell, 2002). Indeed, for specimens prepared under the same conditions, different studies indicated that both  $k_{er}$  and  $\tau_c$  might vary from one test to another for the same soil.  $k_{er}$  can vary by a factor of 2 (e.g., Wan and Fell, 2002; Farrar et al., 2007), whereas  $\tau_c$  may vary by a factor of more than 10 (e.g., Wan and Fell, 2002). The use of the *ERI* allows for the classification of different samples of the same soil in the same erosion group even if  $k_{er}$  varies from one test to another. Another method to overcome these repeatability issues is to use all results for  $\dot{\epsilon}$  and  $\tau_c$  obtained from several specimens, prepared under the same conditions, to determine a unique erosion law (Pham, 2008; Haghighi, 2012).

In the last decade, several optimizations were made on the HET to allow for more control of the hydraulic parameters, such as the hydraulic pressure drop across the sample or the water flow rate (Pham, 2008; Indraratna et al., 2009; Whal, 2010; Benahmed and Bonelli, 2012; Luthi et al., 2012; Haghighi et al., 2013).

The HET was used to assess the impact of the compaction parameters (i.e., the initial water content, initial dry density and compaction energy) on the erodibility of compacted soils. Attom (2012) showed that at the same initial dry density, soils exhibit a higher *ERI* if they are compacted on the wet side of optimum. This observation has been confirmed by Wan and Fell (2002) and Lim (2006). The increase in the initial dry density of soil induces a higher *ERI* (Wan and Fell, 2002; Lim, 2006) and a higher  $\tau_c$  (Benahmed and Bonelli, 2012). For compacted soils, the effects of the initial dry density, on increasing the *ERI*, are also related to the initial water content; the increase of the *ERI* is more pronounced on the dry side of optimum (Attom, 2012). Wahl (2010) and Attom (2012) have also shown that along the

compaction curve, the highest *ERI* values are obtained for coupled values of the optimum initial water content and maximum dry density.

The percentage of clay particles can modify the internal erosion resistance of soils. Several authors showed that increasing the clay percentage induces a higher  $\tau_c$  and lower  $k_{er}$  (Bennabi et al., 2012; Benahmed and Bonelli, 2012; Haghighi et al., 2013).

A limited number of studies considered the improvement of soil internal erosion characteristics by lime or cement treatment. To study the internal erosion of a specific soil, it is necessary to use a device capable of applying the necessary inlet pressure and hence the necessary pressure drop across the soil sample required to initiate the erosion of the studied soil. However, the existing devices are not convenient to fully characterize the impact of these treatments on erodibility due to technical limitations. In fact, the study of erosion in treated soils requires a high level of applied hydraulic shear stress that few devices can provide. Chevalier et al. (2012) showed that a 2% lime-treatment of silt can increase  $\tau_c$  by a factor of at least 4. Herrier et al. (2012) studied a 2% lime-treated soil with a curing time of 14 days and observed that  $\tau_c$  increased by a factor of 20, whereas  $k_{er}$  was reduced by a factor of 10. Indraratna et al. (2009) worked on silty sand treated with cement with a  $\tau_c$  near zero before treatment; they showed that treatment with 3% cement increased  $\tau_c$  by up to 50 Pa and decreased the  $k_{er}$  by two orders of magnitude. Additionally, they found that the decrease in erosion by cement treatment is directly related to the percentage of cement added to the soil. Thus, the literature has shown that the HET could be a convenient method to quantify soil erodibility. Furthermore, treatment with clays, lime or cement could reduce soil erodibility. However, the limited data available did not provide a sufficient amount of information regarding the impact of clay treatment on silty soils or the impact of lime and cement treatments, the curing time and the percentage of admixture.



The main focus of this study is to investigate the impact of soil treatments on erosion characteristics. A new enhanced HET device was created to quantify the effects of different treatments. In the following sections, the testing procedures and theoretical models are presented, and the modifications produced by the treatments are discussed.

## **Materials and experimental setup**

In this section, details regarding the tested materials and experimental setup are presented.

### **Materials**

The studied soil was a silty soil from northern France; Table 2 summarizes the main physical and geotechnical properties of the soil. Four types of commonly used treatment products were considered: kaolinite (2 and 9%), bentonite (2%), quicklime (1 and 3%) and cement (3 and 6%). These percentages refer to the quantity of the product calculated on a dry soil weight basis. These choices were made based on usual field uses of these treatment products in France (SETRA-LCPC, 2000). The bentonite was sodium smectite clay. The lime used in this study contained 94% of quicklime (CaO). The category of the cement was CEM II (i.e., 65% of clinker, 35% of limestone and fly ash).

### **Specimen preparation**

First, the compaction characteristics of the different mixtures were determined. For specimen preparation, the water content of the soil was adjusted to the desired water content for compaction. After a storage period of 24 h, during which the moisture content homogenized, the soil and treatment product were thoroughly mixed. When the lime treatment was added, the mixture was left for 1 h in an airtight container before compaction. When the cement treatment was used, compaction was carried out within a few minutes (maximum of 30 min) after treatment to account for the setting time of the cement. When clay treatments were used, no specific time was needed between the mixing and compaction; the mixture was statically

compacted in the cell test to the target dry density. When a curing period prior to testing was required, the compacted samples were wrapped in plastic sheets and kept at  $20.0 \pm 1.5^{\circ}\text{C}$  to prevent any water loss. The compaction characteristic curves were determined for each type and percentage of treatment according to the standard ASTM-D 698; the results of these experiments are summarized in Table 3.

## **Experimental strategy**

Several authors (e.g., Mitchell et al. 1965; Benson and Daniel 1990; Watabe et al. 2000) showed that soil hydraulic conductivity reaches its minimum value on the wet side of optimum; thus, the investigations were focused on one specific compaction state for each treatment and each percentage. This state was defined by  $w = w_{\text{OMC}+3\%}$  and  $\rho_d = 0.96 \rho_{d\text{max}}$ , depending on the nature and percentage of each treatment, where  $w$  is the compaction moisture content (%),  $w_{\text{OMC}}$  is the optimum moisture content (%),  $\rho_d$  is the dry density ( $\text{Mg/m}^3$ ) and  $\rho_{d\text{max}}$  is the maximum dry density ( $\text{Mg/m}^3$ ) (Table 3). The soil, untreated and treated, was statically compacted directly in the cell mold. After treatment and compaction, the soil specimens were sealed in airtight bags and cured at  $20^{\circ}\text{C}$  for different periods (e.g., 0, 7, and 30 days) before starting the erosion tests.

## **Experimental procedures**

In this section, the enhanced HET device, test procedure and theoretical calculation methods are described.

### **HET device**

An enhanced HET device was developed to measure the internal erosion of the compacted treated soil specimens. This device included several optimizations that allowed for the application of a high inlet pressure, producing a large pressure drop across the sample and hence a high hydraulic shear stress along the hole.

Major improvements were made to the pressure system: the water pressure at the inlet of sample was applied with a special air-water reservoir; an electromechanically operated valve controlled the air flow in the air-water reservoir during the experiment; the inlet pressure was controlled by a sensor at the entrance of the sample; and the water pressure was also measured at the outlet of the sample. The maximum inlet pressure exceeded 650 kPa, producing the necessary pressure drop of 650 kPa between the flows upstream and downstream of the soil samples.

Other optimizations were made to the configuration of the testing cell. A detailed view of the testing cell is provided in Figure 1. The soil samples were strongly held within the testing device from both sides. This prevented any loss of pressure and water leakage and also allowed for better holding of the soil specimen during the test under the large pressure drops.

The water flow was measured with an ultrasonic flowmeter and ranged from 0 to 1.4 L/s. A turbidimeter was connected to the outlet of the test cell to measure the effluent turbidity to determine the diameter of the hole during the test.

The initial diameter of the hole in the sample was between 3 and 6 mm. The tested samples were cylindrical, with a diameter of 70 mm and a length between 70 and 150 mm. When using a sample of 70 mm length and an initial hole of 6 mm, the device allowed for the application of a hydraulic shear stress of approximately 10,000 Pa (calculated with equation 6).

## **Test procedure**

The initial hole was made by drilling into the specimen center; the specimen was then placed in the testing cell. Saturation of the whole system ensured that no air bubbles were trapped inside the cell or pipes; this saturation was established under a low flow while the vent valves were open. The erosion test was conducted by controlling and monitoring hydraulic

parameters (i.e., the pressure applied to the sample, the pressure drop between the upstream and downstream of sample, and the flow through the hole).

In the literature, three different methods were used depending on which hydraulic parameter was applied and controlled during the test: i) applying a constant pressure at the upstream side of the sample (Wan and Fell, 2002 and 2004; Muttuvel, 2008); ii) applying a constant drop pressure across the sample (Pham, 2008; Haghighi, 2012); and iii) maintaining a constant flow through the hole (Bonelli and Benahmed, 2007; Benahmed and Bonelli, 2012). The methods of the tests performed are related to technical constraints only and do not influence the erosion law of the soil, which is independent of the hydraulic conditions of the test.

In this study, tests were performed by applying a constant pressure at the inlet of the sample. Some preliminary tests were performed for each treatment to define the necessary range of applied pressure to initiate erosion by detaching soil particles. This pressure was related to the nature of the soil and the treatment product used. Table 4 provides some examples of the initial inlet pressure necessary to begin erosion for different treatment products and percentages. The erosion starting process was determined by the turbidity signal which increased when the erosion of soil particles increased.

A typical set of the test parameters monitored during a test performed on untreated soil is shown in Figure 2. The system can maintain a constant inlet pressure (Figure 2.a). At the beginning of the test, and after the clear-out of the hole from the soil particles detached during the drilling process, soil erosion increased rapidly due to the large pressure drop between the inlet and outlet of the sample (Figures 2.b and 2.c). Detachment of soil particles produced an increase in the hole diameter, creating an increase in the flow through the sample (Figure 2.d) and a progressive decrease in the pressure drop between the inlet and outlet of the sample. The evolution of the erosion rate is shown in Figure 2.e. After the increasing soil erosion phase, as also shown in the turbidity signal, the detachment of soil particles decreased

progressively, likely because of the decrease in the hydraulic shear stress along the hole (Figure 2.f). The changes of the hydraulic shear stress are related to both the increase of the hole diameter and the decrease of the pressure drop between the inlet and outlet of the sample (equation 6). The test ended when the turbidity reached a lower asymptote. At the end of each test, the cell was dismantled, and the hole in the specimen was filled with liquid wax to determine the final characteristics of the eroded hole.

## **Theoretical model**

### ***Integration of the final shape of the hole***

For all the successful tests, the cross section of the eroded hole at the end of the test was in general circular or in some cases slightly ellipsoidal. These observations lead to suggest a general theoretical model that accounts for the real final shape of the hole and accurately compute the erosion rate and hydraulic shear stress. This model was based on the two radii of the hole ( $a$  and  $b$ ) to better approximate the real shape of the hole.  $a$  and  $b$  are equal for a circular hole.

The erosion rate  $\dot{\varepsilon}$  (kg/s/m<sup>2</sup>) for a given hydraulic shear stress can be expressed by the eroded soil mass (kg) per unit surface area of the hole at time  $t$  (s):

$$\dot{\varepsilon} = \frac{\text{mass of eroded soil}}{\text{surface area of the hole} * \text{unit of time}} \quad (2)$$

Considering an ellipsoidal hole, the cross section is  $S = \pi ab$  and the perimeter is  $p_r = \pi\sqrt{2(a^2 + b^2)}$ , where  $a$  and  $b$  are the smaller and larger radii of the ellipsoid, respectively.

The erosion rate can then be expressed as follow:

$$\dot{\varepsilon} = \frac{\rho_d}{2} \sqrt{\frac{2}{a(t)^2 + b(t)^2}} [a(t)db + b(t)da] \frac{1}{dt} \quad (3)$$

where  $\rho_d$  is the dry density of the soil (Mg/m<sup>3</sup>);  $a(t)$  and  $b(t)$  are the radii of the hole (m) at time  $t$ ; and  $db$  and  $da$  are the variations of the radii at the elementary time  $dt$ .

Using the principle of the equilibrium forces carried out on a volume of fluid between the inlet and outlet of the hole, the applied shear stress to the surface of the hole is related to the hydraulic gradient measured across the hole (Wan and Fell, 2002, Muttuvel, 2008). Considering the ellipsoidal shape, the hydraulic shear stress along the hole can be expressed as:

$$\tau = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \cdot \frac{\Delta P(t)}{L} \cdot \frac{a(t) \cdot b(t)}{\sqrt{a(t)^2 + b(t)^2}} \quad (4)$$

where  $L$  is the length of the sample (m) and  $\Delta P(t)$  is the pressure drop between the inlet and outlet of the sample (Pa). To solve this equation, it is assumed that there is a unique relationship between the radius of the hole:  $a = \alpha b$ . The factor  $\alpha$  is measured at the end of the test and assumed to remain constant during the test. The final radii  $a$  and  $b$  are taken as the mean values along the hole, and only specimens with a uniform shape along the hole were considered. Then,  $\dot{\varepsilon}$  and  $\tau$  are obtained as follows:

$$\dot{\varepsilon} = \rho_d \cdot \sqrt{\frac{2\alpha^2}{\alpha^2 + 1}} \cdot \frac{db}{dt} \quad (5)$$

$$\tau = \frac{\Delta P(t)}{L} \cdot \frac{\alpha}{\sqrt{2(\alpha^2 + 1)}} \cdot b(t) \quad (6)$$

Equations 5 and 6 account for the general shape of the hole. For a circular hole,  $a$  is equal to  $b$ ; the coefficient  $\alpha$  is then equal to 1.

#### ***Determination of the evolution of the radius***

To compute the erosion parameters ( $k_{er}$ ,  $\tau_c$ ), it is necessary to determine the evolution of the radius of the hole ( $db$ ) during the test, which can be related to the soil eroded mass.

Two assumptions were made to determine the evolution of the cross-sectional shape of the hole: *i*) erosion is uniform along the hole and *ii*) the factor  $\alpha$  relating the radii of the hole is constant. The soil eroded mass can be expressed as follows:

$$dm(t) = 2 \cdot \alpha \cdot \pi \cdot \rho_d \cdot L \cdot b(t - 1) \cdot db \quad (7)$$

where  $dm(t)$  is the soil eroded mass (kg).

The soil eroded mass during time step  $dt$  is also related to the measured concentration of soil particles as follows:

$$dm(t) = c(t) \cdot q(t) \cdot dt \quad (8)$$

where  $c(t)$  is the concentration of soil particles ( $\text{kg/m}^3$ ) and  $q(t)$  is the water flow passing through the hole ( $\text{m}^3/\text{s}$ ).

From Equations 7 and 8,  $db$  is given as follows:

$$db = \frac{c(t) \cdot q(t)}{2 \cdot \alpha \cdot \pi \cdot \rho_d \cdot L} \cdot \frac{dt}{b(t-1)} \quad (9)$$

Given the initial radius of the hole  $b_0$ , the radius at each time step can then be expressed as

$$[b(t) = b(t-1) + db].$$

The turbidity signal was used to determine the instantaneous concentration during the erosion process (Reddi et al., 2000; Pham, 2008; Muttuvel, 2008). The relationship between the concentration of soil and the turbidity of the effluent concentration was also calibrated. These calibrations were performed for each treatment and each percentage of treatment product. Some examples of the relationship between the soil concentration and turbidity signal are given in Figure 3. The results indicated a bilinear calibration curve for all samples. Hence, two relationships were considered for each treatment, one for each concentration range. The threshold concentration value was approximately  $1 \text{ kg/m}^3$  and depended on the nature and percentage of treatment.

#### ***Validation of the calculation method***

Figure 4 presents the final eroded diameter measured at the end of the test versus the final diameter calculated from the turbidity signal (Equation 9). The slight differences could be due to inaccuracy of initial and final drilled hole measurements and the turbidity sensor response. The results showed the relevance of the technique used to determine the hole diameter during the test using the soil detachment particles.

## Impact of treatment on soil erodibility

### Untreated soil

The repeatability of the erosion parameters obtained with the new HET device was verified with the untreated soil by performing several tests. Two sets of these results are shown in Figure 5. Table 5 shows the erosion parameters determined from six tests.  $k_{er}$  varies between  $1.13 \times 10^{-04}$  and  $3.04 \times 10^{-04}$  s/m, and  $\tau_c$  varies between 291 and 615 Pa. This dispersion is of the same order of magnitude as has been found in previous studies. As an example, Wan and Fell (2002) found that  $\tau_c$  for a clay-sandy soil varied between 85 and 327 Pa. Haghighi (2012) also found a similar range of  $\tau_c$  (i.e., from 152 to 541 Pa) for a similar silty soil.

The mean values for the untreated silt are  $k_{er} = 2.07 \times 10^{-04}$  s/m and  $\tau_c = 429$  Pa. The *ERI* of the tested materials is between 3.59 and 3.95; therefore, all untreated specimens are classified as having “moderately rapid” erosion according to the classification of Wan and Fell (2002).

The studied silt has a high critical shear stress compared to the values typically observed in untreated soil (Wan and Fell, 2002). This can be related to the high percentage of the fine particle fraction ( $< 80 \mu\text{m}$ ), 99.2%, and to the compaction conditions. In fact, compaction on the wet side of optimum allows for a better rearrangement of the soil particles, than the dry side of the optimum, and reduces porosity (e.g., Benson and Daniel 1990). Compaction on the wet side ( $w = 17.5\%$ ) combined with the high dry density ( $\rho_d = 1.73 \text{ Mg/m}^3$ ) induces a dense arrangement of soil particles. This arrangement hinders the detachment of soil particles and requires a greater level of hydraulic shear stress to start the erosion. However, once this value of hydraulic shear stress is reached, the erosion rate progresses rapidly, as shown by the value of the coefficient of soil erosion ( $k_{er} = 2.07 \times 10^{-04}$  s/m).

### Clay treatment



Examples of the erosion law for the clay treatments are shown in Figure 6, and Table 6 summarizes the erosion characteristics for the clay-treated soil obtained from the other tests. The use of 2% kaolinite did not significantly change  $k_{er}$ ; however,  $\tau_c$  tended to increase and had a mean value of 607 Pa. The addition of 9% kaolinite decreased  $k_{er}$  by one order of magnitude and induced a small increase in  $\tau_c$  with a mean value of 513 Pa. According to the classification of Wan and Fell (2002), the silt treated with 2% kaolinite was in the “moderately rapid” group, whereas the silt treated with 9% kaolinite became “moderately slow”. Therefore, 9% kaolinite was required to significantly modify soil erodibility. For the treatment with 2% bentonite,  $k_{er}$  is of the same order of magnitude for all samples and is approximately  $5.00 \times 10^{-05}$  s/m (Table 6) which is less than one order of magnitude less than that of the untreated soil.  $\tau_c$  varies between 123 and 483 Pa, which are included within the interval of variation of  $\tau_c$  for untreated silt. Thus, the silt treated with 2% bentonite is classified as “moderately slow”. The enhancement of the silt internal erosion characteristic induced by clay treatment is then characterized mainly by the reduction of the coefficient of soil erosion depending on the nature and percentage of the added product.

### **Lime treatment**

To study the internal erosion of lime-treated silt, it was necessary to apply an inlet pressure of up to 250 kPa for 1% and 300 kPa for 3% lime to initiate soil erosion. A typical set of results for the lime-treated silt is presented in Figure 7. Two phases can be distinguished during the test. The erosion process was initiated for a hydraulic shear stress of 926 Pa with a slope  $k_{er}$  of  $3.76 \times 10^{-04}$  s/m until a maximum erosion rate of 0.30 kg/s/m<sup>2</sup> was reached. Then, the erosion rate decreased and stopped for a hydraulic shear stress of 1,500 Pa with a mean slope of approximately  $2.65 \times 10^{-04}$  s/m. This behavior was observed with 1% and 3% lime after 7 days of curing time.  $\tau_c$  at the ending phase was higher than during the

starting phase (Figure 7), indicating that the soil resisted erosion more at the end of the test than at the beginning. Such behavior could be explained by the type of material used. Indeed, lime-treated soil can be considered as brittle material. The drilling is a mechanical process which may damage the brittle material by inducing small cracks. A small area of the soil around the hole could have been damaged during the drilling of the hole after the curing period. This damaged part is then the first to be easily eroded during the test, leading to a higher erodibility than the undisturbed part of the sample.

To verify this hypothesis, some tests were conducted on 3% lime-treated silt with the hole being drilled just after sample compaction. The drilled sample was then left for curing until the erosion test was performed. The results in Figure 8 showed that the effects of the drilling process were less pronounced when the drilling was made before the curing time; this observation was made for both specimens after 7 days of curing (Figure 8.a and 8.b) and after 30 days of curing (Figure 8.c and 8.d). The results also indicated that the erosion law was identical at the starting and ending phases of the test. In fact, soil drilling occurred before the beginning of the formation of the cementitious compounds that bind the soil particles. The soil is then less disturbed by the drilling just after compaction than when drilling occurs after curing. The drilling step after curing significantly modified the soil and produced different behaviors between the starting and ending phases of erosion. To examine the impact of treatment on the erosion characteristics, only the characteristics stemming from the ending phase will be considered; these characteristics correspond to the erosion of the soil that is less disturbed by the drilling process.

Some results for lime-treated soil are shown in Table 7, and examples of the erosion law are shown in Figure 9. For treatment with 1% lime,  $k_{er}$  varied between  $1.09 \times 10^{-04}$  and  $2.87 \times 10^{-04}$  s/m regardless of the curing time. For treatment with 3% lime,  $k_{er}$  varied between  $1.54 \times 10^{-04}$  and  $4.52 \times 10^{-04}$  s/m regardless of the curing time. Lime treatment increases the  $\tau_c$

of the untreated soil, yielding values of up to 1,770 Pa for 1% lime and 1,889 Pa for 3% lime. Moreover,  $\tau_c$  tended to increase with curing time but not in any common progression. The erosion rate during the test was higher for samples treated with 3% lime than for the untreated silt (Figure 9). This observation could be explained by the maximum coarse grain size in the treated soil, which is higher than the untreated soil; furthermore, during the erosion of the treated soil, the detachment of particles accompanied aggregates of larger size than for the untreated silt. It was also observed during the tests, that the erosion of lime treated soil particles often occurs by the detachment of aggregates of soil and not only individual soil particles. Hence, the erosion rate will be higher for the lime-treated silt. The erosion of the lime-treated silt is classified as “moderately rapid,” as is that of the untreated soil, regardless of the lime percentage or curing time. The impact of the lime treatment cannot be observed in these tests because the classification of Wan and Fell (2002) does not consider the critical shear stress. The improvement of the silt internal erosion characteristics induced by lime treatment is then characterized mainly by the increase in the critical shear stress regardless of the curing time and the percentage of the added product.

### **Cement treatment**

Some results from the HET for the cement treatment are shown in Table 8. For 3% cement, it was necessary to apply an inlet pressure of up to 450 kPa to initiate the soil erosion; this is reflected by the high hydraulic shear stress. For most tested samples, erosion started at a hydraulic shear stress of 2,000 Pa, and the erosion was mainly independent from the curing time. For the lime-treated silt, the erosion law exhibited a different behavior between the beginning and end of the tests. Therefore, the same selection process was used to compute the erosion parameters for each step as described for the lime treatment cases. In case of treatment with 6% cement, the applied inlet pressure was more than 500 kPa, and the length

of samples was reduced to 70 mm to apply a higher hydraulic shear stress. Detachment of soil particles started after 4,000 Pa for most specimens; however, the erosion law exhibited non-linear characteristics for most specimens, especially after 7 days of curing. Thus, it was difficult to compute  $k_{er}$  for some samples, and in such cases,  $\tau_c$  was reported as the threshold of the hydraulic shear stress at the end of erosion.

Examples of the erosion law for cement-treated specimens are shown in Figure 10. For treatment with 3% cement,  $k_{er}$  varied between  $1.13 \times 10^{-04}$  and  $1.67 \times 10^{-04}$  s/m, regardless of the curing time. For treatment with 6% lime,  $k_{er}$  varied between  $1.00 \times 10^{-05}$  and  $8.00 \times 10^{-05}$  s/m. Furthermore, for treatment with 3% cement,  $\tau_c$  varied between 2,850 and 3,619 Pa, and the curing time appeared to have no effect on the evolution of  $\tau_c$ . In the case of 6% cement,  $\tau_c$  varied between 4,400 and 6,800 Pa for a curing time of 1 day and reached 9,893 Pa after 7 days of curing. Thus, the erosion of cement-treated silt is classified as “moderately rapid” for 3% cement and “moderately slow” for 6% cement.

The main enhancement of the silt internal erosion characteristic induced by cement treatment is then characterized by the increase in the critical shear stress and may also result in a decrease in the coefficient of soil erosion depending on the percentage of the added product.

## Discussion

Figure 11 shows the erosion characteristics ( $k_{er}$  and  $\tau_c$ ) obtained for both treated and untreated silt.

The addition of kaolinite induced a relatively small increase in  $\tau_c$ , and the addition of bentonite did not significantly change the range of  $\tau_c$ . This observation can be explained by the fact that the initial compaction states ( $\rho_d$ ,  $w$ ) were similar for untreated and clay-treated silt.

The addition of 9% kaolinite and 2% bentonite decreased  $k_{er}$  by one order of magnitude. The nature of the clay particles appears to have an important effect on the erosion behavior of soil. Indeed, the addition of only 2% bentonite has similar effects to the addition of 9% kaolinite. A higher percentage of clay fraction increases the resistance of sandy soils to erosion (e.g., Bennabi et al., 2012; Benahmed and Bonelli, 2012). This study showed that this trend is also valid for silty soil.

The lime treatment resulted in an increasing  $\tau_c$ , even with a short curing time (1 day) (Figure 11), indicating that the increase in erosion resistance by lime treatment is a short-term effect of lime. The development of longer-term (pozzolanic) reactions for increasing the hydraulic shear stress appears to be less important. One of the short-term mechanisms responsible of these changes could be the flocculation-aggregation of soil particles caused by lime addition. The coefficient of soil erosion  $k_{er}$  maintained the same level with or without lime treatment regardless of the lime percentage or curing time, indicating that once erosion has started, the rate of soil detachment will be the same as untreated silt. This result can be explained by the detachment process of soil particles. As it was observed during the tests, the erosion of soil particles often occurs by the detachment of aggregates of soil and not only individual soil particles; this indicates that erosive forces can break more easily the weaker bonds between aggregates.

The main impact of cement treatment was the increase in  $\tau_c$  in proportion to the percentage of cement (Figure 11). Furthermore, the increasing cement percentage was accompanied by a decrease in  $k_{er}$ . The enhancement of the erosion characteristics induced by cement treatment is related to the cement setting and the development of cementitious compounds, which induce strong bonds between soils particles. The detachment of soil particles becomes more difficult, making the soil more resistant to erosion. When treated with 3% cement, this improvement came in early ages of curing time, and no further significant modification was

observed until 30 days. At higher percentages of cement (6%), an increase in the critical shear stress was obtained with increasing curing time. This behavior could be related to the soil-cement setting time, which may be longer for a higher amount of cement treatment.

## **Conclusion**

The main objective of this paper was to study the impact of soil treatment on the internal erosion resistance of treated compacted silt. A new enhanced HET device was developed to determine the erosion characteristics of treated materials. A modified interpretation method that considered the final shape of the eroded hole has been proposed.

The results showed that the studied silt had a higher critical shear stress compared to the values typically observed in the untreated soil. This higher critical shear stress was primarily caused by the compaction conditions on the wet side of the optimum water content. However, the mean coefficient of soil erosion was  $2.07 \times 10^{-04}$  s/m, which may accelerate detachment due to erosion once it has begun. The solution to this issue could be the treatment of soil by adding clay, lime or cement. The following conclusions can be made based on the results obtained:

- The use of clay soil as a treatment product reduces the erosion rate of soil particles. This effect is related to the nature of the clay, and the use of bentonite further reduces the coefficient of soil erosion than the use of kaolinite at the same percentage.
- Lime treatment increases the internal erosion resistance of soil by increasing the critical shear stress. This effect is similar to either 1 or 3% lime treatment and occurs rapidly, with no significant change with increased curing time up to 30 days.
- Cement treatment increases the critical shear stress, and the increase in erosion resistance is proportional to the percentage of cement used. A high percentage of cement will also provide a smaller coefficient of soil erosion. The enhancement occurs

rapidly for 3% cement, whereas higher percentages require additional curing time to yield greater erosion resistance.

Additional works are required to relate the evolution of erosion characteristics to the microstructure of the treated soil which may give more information about the factors responsible of the changes of the erosion characteristics.

Although the short-term effects seemed to be positive, the use of these treatments for hydraulic earth structures should consider their long-term behavior. In fact, such products require specific studies to assess the evolution of these parameters over time when the structures are submitted to climatic conditions, which can affect the sustainability of treatments and decrease their initial performances. The impact of these different treatment products on other hydro-mechanical parameters (e.g., hydraulic conductivity, unconfined compression strength) of the tested soil should also be considered in the framework of the selection of the most cost effective treatment product.

## **Acknowledgment**

The authors would like to thank S. Bonne, E. Lavallée and T. Le Borgne from DTP - Bouygues Construction - France for their valuable support of this study.

## References

- Al-Amoudi, O.S.B., (2002). Characterization and chemical stabilization of Al-Qurayyah sabkha soil. *Journal of Materials in Civil Engineering*, vol. 14, No 6, 478-484.
- ASTM D 4647-98, (1998). Standard Test Method for Identification and Classification of Dispersive Clay Soils by the Pinhole Test. American Society For Testing and Materials, West Conshohocken, 11 p.
- ASTM-D 698-98, (1998). Standard Test Method for Laboratory Compaction Characteristics of Soil Using Standard Effort. American Society For Testing and Materials, West Conshohocken, 8 p.
- Attom, M., (2012). The effect of compaction condition and initial water content on soil erosion. *International Conference on Scour and Erosion, ICSE6 Paris*, 49-56.
- Bell, F.G., (1996). Lime stabilization of clay minerals and soils. *Engineering Geology*, vol. 42, 223-237.
- Bellezza, I., Fratalochi, E., (2006). Effectiveness of cement on hydraulic conductivity of compacted soil-cement mixtures. *Ground Improvement*, vol. 10, No 2, 77-90.
- Benahmed, N., Bonelli, S., (2007). Etude expérimentale de l'érosion interne d'une kaolinite. *25e Rencontres de l'AUGC 2007, Bordeaux, France*, 8 p.
- Benahmed, N., Bonelli, S., (2012). Investigation concentrated leak erosion behaviour of cohesive soils by performing hole erosion tests. *European Journal of Environmental and Civil Engineering*, vol. 16, No 1, 43-58.
- Bennabi, A., Karoui, T., Benamar, A., Wang, H.Q., (2012). Some elements of comparison between two laboratory devices for soil erosion testing. *International Conference on Scour and Erosion, ICSE6 Paris*, 1089-1096.
- Benson, C.H., Daniel, D.E., (1990). Influence of clods on hydraulic conductivity of compacted clay. *Journal of Geotechnical Engineering*, vol. 116, No 8, 1231-1247.



564 Brandl, H., (1981). Alteration of soil parameters by stabilization with lime, Proceedings of the  
565 10th International Conference on Soil Mechanics and foundation Engineering, Stockholm,  
566 vol. 3, 587-594.

567 Chapuis, R.P., (2002).The 2000 R.M. Hardy Lecture: Full-scale hydraulic performance of  
568 soil-bentonite and compacted clay liners. Canadian Geotechnical Journal, vol. 39, No 2, 417-  
569 439.

570 Chevalier, C., Haghighi, I., Herrier, G., (2012). Resistance to erosion of lime treated soils: a  
571 complete parametric study in laboratory. International Conference on Scour and Erosion,  
572 ICSE6 Paris, 1065-1072.

573 Cuisinier, O., Auriol, J.C., Le Borgne, T., Denelle, D., (2011). Microstructure and hydraulic  
574 conductivity of a compacted lime-treated soil. Engineering Geology, vol. 123, 187-193.

575 Eades, J.L., Grim, R.E., (1966). A quick test to determine lime requirements for lime  
576 stabilization. Highway Research Board Bulletin, vol. 139, 61-72.

577 Farrar, J.A., Torres, R.L., Erdogan, Z., (2007). Bureau of reclamation erosion testing for  
578 evaluating piping and internal erosion of dams. Geotechnical Special Publication, vol. 167,  
579 No 3, 22-31.

580 Fell, R., Wan, C.F., Cyganiewicz, J., Foster, M., (2003). Time for development of internal  
581 erosion and piping in embankment dams. Journal of Geotechnical and Geoenvironmental  
582 Engineering, vol. 129, No 4, 2003, 307-314.

583 Haghighi, I., (2012). Caractérisation des phénomènes d'érosion et de dispersion des sols :  
584 développement d'essais et applications pratiques. PhD thesis, Ecole Nationale des Ponts et  
585 Chaussées, Paris, France, 202 p.

586 Haghighi, I., Chevalier, C., Duc, M., Guédon, S., Reiffsteck, P., (2013). Improvement of hole  
587 erosion test and results on reference soils. Journal of Geotechnical and Geoenvironmental  
588 engineering, vol. 139, No 2, 330–339.

589 Herrier, G., Chevalier, C., Froumentin, M., Cuisinier, O., Bonelli, S., Fry, J.J., (2012). Lime  
590 treated soil as an erosion-resistant material for hydraulic earthen structures. International  
591 Conference on Scour and Erosion, ICSE6 Paris, 585-592.

592 Indraratna, B., Muttuvel, T., Khabbaz, H., (2009). Modelling the erosion rate of chemically  
593 stabilized soil incorporating tensile force-deformation characteristics. Canadian Geotechnical  
594 journal, vol. 46, 57-68.

595 Le Runigo, B., Cuisinier, O., Cui, Y.-J., Ferber, V., Deneele, D., (2009). Impact of initial state  
596 on the fabric and permeability of a lime-treated silt under long-term leaching. Canadian  
597 Geotechnical Journal, vol. 46, 1243-1257.

598 Lefebvre, G., Rohan, K., Douville, S., (1985). Erosivity of natural intact structured clay:  
599 evaluation. Canadian Geotechnical Journal, vol. 22, 508-517.

600 Lim, S.S., (2006). Experimental investigation of erosion in variably saturated clay soils. PhD  
601 thesis, University of New South Wales, Australia. 171 p.

602 Luthi, M., Fannin, R.j., Milar, R.G., (2012). A modified hole erosion test (HET-P) device.  
603 Geotechnical Testing Journal, vol. 35, No 4, 660-664.

604 McCallister, L.D., Petry, T.M., (1991). Physical property changes in a lime-treated expansive  
605 clay caused by leaching. Transportation Research Record, vol. 1295, 37-44.

606 Mitchell, J.K., Hooper, D. R., Campanella, R. G. (1965). Permeability of compacted clays.  
607 Journal of the Soil Mechanics and Foundation Division, vol. 91, No sm, 41-65.

608 Muttuvel, T., (2008). Erosion rate of chemically stabilized soils incorporating tensile stress-  
609 deformation behaviour. PhD thesis, University of Wollongong, Australia. 202 p.

610 Pham, T.L., (2008). Erosion et dispersion des sols argileux par un fluide. PhD thesis, Ecole  
611 Nationale des Ponts et Chaussées, Paris, France, 232 p.

612 Reddi, L.N., Lee, I.M., Bonala, M.V.S., (2000). Comparison of internal and surface erosion  
613 using flow pump tests on a sand-kaolinite mixture. *Geotechnical Testing Journal*, vol. 23, 116-  
614 122.

615 Rohan, K., Lefebvre, G., Douville, S., Milette, J.P., (1986). A new technique to evaluate  
616 erosivity of cohesive material. *Geotechnical Testing Journal*, vol. 9, 87-92.

617 Sariosseiri, F., Muhunthan, B., (2009). Effect of cement treatment on geotechnical properties  
618 of some Washington state soils. *Engineering Geology*, vol. 104, 119-125.

619 SETRA-LCPC, (2000). *Traitement des sols à la chaux et/ou aux liants hydrauliques (GTS) -*  
620 *Application à la réalisation des remblais et des couches de forme*. Technical manual, 240 p.

621 Sherard, J.L., Dunnigan, L.P., Decker, R.S., Steele, E.F., (1976). Pinhole test for identifying  
622 dispersive soils. *Journal of Geotechnical Engineering Division*, vol. 102, No GT1, 69-85.

623 Sivapillaiah, P.V., Sridharan, A., Stalin, V.K. (2000). Hydraulic conductivity of bentonite-  
624 sand mixtures. *Canadian Geotechnical Journal*, vol. 37, 406-413.

625 Wahl, T., (2010). A comparison of the hole erosion test and jet erosion test. Joint Federal  
626 Interagency Conference on Sedimentation and Hydrologic Modeling, Las Vegas 2010, 11 p.

627 Wan, C.F., Fell, R., (2002). Investigation of internal erosion and piping of soils in  
628 embankment dams by the slot erosion test and the hole erosion test. UNICIV Report, No R-  
629 412, 358 p.

630 Wan, C.F., Fell, R., (2004). Investigation of rate of erosion of soils in embankment dams.  
631 *Journal of Geotechnical and Geoenvironmental Engineering*, vol. 130, No 4, 373-380.

632 Watabe, Y., Leroueil, S., Le Bihan, J-P., (2000). Influence of compaction conditions on pore-  
633 size distribution and saturated hydraulic conductivity of a glacial till. *Canadian Geotechnical*  
634 *Journal*, vol. 37, 1184-1194.

635

636

## **Tables**

**Table 1: Method of the classification of soils based on their erodibility (Wan and Fell, 2002).**

**Table 2: Physical and geotechnical properties of the studied soil.**

**Table 3: Optimum Proctor compaction characteristics for silt treated with different products and the compaction characteristics for the HET samples.**

**Table 4: Example of the range of the initial applied inlet pressures for different treatments.**

**Table 5: Erosion characteristics for the untreated silt calculated from 6 tests.**

**Table 6: Impact of clay treatments on the erosion characteristics of the studied silt.**

**Table 7: Erosion characteristics of lime-treated silt calculated from several tests after 1, 7 and 30 days.**

**Table 8: Erosion characteristics for cement-treated silt calculated from several tests after 1, 7 and 30 days.**

## Figures

**Figure 1: Schematic of the enhanced HET testing cell.**

**Figure 2: Example results for a HET performed on a sample of untreated silt.**

a) pressure applied at the inlet of the sample.

b) pressure drop between the inlet and outlet of the sample.

c) turbidity signal of the effluent.

d) flow through the sample.

e) erosion rate.

f) hydraulic shear stress.

**Figure 3: Relationship between the soil concentration and turbidity signal.**

a) concentration interval [0 - 1.5 kg/m<sup>3</sup>].

b) concentration interval [0 - 15 kg/m<sup>3</sup>].

The best fit line is drawn for each treatment.

**Figure 4: Representation of the calculated and measured diameter at the end of the different tests.**

**Figure 5: Two examples of erosion law for the untreated silt.**

**Figure 6: Impact of clay treatment on the erosion characteristics of silt.**

The lines represent the erosion law drawn from the best fit line for the selected data of each treatment.

**Figure 7: Example of the erosion law for lime-treated silt (1%) with 7 days of curing.**

**Figure 8: Impact of the drilling on the erosion law of 3% lime-treated soil.**

a) drilling after 7 days of curing

b) drilling before 7 days of curing

c) drilling after 30 days of curing

d) drilling before 30 days of curing

**Figure 9: Examples of the erosion law for lime-treated samples.**

The lines represent the erosion law drawn from the best fit line for the selected data of each treatment.

**Figure 10: Example of the erosion law for cement-treated silt.**

The lines represent the erosion law drawn from the best fit line for the selected data of each treatment.

**Figure 11: Effect of treatment on the erosion characteristics of the studied silt.**

The vertical small bar refers to samples where the coefficient of soil erosion was calculated at the starting phase only.

690 **Table 1: Method of the classification of soils based on their erodibility (Wan and Fell,**  
691 **2002).**

Group number	Erosion Rate Index ( <i>ERI</i> )	Description
1	<2	Extremely rapid
2	2 – 3	Very rapid
3	3 – 4	Moderately rapid
4	4 – 5	Moderately slow
5	5 – 6	Very slow
6	>6	Extremely slow

692

693

694    **Table 2: Physical and geotechnical properties of the studied soil.**

Soil properties	Value
Liquid limit (%)	28.5
Plastic limit (%)	20.5
Plasticity index (%)	8.0
Passing sieve 80 µm (%)	99.2
Clay size content (<2 µm) (%)	6.0
Specific gravity Gs (–)	2.64

695

**Table 3: Optimum Proctor compaction characteristics for silt treated with different products and the compaction characteristics for the HET samples.**

Types of treatment	Notation	Optimum Proctor compaction characteristics		Compaction characteristics for the HET samples	
		$\rho_{dmax}$	$w_{OMC}$ (%)	$\rho_d$ (Mg/m <sup>3</sup> )	$w$ (%)
		(Mg/m <sup>3</sup> )			
Silt	S	1.82	15.0	1.73	17.5
+ 2% kaolinite	SK 2%	1.80	15.5	1.73	18.0
+ 9% kaolinite	SK 9%	1.79	15.8	1.74	18.3
+ 2% bentonite	SB 2%	1.78	15.3	1.74	17.8
+ 1% lime	SL 1%	1.75	17.5	1.70	20.0
+ 3% lime	SL 3%	1.73	17.5	1.68	20.0
+ 3% cement	SC 3%	1.81	15.0	1.75	17.5
+ 6% cement	SC 6%	1.82	15.0	1.75	17.5



700 **Table 4: Example of the range of the initial applied inlet pressures for different**  
701 **treatments.**

Type of treatments	Range of initial applied pressure (kPa)
Silt	70-80
+ 2% kaolinite	70-80
+ 9% kaolinite	100-120
+ 2% bentonite	75-85
+ 1% lime	150-250
+ 3% lime	200-300
+ 3% cement	400-500
+ 6% cement	500-650

702

**Table 5: Erosion characteristics for the untreated silt calculated from 6 tests.**

Test	$k_{er}$ (s/m)	$\tau_c$ (Pa)	Mean values	
			$k_{er}$ (s/m)	$\tau_c$ (Pa)
1	$2.58 \times 10^{-04}$	391	$2.07 \times 10^{-04}$	429
2	$2.16 \times 10^{-04}$	389		
3	$2.22 \times 10^{-04}$	398		
4	$1.13 \times 10^{-04}$	491		
5	$3.04 \times 10^{-04}$	615		
6	$1.30 \times 10^{-04}$	291		

706

707 **Table 6: Impact of clay treatments on the erosion characteristics of the studied silt.**

Test	Nature of treatment	$k_{er}$ (s/m)	$\tau_c$ (Pa)	Mean values	
				$k_{er}$ (s/m)	$\tau_c$ (Pa)
1	+ 2% kaolinite	$1.54 \times 10^{-04}$	586	$1.99 \times 10^{-04}$	607
2		$2.68 \times 10^{-04}$	754		
1	+ 9% kaolinite	$4.62 \times 10^{-05}$	668	$6.92 \times 10^{-05}$	530
2		$8.10 \times 10^{-05}$	391		
3		$5.05 \times 10^{-05}$	519		
1	+ 2% bentonite	$5.66 \times 10^{-05}$	357	$5.62 \times 10^{-05}$	316
2		$5.71 \times 10^{-05}$	511		
3		$5.13 \times 10^{-05}$	123		

708

709

710

711 **Table 7: Erosion characteristics of lime-treated silt calculated from several tests after 1,**  
712 **7 and 30 days.**

Test	Nature of treatment (curing time)	Erosion characteristics		Mean values	
		from the ending phase			
		$k_{er}(s/m)$	$\tau_c(Pa)$	$k_{er}(s/m)$	$\tau_c(Pa)$
1	+ 1% lime (1d)	$1.20 \times 10^{-04}$	618	$1.25 \times 10^{-04}$	745
2		$2.62 \times 10^{-04}$	836		
1	+ 1% lime (7d)	$2.87 \times 10^{-04}$	1725	$2.63 \times 10^{-04}$	1660
2		$2.35 \times 10^{-04}$	1770		
1	+ 1% lime (30d)	$2.53 \times 10^{-04}$	1538	$2.11 \times 10^{-04}$	1279
2		$1.09 \times 10^{-04}$	963		
1	+ 3% lime (1d)	$2.47 \times 10^{-04}$	1409	$2.24 \times 10^{-04}$	1200
1	+ 3% lime (7d)	$1.75 \times 10^{-04}$	1863	$2.46 \times 10^{-04}$	1707
2		$4.52 \times 10^{-04}$	1889		
3		$2.15 \times 10^{-04}$	1567		
4		$2.28 \times 10^{-04}$	1522		
5		$3.07 \times 10^{-04}$	1648		
6		$1.81 \times 10^{-04}$	1608		
1	+ 3% lime (30d)	$2.27 \times 10^{-04}$	1035	$1.71 \times 10^{-04}$	1362
2		$1.78 \times 10^{-04}$	1197		
3		$1.68 \times 10^{-04}$	1 845		
4		$2.42 \times 10^{-04}$	1 365		
5		$1.67 \times 10^{-04}$	1 405		

713

**Table 8: Erosion characteristics for cement-treated silt calculated from several tests after 1, 7 and 30 days.**

NE: not established at the ending of the erosion phase.

Test	Nature of treatment (curing time)	Erosion characteristics from the ending phase		Mean values	
		$k_{er}(s/m)$	$\tau_c(Pa)$	$k_{er}(s/m)$	$\tau_c(Pa)$
1	+ 3% cement (1d)	$1.13 \times 10^{-04}$	2850	$1.13 \times 10^{-04}$	2850
2		NE	2850		
1	+ 3% cement (7d)	$1.22 \times 10^{-04}$	2520	$1.31 \times 10^{-04}$	2985
2		$1.47 \times 10^{-04}$	3619		
1	+ 3% cement (30d)	$1.43 \times 10^{-04}$	2531	$1.47 \times 10^{-04}$	2886
2		$1.67 \times 10^{-04}$	3150		
1	+ 6% cement (1d)	$8.00 \times 10^{-05}$	6475	$4.83 \times 10^{-05}$	5891
2		$1.00 \times 10^{-05}$	6800		
1	+ 6% cement (7d)	NE	9734	NE	9814
2		NE	9893		













































