

Shear strength behavior of crude oil contaminated sand-concrete interface

Amirhossein Mohammadi, Taghi Ebadi* and Abolfazl Eslami

*Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Amirkabir University of Technology,
424 Hafez Ave, Tehran, Iran*

(Received July 05, 2015, Revised May 25, 2016, Accepted October 19, 2016)

Abstract. A laboratory investigation into crude oil contaminated sand-concrete interface behavior is performed. The interface tests were carried out through a direct shear apparatus. Pure sand and sand-bentonite mixture with different crude oil contents and three concrete surfaces of different textures (smooth, semi-rough, and rough) were examined. The experimental results showed that the concrete surface texture is an effective factor in soil-concrete interface shear strength. The interface shear strength of the rough concrete surface was found higher than smooth and semi-rough concrete surfaces. In addition to the texture, the normal stress and the crude oil content also play important roles in interface shear strength. Moreover, the friction angle decreases with increasing crude oil content due to increase of oil concentration in soil and it increases with increasing interface roughness.

Keywords: sand-concrete interface; pollution; shear strength; bentonite

1. Introduction

The thin layer between structures and soil is often called soil-structure interface which transfers loads from structures to soil mass. This layer plays influential roles in the bearing capacity of soils and load-displacement behavior of geotechnical structures (Lashkari 2010). The shear strength of the interface between soil and structural material is important while designing geotechnical structures, including deep foundations (such as pile, drilled shaft, etc.), and shallow foundations (such as retaining wall, sheet pile, etc.) (Tiwari and Al-Adhahd 2014). Although much more attention has been paid in recent years regarding soil-structure interaction for dynamic loading, highly conservative values of the static frictional resistance between soil and structure are used in the design. Not many research articles are available regarding the recommended soil-structure shearing resistance, so majority of the designs are based on empirical values, i.e., ratio of skin friction or adhesion to the internal friction or cohesion of foundation soil (Tiwari and Al-Adhahd 2014, Sim and Lee 2013). Many researches have investigated the soil-structure interaction so far. As an early work which has been cited by many articles in the literature, Potyondy (1961) conducted direct shear test on the interface of concrete, steel, and wood with sand, sandy silt, cohesive soil, rock flour (silt), and clay. He conducted tests for certain pre-set moisture contents as well as for dry specimens, and found that the frictional resistance of a soil depends on its sand

*Corresponding author, Associate Professor, E-mail: tebadi@aut.ac.ir

content. He also revealed that the moisture content, soil composition, surface roughness, and normal load have significant influence on the interface strength (Potyondy 1961).

In another work, Coyle and Sulaiman (1967) investigated the frictional resistance between sand and steel pile whereas Kulhaway and Peterson (1979) measured the frictional resistance between sand and concrete. Several other researchers such as Evgin and Fakharian (1996), Hryciw and Irsyam (1993), Uesigi *et al.* (1998), and Hu and Pu (2004) conducted direct shear tests on the steel/concrete-sand interface in order to measure the interface frictional resistance.

Oil contamination mainly occurs during transportation, leakage from storage tanks or pipelines. However, few studies on oil contaminated soil-structure interface interaction are recorded. Subsequently, soils and ground water might be contaminated. The cleanup procedure in case of the contaminated sites is too difficult or sometimes impossible. In addition to environmental concerns for soil and groundwater, this kind of pollution alters the geotechnical properties of the soil such as the shear strength and the hydraulic conductivity (Oyegbile and Ayininuola 2013). In this regard, several research studies have been carried out to study the geotechnical properties of oil contaminated soils. (Al-Sanad *et al.* 1995) and Al-Sanad and Ismail (1997) performed laboratory tests to investigate the influence of oil contamination and aging effect on geotechnical properties of Kuwaiti sand. Their results proved a small reduction in strength and permeability and an increase in compressibility as a result of contamination. Shin *et al.* (1999) and Shin and Das (2001) found that the bearing capacity of footing decreased significantly with increase of oil contamination. The experimental results obtained by Khamehchiyan *et al.* (2007) indicated the increase of the compressibility of soil samples with the increasing oil content due to reduction of maximum dry density and optimum water content; however, the oil contamination caused a reduction in permeability and strength in the soil samples. Sim and Lee (2012a) investigated some geotechnical properties of palm biodiesel contaminated mining sand and the results showed that an increase of palm biodiesel contents decreased the shear strength of mining sand sample. In another research, Sim and Lee (2012b) studied the palm biodiesel contaminated soil-steel interface, and they found that the magnitude of shear strength in the interface increased harmonically with normal stress but it decreased with increasing of palm biodiesel contents. Additionally, they recognized that the rough steel interface developed larger shear strength in comparison with smooth steel interface. Sim and Lee (2013) evaluated the behavior of palm biodiesel contaminated sand-concrete interface. They concluded that the soil-concrete interface shear strength is dependent upon the concrete surface texture and the palm biodiesel content in the sand. The results also indicated that the sand-concrete interface failure modes are governed by the sliding and deformation displacements. Tiwari *et al.* (2010) studied the shear strength reduction at different soil-structure interfaces (soil-concrete, soil-wood, and soil-steel) using various soil types. They found that skin resistance of the soil-structure interface depends on the surface material of the structure and the type of soil. The behavior of dry soil differs from that of saturated soil. Al-Adhath (2013) investigated the interface friction angle between cohesionless soil and different structural materials (steel, wood, and concrete). He noticed that the shear strength of soil-soil contact was higher than the frictional resistance between soil and the different construction materials. Likewise, the soil-concrete frictional resistance was higher than the soil-steel and soil-wood frictional resistance. Moreover, Goh and Donald (1984) assessed the soil-concrete interface behavior using simple shear apparatus. Their results indicated that the interface shear strength is dependent upon the concrete surface texture and the clay content of the soil. Additionally, they found that large shear strains in the soil are necessary to fully mobilize the interface skin friction, and the effects of interface dilation are negligible. In a recent study by Zhang *et al.* (2016), the

interface shear strength behavior of soil-concrete interface investigated by using a statistical learning approach (LS-SVM) with respect to the three initial parameters namely water content, dry density and applied normal stress. Their proposed approach substantially simplified the complex interrelationships between the physical parameters of the interface.

In the current study, an experimental investigation is conducted to assess the variation of shear strength parameters of crude oil contaminated casting sand-concrete interfaces as a function of concrete roughness, crude oil content, and bentonite content using direct shear apparatus.

2. Material and methods

2.1 Reagents and materials

Crude oil, sand, and bentonite were supplied from Tehran Oil Refinery, Silica Sand MFG Company, and Mokarrar Composite Company, respectively. The sandy soil was synthesized by mixing equal amounts of two sand types (foundry mold sand 141 and industrial sand D11). Table 1 shows a brief description of the resulting mixture characteristics. Crude oil specifications are tabulated in Table 2.

Moreover, Particle size analysis was performed in case of the soil according to ASTM D422-07. Fig. 1 illustrates the grain size distribution of the soil sample. According to the grain size distribution, values of d_{10} , d_{60} , and d_{30} were obtained; consequently, C_u and C_c were calculated.

Table 1 Composition of the synthesized sandy soil

| Composition (%) | | | | | | |
|------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------|------|------|-----|
| SiO ₂ | Fe ₂ O ₃ | Al ₂ O ₃ | K ₂ O | CaO | MgO | LOI |
| 97.5 | 0.85 | 0.95 | 0.19 | 0.27 | 0.24 | 0.0 |

Table 2 Specifications of crude oil supplied from Tehran Oil Refinery

| Parameter | Value |
|----------------------------|---------------------------|
| Specific gravity (15.56°C) | 0.8597 gr/cm ³ |
| Kinematic viscosity (20°C) | 11.22 mm ² /s |
| API | 33.09 |
| Sulphur content | 1.8 Wt.% |




Fig. 1 Grain size distribution of the soil sample

Table 3 Parameters of soil characteristics

| Parameter | Soil type (USCS) | G_s (g/cm ³) | C_u | C_c | w (%) | D_{10} (mm) | e_{min} | e_{max} | D_r (%) |
|-----------|------------------|----------------------------|-------|-------|---------|---------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Value | SP | 2.664 | 2.16 | 0.89 | 1.13 | 0.36 | 0.62 | 0.89 | 48.15 |

Table 4 Chemical analysis of bentonite sample

| Compound | SiO ₂ | Al ₂ O ₃ | Fe ₂ O ₃ | TiO ₂ | CaO | MgO | Na ₂ O | K ₂ O | S | MnO | P ₂ O ₅ |
|----------|------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------|------|------|-------------------|------------------|------|------|-------------------------------|
| % | 61.39 | 13.07 | 2.60 | 0.24 | 4.60 | 1.71 | 2.92 | 0.62 | 1.63 | 0.04 | 0.07 |

Additionally, the soil was classified by unified soil classification system (USCS) according to ASTM D2487 as SP (poorly-graded sand). ASTM D857 was used for obtaining the specific gravity of soil grains. In order to assess the relative density (D_r), e_{max} and e_{min} were obtained through ASTM D4253 and ASTM D4254, respectively. Water content of the soil was analyzed with respect to ASTM D2216. Table 3 holds a list of the soil characteristic parameters. Table 4 carries the results of XRF analysis on bentonite sample.

2.2 Soil sample preparation

Samples of contaminated soil were synthetically prepared by adding certain amount of crude oil (0, 2.5, 5, 7.5, 10% w/w) to the dry soil. Each sample was incubated for 10 days at room temperature in a double-layered black plastic bag to block sunlight exposure and to enable the possible reaction between soil and oil. Fig. 2 shows the prepared samples.

2.3 Concrete sample preparation

3 Cubic 10 cm × 10 cm × 10 cm concrete samples with water:cement (w/c) ratio of 0.58 were prepared and cured for 7 days. Prior to curing, a steel brush was used to make grooved surfaces on two of the samples (in two different degrees of roughness), in order to create various surface roughness. Afterwards, three 10 cm × 10 cm × 1.8 cm samples were cut from each cube.

2.4 Geotechnical tests

In this research, the testing program included compaction and direct shear tests for understanding the effects of crude oil contamination on geotechnical properties of soil samples.



Fig. 2 Contaminated soil samples incubated in double-layered black plastic bag

First of all, a base density was found by the compaction tests, in order to prepare appropriate samples for direct shear tests.

2.4.1 Standard proctor compaction test

Compaction behavior was evaluated through standard proctor compaction test (ASTM D698-07) in case of the followings:

- Pure sand (0, 2.5, 5, 7.5, 10% w/w crude oil contaminated)
- Sand+20% w/w bentonite mixture (0, 2.5, 5, 7.5, 10% w/w crude oil contaminated).

In other words, 10 standard compaction tests were performed. The maximum dry densities and optimum moisture contents of soil samples were taken as the base values. According to this assumption, all of the samples will be on the dry side of the compaction curve and their difference lies in the various crude oil contents (Shin and Das 2001).

2.4.2 Direct shear test

Direct shear test was carried out aiming to find the effect of oil contamination on strength parameters of soils. The tests were performed according to ASTM D3080 in case of soil-soil and soil-concrete interfaces in the following conditions:

- Pure sand (0, 2.5, 5, 7.5, 10% w/w crude oil contaminated)
- Sand+20% w/w bentonite mixture (0, 2.5, 5, 7.5, 10% w/w crude oil contaminated).

In this part of the experiments, a total number of 120 direct shear tests were performed in a rectangular shear box (10 cm × 10 cm) under normal stress of 1, 2, and 3 kg/cm² (approximately 100, 200, and 300 KPa) with a shear rate of 1 mm/min. In case of soil-concrete interface, the concrete sample was placed at the lower jaw of direct shear apparatus, while the upper jaw was filled by the soil.

3. Result

3.1 Standard compaction test

The results of compaction test on different soil samples are plotted in Figs. 3 and 4 in terms of dry density versus water content. As can be seen on Figs. 3 and 4, at fixed bentonite content, the maximum dry density of the contaminated soil increases with oil content and it is achieved in lower water content. In other words, since the soil grains are covered by crude oil, the contamination acts as a strong lubricating agent which facilitates compaction and reduces the amount of




Fig. 3 Results of compaction test in case of 0% bentonite mixture




Fig. 4 Results of compaction test in case of sand with 20% bentonite mixture

water needed to reach maximum density. Based on the Figs. 3 and 4 by increasing bentonite content, maximum dry density and optimum water content increases slightly.

3.2 Direct shear test

3.2.1 Soil-soil interface

Figs. 5 and 6 show variations of cohesion and internal friction angle of two different soil compositions versus crude oil contents at soil-soil interface.

According to the results shown in Figs. 5 and 6, samples show a low cohesion due to oil contamination that can be the result of viscosity and inherent cohesion of oil. This cohesion increases by increasing the contamination. Fig. 6 illustrates that the internal friction angle decreases with the increase of crude oil contamination in soil. Wet sands show a little apparent cohesion due to surface tension force of existing water in soil. Fig. 7 shows the sheared sand sample which contains 20% bentonite and 10% crude oil contamination. Equation of shear strength of soil contains two major parameters which are cohesion (c) and internal friction angle




Fig. 5 Cohesion variations versus crude oil content in case of two different soil compositions at soil-soil interface




Fig. 6 Variations of different soil internal friction angle against crude oil content at soil-soil interface



Fig. 7 Sheared sand sample containing 20% bentonite and 10% crude oil contamination

(ϕ). Cohesion of contaminated soil increases by increasing crude oil content, while ϕ decreases simultaneously.

3.2.2 Soil-concrete interface

Figs. 8 and 9 show the soil friction angle values with different percentages of crude oil contents in case of pure sand and sand-bentonite mixture for smooth, semi-rough, and rough interfaces tests.

The results show reduction in friction angle due to the increasing of crude oil contents in soil specimens. Similar results have been reported in literature (Khamsehchiyan *et al.* 2007, Ghaly 2001). According to Chew and Lee (2010), soil particles were coated with crude oil which resulted in friction reduction when soil particles slipped and slid over each other. The friction angles in case of clean pure sand for smooth, semi-rough, and rough interfaces are about 27.9°, 28.8° and 30.1°, respectively. In case of bentonite-mixed sand, the value of friction angle for smooth, semi-rough, and rough interface textures, are obtained as 27.7°, 28.4°, and 28.9°, respectively. However, It can be seen that as the crude oil content of soil samples increased to 10%, the friction angle may be reduced to about 25.2°, 25.4°, and 25.7° in case of pure sand, and 25.5°, 25.8°, and 26.1° in case of




Fig. 8 Variations of friction angle against crude oil contents in case of three different pure sand-concrete interface textures




Fig. 9 Variations of friction angle against crude oil contents in case of three different (sand-bentonite)-concrete interface textures




Fig. 10 Failure envelopes for pure sand and smooth concrete interface




Fig. 11 Failure envelopes for sand plus bentonite and smooth concrete interface




Fig. 12 Failure envelopes for pure sand and semi-rough concrete interface




Fig. 13 Failure envelopes for sand plus bentonite and semi-rough concrete interface




Fig. 14 Failure envelopes for pure sand and rough concrete interface




Fig. 15 Failure envelopes for sand plus bentonite and rough concrete interface

sand-bentonite mixture for smooth, semi-rough, and rough concrete interfaces, respectively. The failure envelopes of the smooth, semi-rough, and rough concrete interfaces tests are plotted in Figs. 10 to 15: Smooth concrete interface (Figs. 10 and 11), semi-rough concrete interface (Figs. 12 and 13), and rough concrete interface (Figs. 14 and 15).

As the normal stress (σ_n) increases, the maximum shear stress also increases for both pure sand and sand-bentonite mixture, regardless of its crude oil contents. The test results for all concrete interfaces show that clean samples exhibit the largest stress ratio, while samples contaminated with 2.5%, 5%, 7.5%, and 10% crude oil, will sit in the next places respectively. Similar pattern for results have been formerly reported (Al-Sanad and Ismail 1997, Ratnaweera and Meegoda 2006, Khamchayan *et al.* 2007, Rahman *et al.* 2011).

The maximum interface shear stress decreases with increasing crude oil content for both pure sand and sand plus 20% bentonite for smooth, semi-rough, and rough interfaces. It can be explained by this fact that samples are easily slipped or sheared with higher crude oil content when subjected to shear (Chew and Lee 2010). The maximum interface shear stress decreases with increasing applied normal stress; nevertheless, the effect of normal stress is less significant in the specimen with a smooth interface.

4. Conclusions

In this study, the crude oil contaminated sand-concrete interface behavior was investigated through a series of laboratory experiments using direct shear apparatus. The conclusions can be drawn as follows:

- By increasing the oil content within the soil, the maximum dry density increases, and it is achieved in lower water content (i.e., the optimum water content decreases with increasing crude oil content).
- By increasing bentonite content, the maximum dry density and the optimum water content increases slightly.
- Three different textures of concrete interface are studied: relatively smooth, semi-rough, and rough surface. The interface shear strength of rough concrete surface is higher than smooth and semi-rough concrete surfaces. In addition to the texture, the normal stress and crude oil content also play important roles in interface shear strength. The shear strength increases with increasing normal stress and decreases with increasing crude oil content.
- The friction angle decreases with increasing crude oil content due to increase of oil viscosity in soil and it increases with increasing interface roughness.
- C term in strength formula of contaminated soil increases by increasing crude oil content,

while ϕ decreases. As a result shear strength may increase totally because C affects shear strength directly, but ϕ is in the form of tangent in the shear strength formula.

References

- Al-Adhadh, A.R. (2013), "Interface friction angle between cohesionless soil and different structural materials", Master Thesis; Civil Engineering, California State University, CA, USA.
- Al-Sanad, H.A. and Ismael, N.F. (1997), "Aging effects on oil contaminated Kuwaiti sand", *J. Geotech. Geoenviron. Eng.*, **123**(3), 290-293.
- Al-Sanad, H.A., Eid, W.K. and Ismael, N.F. (1995), "Geotechnical properties of oil contaminated Kuwaiti sand", *J. Geotech. Geoenviron. Eng.*, **121**(5), 407-412.
- Chew, S.J. and Lee, C.Y. (2010), "Simple shear behavior of palm biodiesel contaminated soil", *ARPJ. Eng. Appl. Sci.*, **5**(12), 6-9.
- Coyle, H.M. and Sulaiman, I.H. (1967), "Skin friction for steel piles in sand", *J. Soil Mech. Found. Div.*, **93**(6), 261-278.
- Evgin, E. and Fakharian, K. (1996), "Effect of stress paths on the behavior of sand-steel interfaces", *Can. Geotech. J.*, **33**(6), 485-493.
- Ghaly, A.M. (2001), "Strength remediation of oil contaminated sands", *Proceedings of the 17th International Conference on Solid Waste Technology and Management*, PA, USA, December.
- Goh, A.T.C. and Donald, I.B. (1984), "Investigation of soil-concrete interface behavior by simple shear apparatus", *Proceedings of the Conference on Geomechanics*, Perth, Australia, May.
- Hryciw, R.D. and Irsyam, M. (1993), "Behavior of sand particles rigid ribbed inclusions during shear", *Soils Found.*, **33**(3), 1-13.
- Hu, L. and Pu, J. (2004), "Testing and modeling of soil-structure interface", *J. Geotech. Geoenviron. Eng.*, **130**(8), 851-860.
- Khamehchiyan, M., Charkhabi, A.H. and Tajik, M. (2007), "Effects of crude oil contamination on geotechnical properties of clayey and sandy soils", *Eng. Geol.*, **89**(3), 220-229.
- Kulhawy, F.H. and Peterson, M.S. (1979), "Behavior of sand and concrete interfaces", *Proceedings of the 6th Pan American Conference on Soil Mechanics and Foundation Engineering*, Brazil, Volume 2, pp. 225-230.
- Lashkari, A. (2010), "Modeling of sand-structure interfaces under rotational shear", *Mech. Res. Commun.*, **37**(1), 32-37.
- Oyegbile, O.B. and Ayininuola, G.M. (2013), "Laboratory studies on the influence of crude oil spillage on lateritic soil shear strength: A case study of niger delta area of Nigeria", *J. Earth Sci. Geotech. Eng.*, **3**(2), 73-83.
- Potyondy, J.G. (1961), "Skin friction between various soils and construction materials", *Geotech.*, **2**(4), 339-353.
- Rahman, Z.A., Hamzah, U. and Taha, M.R. (2010), "Influence of oil contamination on geotechnical properties of basaltic residual soil", *Am. J. Appl. Sci.*, **7**(7), 954-961.
- Rahman, Z.A., Hamzah, U. and Ahmad, N. (2011), "Engineering geological properties of Oil-contaminated granitic and metasedimentary soils", *Sains Malaysia*, **40**(4), 293-300.
- Ratnaweera, P. and Meegoda, J.N. (2006), "Shear strength and stress-strain behavior of contaminated soils", *ASTM Geotech. Test. J.*, **29**(2), 133-140.
- Shin, E.C. and Das, B.M. (2001), "Bearing capacity of unsaturated oil-contaminated sand", *Int. J. Offshore Polar Eng.*, **11**(3), 220-227.
- Shin, E.C., Lee, J.B. and Das, B.M. (1999), "Bearing capacity of a model scale footing on crude oil contaminated sand", *Geotech. Geol. Eng.*, **17**(2), 123-132.
- Sim, Y.L. and Lee, C.Y. (2012a), "Some geotechnical properties of palm biodiesel contaminated mining sand and weathered granite soil", *Int. J. Adv. Sci. Eng. Technol. Res.*, **1**(4).
- Sim, Y.L. and Lee, C.Y. (2012b), "Palm biodiesel contaminated sand-steel interface testing with direct

- simple shear apparatus”, *Int. J. Civil Struct. Eng.*, **3**(3), 970-981.
- Sim, Y.L. and Lee, C.Y. (2013), “Behavior of palm biodiesel contaminated sand-concrete interface”, *Int. J. Eng. Appl. Sci.*, **4**(1), 88-96.
- Tejchman, J. and Wu, W. (1995), “Experimental and numerical study of sand-steel interfaces”, *Int. J. Numer. Anal. Methods Geomech.*, **19**(8), 513-536.
- Tiwari, B. and Al-Adhadh, A.R. (2014), “Influence of relative density on static soil–structure frictional resistance of dry and saturated sand”, *Geotech. Geol. Eng.*, **32**(2), 411-427.
- Tiwari, B., Ajmera, B. and Kaya, G. (2010), “Shear strength reduction at soil structure interface”, *Proceeding of GeoFlorida 2010: Advances in Analysis, Modeling & Design Foundation Engineering Design Problems*, Orlando, FL, USA, February, pp. 1747-1756.
- Uesugi, M., Kishida, H. and Tsubakihara, Y. (1988), “Behavior of sand particles in sand-steel friction”, *Soils Found.*, **28**(1), 107-118.
- Ur-Rahman, H., Abduljawwad, S.N. and Akram, T. (2007), “Geotechnical behavior of oil-contaminated fine grained soils”, *Electron. J. Geotech. Eng.*, **12**.
- Zhang, C., Ji, J., Gui, Y., Kodikara, J., Yang, S. and He, L. (2016), “Evaluation of soil-concrete interface shear strength based on LS-SVM”, *Geomech. Eng., Int. J.*, **11**(3), 361-372.