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Introduction

- 18.8 miles – I-270/I370 to I-95/US-1
- 6-lane divided highway with 8 full interchanges
Introduction

Purpose:
- Link existing and proposed development
- State-of-the-art, limited/controlled access
- Minimal environmental impact
Problem - Earthwork Conditions

Fill Requirement: 92% MDD (Modified) at +/- 2% OMC

- Average natural moisture content of on-site soils 4% above optimum
- Year-round fill placement with rainy season
- 35 ft tall embankments
- Piedmont Residual Soils
  - Silts, Silty Sands
  - LL = NP to 65, PI = NP to 30
  - NMC = 8% to 45% +
  - Max. Dry Density ~ 110 pcf
  - OMC ~ 12%
Solution - Soil Cement

- **Modification: Temporary**
  - Reduces soil plasticity
  - Increases strength

- **Stabilization: Permanent**
  - Permanent strength increase
  - Increased resilient modulus
  - Reduce shrink/swell
  - Freeze/thaw resistance
Solution - Soil Cement

- Most benefit in granular soils
- Formation of calcium silicate hydrate
- Dose depends on strength, durability, soil type

Why not Lime?
Solution – Maryland SHA Concerns

- Pavement Subgrade
  - Performance
  - Durability
- Slope Stability
- Compressibility
- Leachate
- Landscaping
Solution - Zoned Embankment
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Solution

- **Zoned Embankment Concept**

Add cement to core soils:

- Reduce compacted fill density while:
  - Achieving soil strength
  - Reducing compressibility
- Modify soil index properties
  - Reduce plasticity
  - Improve workability
- Allow fill placement at high moisture contents
Analyses

- Slope stability
- Global embankment slope stability: $FS > 1.3$
  - Cohesion = 720 psf
  - UCS > 10 psi
Analyses

- Embankment loads
  - Max embankment height of 35-ft, 32.5-ft to TOS
  - Max Overburden Pressure = 120 pcf*32.5 ft + 250 psf (traffic load) + 325 psf (pavement section) = 4,475 psf = 31 psi
  - 31 psi * 1.3 (FS) = 40 psi
Results

- Laboratory tests
- Samples at 0, 3, 4, 6% Cement
  - Classification
  - Proctors (Std/Mod)
  - Unconfined Compression
    - Molded to 85, 90, 95% of Std, 92% of Mod
    - Wet as possible to achieve density
    - Cured 1, 7, 14, 28 days
  - Consolidation
Unconfined Compressive Strength vs. Dry Density
7-Day Results

Sample Description:
SANDY ELASTIC SILT

Optimum Moisture (%):
13.2

Max Dry Density (pcf):
110.9

Target 40 psi
Unconfined Compressive Strength vs. Moisture Content
7-Day Results

Sample Description:
SANDY ELASTIC SILT

Optimum Moisture (%): 13.2
Max Dry Density (pcf): 110.9

Target 40 psi
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Results - Field Procedures

- Zoned embankment
  - Cement dose of 3-percent
  - Compact to 85% MDD per AASHTO T-99
  - Dry density > 80 pcf
  - Moisture content < 40%

- Test strips
  - Establish effective construction methods
  - Establish QC tests
  - Verify core properties are achieved
Results - Quality Control Procedures

- Visual observations
- Perform >10 nuclear density tests per lift/day
- Mold compressive strength test cylinders
  - +/- 2 pcf of lowest density recorded
  - Cure and compressive strength test at 7 days
  - UCS > 40 psi at 7 days
Success!

- Contractor could place fill year round
- Met project schedule
- Overall cost savings
Contract B used an alternative method

- Same 3% for embankment / 5% for pavement subgrade but eliminated the zone concept
- If compaction criteria met, considered cement as modification only
- If compaction criteria not met, utilized strength based approach
- Transferred landscaping risks to subcontractor

This flexibility was valuable to the contractor

Due to increased durability and reliability, the contractor used soil cement even when not necessary
Lessons Learned

- Considering cement modification/stabilization is an investment and can be time consuming.
- Cement can be useful at low doses.
- The same cement used in laboratory study must be used in the field operations.
- Field observations are critical to evaluation.

The best Quality Control plans evaluate the work based on field observations and use laboratory testing to confirm field results.
Lessons Learned

- Feasibility Study, Operation Plan, and Quality Control Plan must be developed full circle
  - This can be a challenge
  - Consider broad Feasibility Study (broader study early means more options later)
  - Expect variations
  - Use a Factor of Safety to account for variability in field/lab methods
Geology
Name the three types of rock.

1. Classic
2. Punk
3. Hard