*Journal of Engineering Research and Reports*

***Volume 26, Issue 7, Page 102-120, 2024; Article no.JERR.118346***
***ISSN: 2582-2926***

# Evaluating the Compaction Behavior of Oil-contaminated Soils for Civil Engineering Applications

**Aniekan Daniel Udo [a*]**

[a] *Civil Engineering and Technology Researcher, Federal University of Technology, Ihiagwa, Owerritate, Nigeria.*

***Author's contribution***

*The sole author designed, analyzed, interpreted and prepared the manuscript.*

***Article Information***

DOI: https://doi.org/10.9734/jerr/2024/v26i71198

**Open Peer Review History:**
This journal follows the Advanced Open Peer Review policy. Identity of the Reviewers, Editor(s) and additional Reviewers, peer review comments, different versions of the manuscript, comments of the editors, etc are available here: https://www.sdiarticle5.com/review-history/118346

***Original Research Article***

***Received: 08/04/2024***
***Accepted: 12/06/2024***
***Published: 15/06/2024***

## ABSTRACT

This study investigates the impact of oil contamination on the compaction characteristics of soil, specifically lateritic soil samples from Bori Local Government Area in Rivers State, Nigeria. The research focuses on understanding how varying degrees of oil pollution affect soil's compaction behavior, crucial for civil engineering applications. Compaction tests, including the standard Proctor test, were conducted on both uncontaminated and oil-contaminated soil samples. The results indicate that up to 2% oil addition improves compaction, reducing the optimum moisture content and increasing the maximum dry density. Beyond 4% oil content, no significant enhancement in compaction was observed, and higher oil percentages led to saturation and expulsion of oil, based on visual inspection it appears to negatively affect the soil strength. These findings are essential for engineering projects in oil spill regions, providing insights into effective soil compaction strategies and the potential use of oil-contaminated soils in construction.

---

**Corresponding author: Email: jamezdaniel@gmail.com;*

***Cite as:*** *Udo, Aniekan Daniel. 2024. "Evaluating the Compaction Behavior of Oil-Contaminated Soils for Civil Engineering Applications". Journal of Engineering Research and Reports 26 (7):102-20. https://doi.org/10.9734/jerr/2024/v26i71198.*

*Keywords: Oil contamination; soil compaction; lateritic soil; proctor test; maximum dry density; optimum moisture content; civil engineering; soil improvement.*

# 1. INTRODUCTION

## 1.1 Background Information

Soil has been integral to human civilization, serving as agricultural soil and a construction material for building dams, houses, and other structures. The advent of crude oil has expanded its applications, making petroleum oil a global interest [1]. Historical records indicate that various operations, including petroleum oil handling, have been associated with oil spills, which alter the physical and chemical characteristics of soils. These changes affect the engineering properties and compaction characteristics of the soils [2,3].

Every civil engineering structure, whether buildings, dams, or bridges, relies on the earth’s surface or subsurface, making it crucial to understand soil properties under varying conditions. This knowledge helps in controlling and predicting soil properties [1].

Despite frequent oil spills, normal activities must continue. The Niger Delta region of Nigeria faces increasing oil contamination due to oil pollution, impacting the soil's compaction characteristics [4]. Soil compaction, a soil improvement method, involves densifying the soil mass to expel air and excess moisture, thereby reducing voids [5]. This process aims to minimize future soil settlement and the structures it supports [2].

Understanding how different soils respond to compaction and the influence of varying oil contamination levels on soil compaction behavior is essential [6]. Additionally, the economic implications for civil engineering projects must be considered.

## 1.2 Statement of the Problem

Crude oil has been pivotal to the Nigerian economy. However, oil spills and pollution have been recurring problems since the late 1990s, particularly in the Niger Delta region [7]. Concurrently, soil compaction behavior is crucial in civil engineering activities involving earth movement [8]. Therefore, this research seeks to address the following questions:

- How does oil pollution affect the soil's compaction properties?
- Does the degree of oil contamination affect the soil's compaction behavior?
- Does oil influence compaction more effectively than water?

## 1.3 Objectives of Study

This research aims to:

1. Examine any significant variation in the compaction characteristics of oil-contaminated soil.
2. Determine the relationship between oil spill volume and the compaction characteristics of cohesive soil.

## 1.4 Scope of Study

This study will focus on a lateritic soil sample from BORILGA, Rivers State, suitable for road construction and other civil engineering works. It will investigate the relationship between water and oil during compaction operations. This will be achieved by conducting compaction tests on oil-contaminated soil specimens, using the standard Proctor test on uncontaminated soil as the control.

## 1.5 Significance of the Study

This study will benefit the engineering community, particularly those involved in earth-moving operations. It will highlight any beneficial uses of oil in construction. The findings will assist engineers in deciding when and how much oil to introduce for effective compaction, improving the quality of the finished product. Additionally, this study will pave the way for further research on the impact of oil spill contamination on other soil uses and aid civil engineers in designing and constructing projects in oil spill regions.

# 2. LITERATURE REVIEW

## 2.1 Classification of Soil

Soil classification for engineering purposes describes the various soil types found in nature [6]. According to Lambe and Whitman [9], soil classification groups soils with similar behaviors, developed through extensive empirical experience.

Arora [5] outlines the criteria for a useful soil classification:

1. Limited number of groups.
2. Based on relevant engineering properties.
3. Simple and easy to understand terms.

Broad classifications of soil include:

- Particle soil classification
- Textural classification
- AASHTO classification system
- Unified Soil Classification (USC) system
- Indian Standard Classification system (similar to the USC system)

Most soil classification systems in soil mechanics use particle size characteristics, liquid limit, and plasticity index [6]. According to Arora [5], particle size classifications are as follows:

1. Clay: particle size ≤ 0.002 mm
2. Silt: particle size 0.002 – 0.06 mm
3. Sand: particle size 0.06 – 2.0 mm
4. Gravel: particle size ≥ 2.0 mm

The USC system, first developed by Casagrande in 1948 and later modified in 1952, is widely used for engineering problems involving soil [10]. This system uses both particle size and plasticity characteristics and has been standardized by ASTM [5].

## 2.2 Contamination in Soil

Oil (crude oil) is a significant soil contaminant, as shown by Beckett [7]. Various sources of soil contaminants include:

- **Heavy Metals:** Cadmium, Lead, Zinc, Copper, Nickel
- **Inorganic:** Sulfate, Asbestos
- **Organic:** Oil, Tars, Chlorinates, Hydrocarbons, PCBs, Dioxins
- **Gases:** Landfill Gas

*Pollution vs. Contamination*

Beckett [7] defines contamination as the introduction or presence of foreign substances in the environment that may cause damage. Contamination alone does not suffice for pollution. Pollution, according to Baljet [11], is an undesirable change in the physical, chemical, or biological characteristics of air, land, and water, harmful to living beings. The Royal Commission on Environmental Pollution defines it as substances introduced by humans that pose hazards to health, harm resources, damage structures, or interfere with legitimate uses of the environment [12].

## 2.3 Crude Oil

Crude oil is a naturally occurring mixture of hydrocarbons and sulfur, nitrogen, and oxygen derivatives, extracted in liquid form [13]. It is classified based on quality into:

1. Paraffin base
2. Asphaltic base
3. Intermediate base
4. Hybrid (naphthenic) base

Paraffin base crude oils yield residues with paraffin wax, while asphaltic base crude oils yield asphaltic materials [14]. Intermediate base crude oils produce residues with both paraffin wax and asphaltic materials, and naphthenic base crude oils contain mainly asphaltic materials with some paraffin wax [15].

## 2.4 Soil-Oil Interaction

Oil spillage has environmental and socio-economic impacts in petroleum-producing areas, such as Nigeria's riverine regions [16]. Hjeldnes et al. [17] found that oil spreads similarly in soil and along container walls, with movement slowing after seven days. The shape of the contaminated zone depends on the sand's water content.

Meegoda and Ratnaweera [4] studied oil-contaminated soils, finding that adding 3% motor oil affects soil classification. Treatments like heating, solvents, and surfactants were tested, with surfactants producing near-virgin soil. Low-temperature thermal treatment was ineffective for all soils.

## 2.5 Properties of Oil-Contaminated Soil

Al-Sanad et al. [1] investigated basic soil properties, California Bearing Ratio (CBR), direct shear, and triaxial tests on oil-contaminated soil. They found that up to 4% oil contamination improved compaction and CBR values, but beyond 6%, dry density decreased. Srivastava and Pandey [1] observed that oil addition decreases Optimum Moisture Content (OMC) and initially increases Maximum Dry Density (MDD) before it falls, with 6% oil yielding the highest MDD. They attributed this to oil's lubricating effect, reducing water needed for maximum density. However, strength parameters, like cohesion and internal friction angle, decrease with oil content over 3% [17].

Key findings include:

1. Specific gravity of both alluvial soil and sand decreases.
2. Liquid limit and plasticity index of alluvial soil increase, indicating potential settlement issues.
3. Oil improves compaction behavior by reducing OMC, with a small effect on MDD.
4. Compression index of alluvial soil increases, suggesting higher settlement potential.
5. Strength parameters reduce with oil addition.

## 3. METHODOLOGY

### 3.1 Introduction

This chapter outlines the procedures for conducting this study, covering the following sections:

- Area of Study and Characteristics of the Study Population
- Data Collection
- Method of Data Analysis

### 3.2 Area of Study and Characteristics of the Study Population

The study examines the effect of oil spills (using petrol-diesel) on the compaction characteristics of soils, specifically focusing on laterite soil samples from Bori Local Government Area of Rivers State, Nigeria. This area is selected due to its history of oil spills and its significance as an oil-producing region.

### 3.3 Method of Data Collection

Primary data on the compaction characteristics of petrol-diesel spills were collected through laboratory experiments and observations.

**Data Collection Instruments** The instruments used are classified based on the type of data required:

- **Soil Identification Instruments:** These include sieve analysis classification tests, Atterberg (consistency) limit tests, and specific gravity tests. These tests were conducted according to BS 1377 Part 4 [18] to understand the properties of the uncontaminated soil.
- **Standard Proctor Test:** This apparatus was used to determine soil moisture content and dry densities of the dry soil, following BS 1377 Part 4.

**Data Collection Schedule** The laboratory experiment schedule for both air-dried and oil-contaminated soil samples is as follows:

### 3.4 Presentation and Analysis of Data

Data were presented using graphs and charts, including:

- **Optimum Moisture Content Curve:** Dry densities were plotted against the percentage water content, with the highest dry density indicating the optimum moisture content. This was done for both uncontaminated and oil-contaminated soils.
- **Optimum Oil Content Graph:** Bulk densities of oil-contaminated soil were plotted against the percentage of oil content, providing a basis for comparison with the optimum moisture content curve.
- **Sieve Analysis Curve:** For the uncontaminated soil, percentages passing each sieve were plotted against sieve sizes to describe the soil type.

Parameters were obtained using basic soil mechanics equations:

Dry Density=WsV\text{Dry Density} = \frac{W_s}{V}Dry Density=VWs

where WsW_sWs is the weight of dry soil, and VVV is the volume of the soil sample.

Percentage Water Content=Ww×100%W\text{Percentage Water Content} = \frac{W_w \times 100\%}{W}Percentage Water Content=WWw ×100%

where WwW_wWw is the weight of water, and WWW is the weight of the soil.

$$\text{Percentage oil content} = \frac{V_{d\,x\,100\%}}{V_S} \qquad \text{Eq..3.2}$$

Where $V_d$ = volume of petro diesel added to soil

V = Volume of soil

Bulk density = $\frac{W}{V}$

Where W = total weight of the soil sample

V = Total volume of soil sample.

## 4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter discusses the results obtained from the data analysis. The results are presented according to the research experiments conducted. Initially, identification test results are presented to describe the type and nature of the soil used for the experiment. Subsequently, various compaction test results are compared and analyzed alongside the standard Proctor test (used as control without any addition of petrol-diesel). Differences, if any, are noted and commented upon.

### 4.1 Identification Tests

The following experiments were carried out as outlined in Table 2 of Chapter Three. Some results are presented below, while other relevant data are placed in the appendix.

### 4.2 Consistency Limit Tests

The Atterberg limit test results are presented below:

These values fall within the range (15-32% moisture) obtained by both Arora [5] and Obi-Egbedi [19].

Sieve Analysis.

The graph of the sieve analysis of the air-dried sample is presented in Appendix A. Laterite, which contains a good combination of fine clay particles and sand particles, conforms to the distribution shown above. This chart indicates a well-graded sample since Cu > 2 [5]. A well-graded soil typically has a Cu value greater than 2, confirming the sample selected for the experiment is not a gap-graded sample but a well-graded one [7]. From the distribution curve:

- D10 = 0.35
- D30 = 0.8
- D60 = 1.70

The coefficients are calculated as follows:

- Cu (Coefficient of uniformity) = D60 / D10 = 1.70 / 0.35 = 4.86
- Cc (Coefficient of curvature) = (D30^2) / (D10 * D60) = 1.1

The value of Cc = 1.1 confirms the soil is well-graded, meeting the requirements for most engineering compaction purposes, resulting in better compaction ease.

### 4.3 Specific Gravity Test

The specific gravity of the uncontaminated sample was approximately 2.475, similar to results obtained by Srivastava and Pandey [1]. Obi-Egbedi [19] also reported specific gravity values ranging from 2.50 to 2.53 for laterite sourced from Port Harcourt.

### 4.4 Compaction Test

Several compaction tests were conducted to gather the desired results. The standard Proctor compaction test was first carried out, followed by compaction tests on specimens contaminated with varying degrees of oil. Additionally, a compaction test using only oil (petrol-diesel) without any added water was conducted.

### 4.5 Normal Compaction Test (Proctor Test)

The state of soil compaction is measured using the dry density, related to moisture content. As water is added to dry soil, absorbed water films form around the particles, lubricating them and increasing density. Beyond a certain point, absorbed films push particles apart, reducing density. The maximum dry density occurs at the optimum moisture content.

For the natural air-dried sample, the results were:

- Maximum dry density = 1.80 mg/m$^3$
- Optimum moisture content = 16%

These values align with the range of 8-20% moisture content for soils varying from sandy silt to clay soil [5] and similar research by Srivastava and Pandey on alluvial soil [1].

The compaction test results on specimens with specific percentages of oil addition are shown below.

The bulk density of the air-dried sample at varying oil content percentages is plotted in Chart 7. Below 4%, oil addition positively impacts compaction without added water. The effective oil content recorded (2%) is within the range obtained before the transition in effect, as shown in Chart 1.

A transition in effect occurs between 4% to 6% oil content, where negligible changes in bulk density are observed. Beyond 6%, oil does not reduce maximum dry density due to intermolecular forces between the soil-oil-water matrix. At oil content above 14%, the soil saturates with oil, forcing excess oil out upon compaction.

The common shapes of compaction curves fall within the types described by Lee and Suedkamp [10]. The optimum values of compaction results are presented in Table 3.

**Table 1. Laboratory experiment schedule for both air-dried and oil-contaminated soil samples**

| Specimen Designation | Specimen Makeup | Test Carried Out |
|---|---|---|
| A1 | Natural air-dried sample | Consistency limit test |
| A2 | Natural air-dried sample | Sieve analysis |
| A3 | Natural air-dried sample | Specific gravity test |
| B1 | Air-dried sample + varying % water (Proctor test) | Proctor test |
| B2 | Sample + 16% OMC (water) + varying oil | Bulk density determination |
| C1 | Air-dried sample + varying % oil | Bulk density determination |
| C2 | Air-dried sample + 2% petrol-diesel + varying water | Proctor test |
| C3 | Air-dried sample + 4% petrol-diesel + varying water | Proctor test |
| C4 | Air-dried sample + 5% petrol-diesel + varying water | Proctor test |
| C5 | Air-dried sample + 6% petrol-diesel + varying water | Proctor test |

*"A" denotes identification tests, "B" denotes bulk density tests, and "C" denotes Proctor compaction tests. Oil was added in terms of volume (ml) to reflect standard Proctor test methods before compactive effort was applied. Bulk density was determined by dividing the weight of the compacted soil by the volume of the mold. This procedure was repeated for varying percentages of petrol-diesel oil.*

**Table 2. Consistency limit results**

| Consistency Limit | Moisture content values (%) |
|---|---|
| Liquid Limit | 28.0 |
| Plastic Limit | 18.8 |




**Chart 1. Comparative analysis of compaction curve**




**Chart 2. Soil sample and percentage oil addition**




COMPACTION TEST
Loc. No............BORI / RIVERS STATE.................. DESCRIPTION......
COMPACTION CURVE FOR SOIL + 4% DIESEL OIL ...... SAMPLE No. ...A4.
1.8
1.7
1.6
1.5
1.4
10
12
14
16
18
20
MOISTURE CONTENT %
Type of compaction......STANDARD PROCTOR..........No of Layers...3....
No of blows...25/ LAYER... Wt. of Rammer...2.5...Kg. Mould...PROCTOR......
Maximum dry density.........1.79..........Mg/m³
OPTIMUM MOISTURE CONTENT............15.6.......% dry weight
NOTES: Natural moisture content......6......%
CHART 4.4
39


Chapter four: results and discussion
COMPACTION TEST
Loc. No............BORI/ RIVERS STATE............... Name......................................
DESCRIPTION... COMPACTION CURVE FOR SOIL + 5% DIESEL OIL ... SAMPLE No. ......A5.......
1.8
1.7
1.6
1.5
1.4
10
12
14
16
18
20
MOISTURE CONTENT %
Type of compaction......STANDARD...PROCTOR....... No of Layers...3..
No of blows...25/ layer......... Wt. of Rammer......2.5...Kg. Mould...Proctor Mould...
Maximum dry density.........1.80..........Mg/m³ O M C......14....% dry weight
NOTE: Air dried moisture content......6......%
CHART 4.5
40




**Chart 3-6. Compaction tests using only oil**

**Table 3. Optimum values of compaction results**

| Specimen | $P_{\delta max}$ Mg/m³ | OMC (%) |
|---|---|---|
| Natural air dried | 1.80 | 16.00 |
| Air dried + 2% oil | 1.85 | 13.00 |
| Air dried + 4% oil | 1.79 | 15.6 |
| Air dried + 5% oil | 1.80 | 14.00 |
| Air dried + 6% oil | 1.80 | 15.20 |

The graphical representation shows a significant reduction in moisture content to achieve maximum dry density during compaction, attributed to the oil-water interaction and oil's lubricating effect.

From the results, the most effective compaction occurs at 2% oil addition, yielding maximum dry density and minimum moisture content. This "Effective Oil Content" (EOC) produces an increase in maximum dry density with a reduction in optimum water content.

Except for the EOC, other oil additions have no positive effect on the maximum dry density, remaining constant at ±0.01 Mg/m³. Observations indicate that at least 4% oil content results in saturation and expulsion of diesel oil and some water, reducing moisture content and dry density.

For practical compaction, the process should stop before soil void saturation to achieve the desired density. Above certain oil addition percentages, the oil negatively affects compaction, reducing soil strength and bearing capacity, as concluded by Srivastava and Pandey [1]. They noted that "The strength parameters reduce due to oil addition to soils," impacting bearing capacity and slope stability in construction on contaminated soils [17].




**Chart 7. Oil addition effect on compaction**

## 5. DISCUSSION

This chapter discusses the results obtained from the data analysis. The results are presented according to the research experiments conducted. Initially, identification test results are presented to describe the type and nature of the soil used for the experiment. Subsequently, various compaction test results are compared and analyzed alongside the standard Proctor test (used as control without any addition of petrol-diesel). Differences, if any, are noted and commented upon.

### 5.1 Identification Tests

The following experiments were carried out as outlined in Table 4 of Chapter Three. Some results are presented below, while other relevant data are placed in the appendix.

**Table 4. Consistency limit results**

| Consistency Limit | Moisture content values (%) |
|---|---|
| Liquid Limit | 28.0 |
| Plastic Limit | 18.8 |

### 5.2 Consistency Limit Tests

The Atterberg limit test results are presented below:

These values fall within the range (15-32% moisture) obtained by both Arora [5] and Obi-Egbedi [19].

The graphical representation shows a significant reduction in moisture content to achieve maximum dry density during compaction, attributed to the oil-water interaction and oil's lubricating effect.

From the results, the most effective compaction occurs at 2% oil addition, yielding maximum dry density and minimum moisture content. This "Effective Oil Content" (EOC) produces an increase in maximum dry density with a reduction in optimum water content.

### 5.3 Oil Addition Effect on Compaction

Except for the EOC, other oil additions have no positive effect on the maximum dry density, remaining constant at ±0.01 Mg/m³.

Observations indicate that at least 4% oil content results in saturation and expulsion of diesel oil and some water, reducing moisture content and dry density.

For practical compaction, the process should stop before soil void saturation to achieve the desired density. Above certain oil addition percentages, the oil negatively affects compaction, reducing soil strength and bearing capacity, as concluded by Srivastava and Pandey [1]. They noted that "The strength parameters reduce due to oil addition to soils," impacting bearing capacity and slope stability in construction on contaminated soils.

### 5.4 Research Context

This research investigates the impact of oil spills on the compaction characteristics of soil. The study uses diesel oil and lateritic soil sourced from Bori LGA of Rivers State, located in the southeastern part of Nigeria. The findings are valuable for those utilizing lateritic soil in construction, particularly in road and flexible pavement construction.

The research methodology was inspired by a similar study conducted in Kuwait by Srivastava and Pandey [1] on alluvial and sandy soil. The approach is divided into two phases: Phase one involves soil identification experiments to classify the soil type, and Phase two comprises compaction tests on various soil + oil + water matrices. The compaction of natural air-dried specimens served as the control experiment. The results are presented in charts and tables and analyzed through comparison with the control experiment. Similar trends in soil behavior, specifically a positive increase in compaction up to a certain oil content, were observed, consistent with the findings of Srivastava and Pandey [1]. The compaction characteristics also align with the four general charts described by Lee and Suedkamp [10].

The research demonstrates that adding oil positively influences the compaction behavior of soil, increasing dry density and reducing optimum moisture content (OMC) up to a certain point. Beyond this point, further oil addition is not desirable, although an effective oil content was identified [20,21].

## 5. CONCLUSION

From the analysis of the experimental results on the various prepared specimens, the following conclusions can be drawn:

1. Oil addition (diesel) affects the compaction behavior of soil.
2. The most effective compaction is achieved with less than 4% oil addition to the lateritic soil, termed "effective oil content." This results in increased maximum dry density and reduced OMC compared to the control experiment.
3. Below the effective oil content, oil positively contributes to the compaction process.
4. Adding oil beyond the effective oil content does not significantly enhance the compaction process and often leads to a loss of soil shear strength.

## 6. RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings, the following recommendations are made:

1. Oil-contaminated soils can be utilized for road construction if the oil content is less than the effective oil content (EOC) of the soil.
2. Compaction of oil-contaminated soil should be performed when the moisture content can be controlled (e.g., during the dry season) to ensure optimal compaction.

### 6.1 Recommendations for Further Research

Acknowledging that no single study can comprehensively cover all aspects of a subject, further research is recommended in the following areas:

1. The effect of oil contamination on the shear strength of soil.
2. The impact of different oils on the compaction characteristics and shear strength of soils.

## DISCLAIMER (ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE)

Author(s) hereby declare that NO generative AI technologies such as Large Language Models (ChatGPT, COPILOT, etc) and text-to-image generators have been used during writing or editing of manuscripts.

## COMPETING INTERESTS

Author has declared that no competing interests exist.

## REFERENCES


1. Srivastava RK, Pandey VD. “Geotechnical Evaluation of Oil Contaminated Soil” an issue in contaminated and derelicit land. Thomas Telford London. 1998;204 209.
2. Geotechnical properties of oil contaminated Kuwait sand Journal of Geotechnical Engineering. 1995;121(5): 407-412.
3. Karabash Z, Al-Obaydi MA, Awad MA, Al-Khashab MN. Geotechnical properties of clay soil contaminated with different types of oil. Geotechnical and Geological Engineering. 2023;41(4):2677-89.
4. Ajayi ND, Ajayi SA, Boyi JO, Olaniyi OO. Understanding the Chemistry of Nitrene and Highlighting its Remarkable Catalytic Capabilities as a Non-Heme Iron Enzyme. Asian Journal of Chemical Sciences. 2024; 14(1):1–18.
   Available:https://doi.org/10.9734/ajocs/2024/v14i1280
5. Arora KR. Soil Mechanics and Foundation Engineering, Standard Publishers Distributors. Delhi. 2005;1:14-16,19,26,69, 89-95,301,357,361-363,812.
6. Aysen A. Soil Mechanics basic concepts and engineering application. Taylor and Francis, New York. 2002;39.
7. Baijet SK. Environmental Engineering; An Overview. Khanna Publishers. Delhi Pg. 1989;23.
8. Ajayi SA, Olaniyi OO, Oladoyinbo TO, Ajayi ND, Olaniyi FG. Sustainable Sourcing of Organic Skincare Ingredients: A Critical Analysis of Ethical Concerns and Environmental Implications. Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports. 2024; 18(1):65–91.
   Available:https://doi.org/10.9734/ajarr/2024/v18i1598
9. Oladoyinbo OB. Comprehensive Synthesis and Integrative Review of Agricultural Dynamics in Southwest Nigeria: Assessing Economic Viability, Technological Advances, and Rural Development Approaches. Asian Journal of Agricultural Extension, Economics & Sociology. 2023; 41(11):312–328.
   Available:https://doi.org/10.9734/ajaees/2023/v41i112288
10. Lee PI, Suedkamp RJ. Characteristics of Irregularly Shaped Compaction Curve of Soil. Highway research. Record no 381, National Academy of Science, Washington, D.CPp. 1972;1-9.
11. BS 6110 ci. 2. 2. 1. Building and Civil Engineering terms. British Standard Institute; 1992.
12. Ajayi ND, Ajayi SA, Olaniyi OO. Exploring the Intricacies and Functionalities of Galactose Oxidase: Structural Nuances, Catalytic Behaviors, and Prospects in Bio-electrocatalysis. Asian Journal of Chemical Sciences. 2024;14(1):19–28.
   Available:https://doi.org/10.9734/ajocs/2024/v14i1282
13. Ram P. Petroleum Refining Technology, Khanna Publishers, DethiPg 15 Robert, S. (1998): Oil spill response Performance. ASTM Publisher. 2000;2:26.
14. Available:http ://www. answers. coin/top i c/petoleurn. Retrieved on Thursday 9th October, 08.
15. O’Flaherty CA. Highway Engineering. Third Edition. Edward Arnold, London. 1998;5.
16. Olaoye OO, Quadri FU, Olaniyi OO. Examining the Role of Trade on the Relationship between Environmental Quality and Energy Consumption: Insights from Sub Saharan Africa. Journal of Economics, Management and Trade. 2024;30(6):16–35.
   Available:https://doi.org/10.9734/jemt/2024/v30i61211
17. Ajayi ND, Ajayi SA, Oladoyinbo OB, Olaniyi OO. A Review of Literature on Transferrin: Deciphering its Complex Mechanism in Cellular Iron Regulation and Clinical Implications. Asian Journal of Research in Infectious Diseases. 2024;15 (1):9–23.
   Available:https://doi.org/10.9734/ajrid/2024/v15i1321
18. BS 1377; Part 4 Method of Testing of Soil for Civil Engineering Purposes. British Standard Institute; 1990.
19. Obi-Egbedi R. an unpublished thesis on geotechnical properties of lateritic soil deposits at Obigbo, Port Harcourt. River State. 1999;57.
20. Ajayi SA, Olaniyi OO, Oladoyinbo TO, Ajayi ND, Olaniyi FG. Sustainable Sourcing of Organic Skincare Ingredients: A Critical Analysis of Ethical Concerns and Environmental Implications. Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports. 2024;18(1):65–91.
   Available:https://doi.org/10.9734/ajarr/2024/v18i1598
21. Available:http ://www. wikipedia. corn/ petroleum/liquid fuel/diesel. Retrieved on Thursday 9th October, 2008.

**COMPACTION TEST DATA** **APPENDIX A1**

**A1**

Location No:……………………. Name:………………………………….. Sample No:…………………. Date: 20th July 2008
WORK/UNIT VOLUME

1. STANDARD COMPACTION USING Proctor mould: volume …. **996**…..cm³ No of LAYERS…..**3**……ESTIMATED
2. A. A. S. H. O. COMPACTION USING C. B. R. MOULD: VOLUME……………cm³ TOTALBLOWS..**25**/layer ORIGINAL
3. MODIFIED A. A. S. H. O. Using (1mg/ cm³) WEIGHT OF Rammer…… **2.5**kg MOISTURE….**6.0**…..%

| **COMPACTION** | | **1st trial** | **2nd trial** | **3rd trial** | **4th trial** | **5th trial** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| WEIGHT OF MOULD + WET SOIL: $W_2$ | gm | 6128 | 6320 | 6417 | 6484 | 6493 |
| WEIGHT OF MOULD : $W_1$ | gm | 4433 | 4433 | 4433 | 4433 | 4433 |
| WEIGHT OF WET SOIL : $W_2 - W1$ | gm | 1695 | 1887 | 1984 | 2051 | 2060 |
| DENSITY OF WET SOIL | Y Mg/m³ | 1.70 | 1.89 | 1.99 | 2.06 | 2.07 |

| **COMPACTION** | | **1st trial** | **2nd trial** | **3rd trial** | **4th trial** | **5th trial** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| WEIGHT OF WET SOIL + CONTAINER: $W_W$ | gm | 63.96 | 78.03 | 78.71 | 87.15 | 95.17 |
| WEIGHT OF DRY SOIL + CONTAINER : $W_d$ | gm | 60.00 | 72.75 | 72.66 | 79.57 | 85.03 |
| WEIGHT OF CONTAINER : $W_c$ | gm | 27.85 | 32.13 | 27.78 | 28.79 | 29.19 |
| WEIGHT OF DRY SOIL : $W_d - Wc$ | gm | 32.15 | 40.62 | 44.88 | 50.78 | 55.84 |
| WEIGHT OF MOISTURE : $W_w - W_d$ | gm | 3.96 | 5.28 | 6.05 | 7.58 | 10.14 |
| MOISTURE CONTENT | % | 12.32 | 13.00 | 13.48 | 14.93 | 18.16 |
| DRY DENSITY | Y Mg/m³ | 1.51 | 1.51 | 1.75 | 1.79 | 1.75 |

**COMPACTION TEST DATA** **APPENDIX $A_2$**

**A2**

Location No:……………………. Name:………………………………….. Sample No:…………………. Date: 20th July 2008
WORK/UNIT VOLUME

1. STANDARD COMPACTION USING Proctor mould: volume …. **996**…..cm³ No of LAYERS…..**3**……ESTIMATED
2. A. A. S. H. O. COMPACTION USING C. B. R. MOULD: VOLUME……………cm³ TOTALBLOWS..**25**/layer ORIGINAL
3. MODIFIED A. A. S. H. O. Using (1mg/ cm³) WEIGHT OF Rammer…… **2.5**kg MOISTURE….**6.0**…..%

| **COMPACTION** | | **2% OIL** | **4% OIL** | **6% OIL** | **10% OIL** | **14% OIL** | **18% OIL** | **22% OIL** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| WEIGHT OF MOULD + WET SOIL: $W_2$ | gm | 6000 | 6094 | 6098 | 6232 | 6284 | 6334 | 6362 |
| WEIGHT OF MOULD : $W_1$ | gm | 4433 | 4433 | 4433 | 4433 | 4433 | 4433 | 4433 |
| WEIGHT OF WET SOIL : $W_2 - W1$ | gm | 1567 | 1661 | 1665 | 1799 | 1851 | 1901 | 1929 |
| DENSITY OF WET SOIL | Y $Mg/m^3$ | 1.57 | 1.67 | 1.67 | 1.75 | 1.86 | 1.91 | 1.94 |

| **COMPACTION** | |
|---|---|
| WEIGHT OF WET SOIL + CONTAINER: $W_W$ | gm |
| WEIGHT OF DRY SOIL + CONTAINER : $W_d$ | gm |
| WEIGHT OF CONTAINER : $W_c$ | gm |
| WEIGHT OF DRY SOIL : $W_d - Wc$ | gm |
| WEIGHT OF MOISTURE : $W_w - W_d$ | gm |
| MOISTURE CONTENT | % |
| DRY DENSITY | Y $Mg/m^3$ |

**@ ENGINEERING LABORATORY EQUIPMENTS LIMITED** **SIGNED:……………………………………..**

**COMPACTION TEST DATA** **APPENDIX $A_2$**

**A3**

Location No:……………………. Name:………………………………….. Sample No:…………………. Date: 20th July 2008

WORK/UNIT VOLUME

1. STANDARD COMPACTION USING Proctor mould: volume …. **996**…..$cm^3$ No of LAYERS…..**3**……ESTIMATED
2. A. A. S. H. O. COMPACTION USING C. B. R. MOULD: VOLUME……………$cm^3$ TOTALBLOWS..**25**/layer ORIGINAL
3. MODIFIED A. A. S. H. O. Using ($1mg/cm^3$) WEIGHT OF Rammer…… **2.5**kg MOISTURE….**6.0**…..%

| **COMPACTION** | | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| WEIGHT OF MOULD + WET SOIL: $W_2$ | gm | 6170 | 6260 | 6341 | 6461 | 6494 | 6518 | 6455 | 6392 |
| WEIGHT OF MOULD : $W_1$ | gm | 4433 | 4433 | 4433 | 4433 | 4433 | 4433 | 4433 | 4433 |
| WEIGHT OF WET SOIL : $W_2 - W1$ | gm | 1737 | 1827 | 1908 | 2028 | 2061 | 2085 | 2022 | 1961 |
| DENSITY OF WET SOIL | Y $Mg/m^3$ | 1.74 | 1.83 | 1.92 | 2.04 | 2.07 | 2.09 | 2.03 | 1.97 |

| **COMPACTION** | | **10** | **19** | **15** | **16** | **21** | **11** | **18** | **13** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| WEIGHT OF WET SOIL + CONTAINER: $W_W$ | gm | 99 | 100 | 90.5 | 102 | 118 | 105 | 104 | 110 |
| WEIGHT OF DRY SOIL + CONTAINER : $W_d$ | gm | 92 | 94 | 85 | 94.5 | 106 | 96 | 94 | 98 |
| WEIGHT OF CONTAINER : $W_c$ | gm | 28 | 30 | 31 | 29 | 27.5 | 29.5 | 30.5 | 27.5 |
| WEIGHT OF DRY SOIL : $W_d - W_c$ | gm | 64 | 64 | 54 | 65.5 | 78.5 | 63.5 | 63.5 | 70.5 |
| WEIGHT OF MOISTURE : $W_w - W_d$ | gm | 7.0 | 6.0 | 5.5 | 7.5 | 12 | 9 | 10 | 12 |
| MOISTURE CONTENT | % | 10.94 | 9.38 | 10.19 | 11.45 | 15.29 | 14.17 | 15.75 | 17.02 |
| DRY DENSITY | Y Mg/m³ | 1.57 | 1.67 | 1.74 | 1.80 | 1.83 | 1.83 | 1.75 | 1.68 |

**COMPACTION TEST DATA** **APPENDIX $A_2$** **@ ENGINEERING LABORATORY EQUIPMENTS LIMITED** **SIGNED:……………………………………..**

Location No:……………………. Name:………………………………….. Sample No:…**A4**………………. Date: 20th July 2008

WORK/UNIT VOLUME

1. STANDARD COMPACTION USING Proctor mould: volume …. **996**…..cm³ No of LAYERS…..**3**……ESTIMATED
2. A. A. S. H. O. COMPACTION USING C. B. R. MOULD: VOLUME……………cm³ TOTALBLOWS..**25**/layer ORIGINAL
3. MODIFIED A. A. S. H. O. Using (1mg/ cm³) WEIGHT OF Rammer…… **2.5**kg MOISTURE….**6.0**…..%

| **COMPACTION** | | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| WEIGHT OF MOULD + WET SOIL: $W_2$ | gm | 6118 | 6242 | 6406 | 6484 | 6490 | 6468 |
| WEIGHT OF MOULD : $W_1$ | gm | 4433 | 4433 | 4433 | 4433 | 4433 | 4433 |
| WEIGHT OF WET SOIL : $W_2 - W1$ | gm | 1685 | 1809 | 1973 | 2051 | 2057 | 2035 |
| DENSITY OF WET SOIL | Y Mg/m³ | 1.69 | 1.82 | 1.98 | 2.06 | 2.07 | 2.04 |

| **COMPACTION** | | **18** | **2** | **7** | **9** | **5** | **11** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| WEIGHT OF WET SOIL + CONTAINER: $W_W$ | gm | 47 | 60 | 62 | 78 | 72 | 76 |
| WEIGHT OF DRY SOIL + CONTAINER : $W_d$ | gm | 43 | 56 | 57 | 68 | 65 | 69 |
| WEIGHT OF CONTAINER : $W_c$ | gm | 3 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 |
| WEIGHT OF DRY SOIL : $W_d - W_c$ | gm | 40 | 36 | 37 | 48 | 45 | 49 |
| WEIGHT OF MOISTURE : $W_w - W_d$ | gm | 4 | 4 | 5 | 10 | 7 | 7 |
| MOISTURE CONTENT | % | 10.0 | 11.1 | 13.5 | 20.8 | 15.6 | 14.2 |
| DRY DENSITY | Y Mg/m³ | 1.54 | 1.64 | 1.75 | 1.71 | 1.79 | 1.78 |

**@ ENGINEERING LABORATORY EQUIPMENTS LIMITED** **SIGNED:……………………………………..**

**COMPACTION TEST DATA** **APPENDIX $A_2$**

**A5**

Location No:……………………. Name:………………………………….. Sample No:…………………. Date: 20th July 2008
WORK/UNIT VOLUME

1. STANDARD COMPACTION USING Proctor mould: volume …. **996**…..cm³ No of LAYERS…..**3**…… ESTIMATED
2. A. A. S. H. O. COMPACTION USING C. B. R. MOULD: VOLUME……………cm³ TOTALBLOWS..**25**/layer ORIGINAL
3. MODIFIED A. A. S. H. O. Using (1mg/ cm³) WEIGHT OF Rammer…… **2.5**kg MOISTURE….**6.0**…..%

| **COMPACTION** | | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| WEIGHT OF MOULD + WET SOIL: $W_2$ | gm | 6146 | 6238 | 6376 | 6492 | 6469 |
| WEIGHT OF MOULD : $W_1$ | gm | 4433 | 4433 | 4433 | 4433 | 4433 |
| WEIGHT OF WET SOIL : $W_2 - W1$ | gm | 1713 | 1805 | 1943 | 2059 | 2036 |
| DENSITY OF WET SOIL | Y Mg/m³ | 1.720 | 1.812 | 1.951 | 2.067 | 2.044 |

| **COMPACTION** | | **6** | **7** | **5** | **3** | **4** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| WEIGHT OF WET SOIL + CONTAINER: $W_W$ | gm | 79 | 67 | 52 | 62 | 68 |
| WEIGHT OF DRY SOIL + CONTAINER : $W_d$ | gm | 73.5 | 63 | 49 | 56 | 61 |
| WEIGHT OF CONTAINER : $W_c$ | gm | 22 | 21 | 22 | 20 | 19 |
| WEIGHT OF DRY SOIL : $W_d - Wc$ | gm | 51.5 | 42 | 27 | 36 | 42 |
| WEIGHT OF MOISTURE : $W_w - W_d$ | gm | 5.5 | 4 | 3 | 6 | 7 |
| MOISTURE CONTENT | % | 10.680 | 9.524 | 11.111 | 16.667 | 16.660 |
| DRY DENSITY | Y Mg/m³ | 1.554 | 1.654 | 1.756 | 1.772 | 1.753 |

**COMPACTION TEST DATA** **APPENDIX $A_2$** **@ ENGINEERING LABORATORY EQUIPMENTS LIMITED** **SIGNED:……………………………………..**

**A6**

Location No:……………………. Name:………………………………….. Sample No:…………………. Date: 20th July 2008
WORK/UNIT VOLUME

1. STANDARD COMPACTION USING Proctor mould: volume …. **996**…..cm³ No of LAYERS…..**3**…… ESTIMATED
2. A. A. S. H. O. COMPACTION USING C. B. R. MOULD: VOLUME……………cm³ TOTALBLOWS..**25**/layer ORIGINAL
3. MODIFIED A. A. S. H. O. Using (1mg/ cm³) WEIGHT OF Rammer…… **2.5**kg MOISTURE….**6.0**…..%

| **COMPACTION** | | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| WEIGHT OF MOULD + WET SOIL: $W_2$ | gm | 6126 | 6278 | 6413 | 6491 | 6480 |
| WEIGHT OF MOULD : $W_1$ | gm | 4433 | 4433 | 4433 | 4433 | 4433 |
| WEIGHT OF WET SOIL : $W_2 - W1$ | gm | 1693 | 1845 | 1980 | 2058 | 2047 |
| DENSITY OF WET SOIL | Y Mg/m³ | 1.70 | 1.85 | 1.99 | 2.07 | 2.06 |

| **COMPACTION** | | **1** | **2** | **10** | **8** | **9** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| WEIGHT OF WET SOIL + CONTAINER: $W_W$ | gm | 74 | 56 | 62 | 58 | 62 |
| WEIGHT OF DRY SOIL + CONTAINER : $W_d$ | gm | 69.0 | 53.0 | 57.0 | 53.0 | 56.5 |
| WEIGHT OF CONTAINER : $W_c$ | gm | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 |
| WEIGHT OF DRY SOIL : $W_d - W_c$ | gm | 49.0 | 33.0 | 37.0 | 33.0 | 36.5 |
| WEIGHT OF MOISTURE : $W_w - W_d$ | gm | 5.0 | 3.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.5 |
| MOISTURE CONTENT | % | 10.204 | 9.091 | 13.514 | 15.152 | 15.06 |
| DRY DENSITY | Y Mg/m$^3$ | 1.54 | 1.70 | 1.75 | 1.77 | 1.79 |

**COMPACTION TEST DATA** **APPENDIX $A_2$ @ ENGINEERING LABORATORY EQUIPMENTS LIMITED** **SIGNED:……………………………………**

Location No:……………………. Name:………………………………….. Sample No:…**A7**………………. Date: 20th July 2008

WORK/UNIT VOLUME

1. STANDARD COMPACTION USING Proctor mould: volume …. **996**…..cm$^3$ No of LAYERS…..**3**…… ESTIMATED
2. A. A. S. H. O. COMPACTION USING C. B. R. MOULD: VOLUME……………cm$^3$ TOTALBLOWS..**25**/layer ORIGINAL
3. MODIFIED A. A. S. H. O. Using (1mg/ cm$^3$) WEIGHT OF Rammer…… **2.5**kg MOISTURE….**6.0**…..%

| **COMPACTION** | | **0% OIL** | **2% OIL** | **4% OIL** | **6% OIL** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| WEIGHT OF MOULD + WET SOIL: $W_2$ | gm | 6500 | 6481 | 6471 | 6468 |
| WEIGHT OF MOULD : $W_1$ | gm | 4433 | 4433 | 4433 | 4433 |
| WEIGHT OF WET SOIL : $W_2 - W1$ | gm | | 2054 | 2054 | 2035 |
| DENSITY OF WET SOIL | Y Mg/m$^3$ | 2.075 | 2.062 | 2.062 | 2.043 |

| **COMPACTION** | |
|---|---|
| WEIGHT OF WET SOIL + CONTAINER: $W_W$ | gm |
| WEIGHT OF DRY SOIL + CONTAINER : $W_d$ | gm |
| WEIGHT OF CONTAINER : $W_c$ | gm |
| WEIGHT OF DRY SOIL : $W_d - W_c$ | gm |
| WEIGHT OF MOISTURE : $W_w - W_d$ | gm |
| MOISTURE CONTENT | % |
| DRY DENSITY | Y Mg/m$^3$ |

**@ ENGINEERING LABORATORY EQUIPMENTS LIMITED** **SIGNED:……………………………………..**

## APPENDIX $C_2$
## Range of Optimum Water Content

| Sand | Sandy silt or silty sand | Silt | Clay |
|---|---|---|---|
| 6 to 10% | 8 TO 12% | 12 TO 16% | 14 TO 20% |

*Source: Soil mechanics and foundation engineering Arora, K. R. (2005)*

## APPENDIX $B_2$

**SOIL TESTING LABORATORY**

**LIQUID LIMIT DETERMINATION**

**Sample No:**............................................................ **Project No:**............................................

**Boring No:**.............................................................. **Location:**...............................................

**Depth of Sample:**................................................

**Description of Sample:**.......................................................................

**Testes by :**..........................................................................................

**Date:**........................................................

| **Determination No.** | **1** | **2** | **3** |
|---|---|---|---|
| Number of drops | 30 | 27 | 25 |
| Can No. | A3/B15 | 09/H2 | 40/70 |
| Weight of can + moist soil, $W_1$ (g) | 47.60 | 44.80 | 46.10 |
| Weight of can +dry soil, $W_2$ (g) | 42.70 | 41.00 | 41.70 |
| Weight of can $W_C$ (g) | 28.00 | 29.70 | 27.80 |
| Weight of water, $W_w$ (g) | 4.90 | 3.90 | 4.40 |
| Weight of dry soil, $W_s$ (g) | 14.70 | 11.30 | 13.90 |
| Moisture content, W (%) | 18.59 | 15.51 | 31.65 |

From the flow curve, the liquid limit is **28%**

## APPENDIX $B_2$

**SOIL TESTING LABORATORY**

**PLASTIC LIMIT DETERMINATION AND PLASTICITY INDEX**

**Sample No:**............................................................ **Project No:**..........................................

**Boring No:**........................................................... **Location:**............................................

**Depth of Sample:**................................................

**Description of Sample:**.......................................................................

**Testes by :**..........................................................................................

**Date:**........................................................

| **Determination No.** | **1** | **2** | **3** |
|---|---|---|---|
| Can No. | 47/47 | 01/01 | BA/BA |
| Weight of can + moist soil, $W_1$ (g) | 35.10 | 34.30 | 37.90 |
| Weight of can +dry soil, $W_2$ (g) | 33.90 | 32.90 | 36.30 |
| Weight of can $W_C$ (g) | 26.60 | 25.70 | 28.50 |
| Weight of water, $W_w$ (g) | 1.20 | 1.40 | 1.60 |
| Weight of dry soil, $W_s$ (g) | 7.30 | 7.20 | 7.80 |
| Moisture content, W (%) | 16.44 | 19.44 | 20.51 |
| PLASTIC LIMIT (%) | 18.8 | | |

Liquid limit = 28.0%

Plastic limit = 18.8%

Plasticity index = liquid limit – plastic limit 10.8%

## APPENDIX $B_0$
## LOCATION: BORI/RIVERS STATE
## SAMPLE NO. A7
## GRAIN SIZE ANALYSIS

| NO. | SIEVE SIZE (MM) | Wt of SIEVE (mm) | Wt of SIEVE + SAMPLE | Wt of SAMPLE RETAINED (mm) | PERCENT RETAINED (%) | CUMMULATIVE PERCENT RETAINED (%) | PERCENTAGE PASSING |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 4 | 4.750 | 483.20 | 492.00 | 8.8 | 2.108 | 2.108 | 97.890 |
| 10 | 2.000 | 401.79 | 532.00 | 130.21 | 31.100 | 33.298 | 66.702 |
| 30 | 0.600 | 501.58 | 669.00 | 167.42 | 40.108 | 73.406 | 26.702 |
| 50 | 0.300 | 314.01 | 387.00 | 72.99 | 17.485 | 90.891 | 26.590 |
| 100 | 0.150 | 291.30 | 321.00 | 30.00 | 7.190 | 98.081 | 9.110 |
| 200 | 0.075 | 291.00 | 294.00 | 3.00 | 0.718 | 98.799 | 1.910 |
| RECEIVER | PAN | 264.88 | 269.00 | 5.00 | 1.190 | 100.00 | 1.200 |



*Peer-review history:*
*The peer review history for this paper can be accessed here:*
*https://www.sdiarticle5.com/review-history/118346*