REVIEWS

The following reviews have been prepared by the Soil Mechanics Information Analysis Center for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Waterways Experiment Station in Vicksburg, Miss.

Behavior of Soft Soils, 1


Behavior of Soft Soils, 2


Nuclear Site Investigations

Major considerations for analysis and design include bearing capacity of foundation materials, total and differential settlements of structures under static and earthquake loading conditions, stability of cuts and slopes in soil and rock under static and earthquake loading conditions, propagation of earthquake-induced motions through underlying deposits, and potential for liquefaction of soils. The purpose of the proposed guidelines is to describe programs for geological and engineering site investigations that would be adequate to evaluate the safety of the site and to provide the parameters needed for engineering analysis and design of foundations and earthworks. General requirements for site investigations are discussed, and methods of subsurface investigation, including their applicability, limitations, and pitfalls, are described.

Undisturbed Sampling of Cohesionless Soils

This publication describes the current state of the art in obtaining undisturbed samples of cohesionless material—specifically, sands, silts, gravels, and mixtures—primarily as it is reflected in the experience of the Waterways Experiment Station and of others on the North American continent. It discusses general considerations in planning an undisturbed sampling program; methods of access to the soil materials for sampling, testing, or observation; and methods of sampling cohesionless soil. Methods of access and sampling are described in tables that also note the areas of applicability of the various methods, important limitations and pitfalls, and important references. It also discusses characteristics of sampling devices, drilling fluids, and sample intervals; the care of soil samples; and evaluation of sample disturbance.

Soil Compaction Procedures
REFERENCE: Price, J. T., “Soil Compaction Specification Procedure for Desired Field Strength Response,” JHRP-78-7, interim report, joint highway research project conducted in cooperation with the Indiana State Highway Commission and the U.S. Federal Highway Administration, Engineering Experiment Station, Purdue University, West Lafayette, Ind., June 1979, 151 pages.

A glacial silty clay was compacted in a field test pad to determine what variables control density and strength and their variabilities. Correlation was attempted to provide a prediction process for the field result. Additionally, a procedure was identified by which quality assurance and design engineers can interpret and write compaction specifications that ensure a desired field strength. A procedure is presented for this soil that develops a computer tabulation of the variables to allow an estimate of field compacted strength to be derived from inspection test results.
Horizontal Loads on Piles


Subdrainage and Soil Moisture


LETTERS

Soil Bearing Footing Area Tests

The following letter is a response to a letter on the same topic from Guy D. Jones, Jr., of Howard Needles Tammen and Bergendoff in Kansas City, Mo., which appeared in the June 1979 issue of the Geotechnical Testing Journal.

To the editor:

Regarding Jones’s interest in a portable testing device for verification of bearing capacity, the writer presumes that Jones does not intend that this be substituted for the practice of preconstruction site investigation with borings.

If a professional site investigation has been done, the problem of verification and approval ought to be easily solved.

A geotechnical engineer who has recommended that footings be founded on a particular soil and proportioned using some allowable pressure has or should have a theory of the soil upon which the footings will rest. He can define his theoretical soil in such a way that it can be identified by measurable things. Otherwise he has not done a professional workup.

In the case of natural deposits, in the writer’s experience, it is possible to differentiate between, for example, a softened surface layer of clay and the underlying stiff unsoftened material by using some or all of the following quantitative tests: elevation or depth of soil in question, dry density, moisture content, penetration resistance (with a calibrated hand penetrometer), and Torvane test results. All these tests can be done with portable equipment in minutes, and the results compared with the geotechnical engineer’s theory of the soil. Simple field identification tests, such as those often used with the Unified Soil Classification System, are also useful, and color can provide a clue. This may be easier for the geotechnical engineer than for, say, a nonspecialist construction inspector, but the geotechnical engineer can or should be able to reduce this theory to writing, giving however many criteria are required to identify the soil he has in mind, even if it takes another geotechnical engineer to apply the criteria.

In the case of fills, if the geotechnical engineer has done a thorough workup, the mere fact that the fill meets his moisture and density specifications ought to be sufficient to establish the presumption that it has the bearing capacity he has attributed to it. This is done daily in pavements.

If a professional site investigation has not been done, or a fill has unknown composition and compaction, the geotechnical engineer is not obliged to guess for anyone’s account, and tests of the surface are as likely to be misleading as not. Who needs this kind of work?

The opinions expressed herein are those of the writer and do not necessarily reflect the opinions of Spencer J. Buchanan and Associates, Inc.

Very truly yours,

Robert E. Bigham
Spencer J. Buchanan and Associates
Bryan, Tex.