



**BUSITEMA  
UNIVERSITY**  
*Pursuing Excellence*

**FACULTY OF ENGINEERING**

**DEPARTMENT OF WATER AND MINING ENGINEERING**

**FINAL YEAR PROJECT REPORT**

**UTILISATION OF POLYETHYLENE TEREPHALATE (PET) WASTE PLASTICS IN  
STABILISING SOILS FOR CONSTRUCTION.**

**BY**

**TWESIGYE JUSTINE**

**REGISTRATION NO: BU/UG/2017/98**

**EMAIL:twesigyejustine70@gmail.com**

**Tel: 0786148916/0704088270**

**MAIN SUPERVISOR: DR. NIBIKORA IDEPHONSE**

*A final year project submitted to the Department of Mining and Water Resources Engineering as a partial fulfillment of the requirements for the award of a Bachelor of Science degree in Water Resources Engineering.*

## **ABSTRACT**

This research focused on the potential utilization of PET wastes as a stabilizer to improve the compressive strength of clay soil. A series of laboratory compaction and CBR tests were carried out. Soil specimens were compacted at maximum dry density with different percentages of plastic waste 2.5%, 5%, 7.5%, and 10% weight of clay soil).

Results indicate that an increasing of PET waste content decreases the maximum dry density And the optimum moisture content (OMC). Soil became non plastic when the addition of PET waste content was equal to or greater than 5% of weight of clay soil. An increasing of PET waste content increased the CBR values of clay soil

This new technique of soil stabilization can be effectively used to meet the challenges of society, to reduce the quantities of waste, producing useful material from non-useful waste materials.

Thus using plastic bottles as a soil stabilizer is an economical utilization since there is scarcity of good quality soil for construction. This project involved the detailed study on the possible use of waste plastic bottles for soil stabilization. The analysis was done by conducting Maximum Dry Density and California Bearing Ratio tests after mixing predetermined quantities of soil and plastic strips to attain the various results. The comparison of test results showed that 5.0% plastic strips mixed in the Clay (black cotton) were the most efficient in increasing strength of soil. The optimum percentage of plastic strips in soil was found out by California Bearing Ratio Test.

**DECLARATION**

I TWESIGYE JUSTINE hereby declare that this project is my original work and that the information contained in this project is out of my hard work and research, except where explicit citation has been made and it has not been presented to any institution of higher learning for any academic award.

Signature .....

Date.....

**APPROVAL**

This project has been submitted for examination with approval from the following supervisors:

**PROJECT SUPERVISOR**

**Dr. NIBIKORA ILDEPHONSE**

Signature: .....

Date: .....

## **DEDICATION**

I dedicate this final year project to my parents; **MR. MUBANGIZI HENLY** and **MRS. TUMWEBAZE ANNET** who has enabled me to see the light of education through thick and thin and my lecturers who have mentored me from first year up to now. May the Almighty God bless you abundantly.

## **ACKNOWLEDGMENT**

My sincere thanks go to the Almighty God for the strength, health, wisdom, grace, and protection He has given to me all through. Am very grateful to my parents and my young siblings **AGNES, NICHOLAS, MOREEN** and **BRIAN** for all their support and guidance whenever I needed them. I extend my thanks to all my lecturers especially my supervisor **DR. NIBIKORA ILDEPHONSE**; of Busitema University, Textile and ginning Engineering Department who have put in a lot to see that this project is a success and have equipped me with the knowledge that has enabled me to succeed in my studies. Then the government of republic of Uganda for sponsoring my university education.

Finally, I thank all my friends who have always been there for me in all situations.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

DECLARATION .....	ii
APPROVAL .....	ii
DEDICATION .....	iv
ACKNOWLEDGMENT .....	v
LIST OF FIGURES .....	viii
LIST OF TABLES .....	ix
ABSTRACT.....	i
CHAPTER ONE: .....	1
1.0 INTRODUCTION .....	1
1.1 BACKGROUND .....	1
1.2 PROBLEM STATEMENT .....	3
1.3 JUSTIFICATION .....	3
1.4 OBJECTIVES .....	4
1.4.1 MAIN OBJECTIVE.....	4
1.4.2 SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES .....	4
1.5 SIGNIFICANCE.....	4
1.6 SCOPE OF STUDY.....	4
1.6.1 Conceptual scope .....	4
1.6.2 Geographical scope .....	4
1.6.3 Time scope .....	4
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW .....	5
2.0 PLASTICS. ....	5
2.1 OVERVIEW OF PLASTICS.....	5
2.1.1 Plastic classification.....	5
2.1.2. Polyethylene terephthalate (PET) .....	5
2.1.2.1 Structural properties .....	6
2.1.3.0 PLASTIC WASTES .....	7
2.1.3.1. Environmental concerns.....	7
2.1.3.2 Waste plastic and its sources.....	7
2.1.3.3 Plastic wastes in construction .....	8

2.1.4 Plastic characteristics that make it good for construction activities include.....	8
2.2 SOIL.....	8
2.2.1 Soil properties .....	9
2.2.2 Mechanical properties of the soil .....	9
2.2.2 Physical properties of soil .....	9
2.3 Types of soils .....	10
2.3 Soil Stabilization.....	11
2.3.1. Principles of Soil Stabilization:.....	11
2.3.2. Advantages of soil stabilization .....	11
2.3.3. Methods used in stabilizing soil.....	12
1. Mechanical method.....	12
2. <b>Additive method.</b> .....	12
CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY .....	13
3.0 Introduction.....	13
3.1 Collection and preparation of materials .....	13
3.2 Soil testing .....	13
3.2.1 Liquid limit .....	14
3.2.3 Sieve analysis.....	18
3.2.4 Standard proctor test .....	21
3.2.5 California bearing ratio test.....	24
CHAPTER FOUR: ANALYSIS OF RESULTS .....	28
4.0 Introduction.....	28
4.1 Particle Size Distribution .....	28
4.2 Liquid limit .....	29
4.3. Plastic limit. ....	30
4.4 Standard proctor test calculations and results. ....	32
4.5 California bearing ratio calculations and results. ....	38
4.6 Analysis of values for proctor test using excel .....	45
CHAPTER FIVE: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS .....	46
5.1 Conclusions.....	46
5.2 Recommendations.....	46
APPENDICES .....	47
References.....	48



## LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1: The liquid limit test .....	16
Figure 2; wet sieving.....	20
Figure 3; Dry Sieving.....	21
Figure 4; performing CBR test.....	26
Figure 5; A graph of penetration against moisture content.....	30
Figure 6; The plasticity chart .....	32
Figure 7; A graph of dry density against moisture content.....	33
Figure 8; A graph of dry density vs. moisture content.....	34
Figure 9; A graph of dry density vs. moisture content.....	35
Figure 10; A graph of dry density vs. moisture content.....	36
Figure 11; A graph of dry density vs. moisture content.....	38
Figure 12;A graph of load against penetration.....	43
Figure 13; A graph of CBR against plastic percentages .....	44

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1; showing waste plastic and its sources.....	8
Table 2; Table of sieve analysis results .....	28
Table 3; Table for liquid limit formulae .....	29
Table 4; Results for liquid limit test.....	29
Table 5; Table for plastic limit formulae .....	30
Table 6; Plastic limit calculations and results.....	31
Table 7; Important formulae used.....	32
Table 8; Proctor test for 0% plastic content.....	33
Table 9; Proctor test for 2.5% plastic content.....	34
Table 10; Proctor test for 5% plastic content.....	35
Table 11; Proctor test for 7.5% plastic content.....	36
Table 12; Proctor test for 10% plastic content.....	38
Table 13; For California Bearing Ratio equations .....	39
Table 14; Table of results of bulk density, dry density and moisture content .....	40
Table 15; CBR readings for 0% plastic content.....	40
Table 16; CBR readings and load for 2.5% plastic content .....	41
Table 17; CBR readings and load for 5.0% plastic content .....	41
Table 18; Table of CBR results and load for 10% plastic content.....	42
Table 19; CBR calculations and results .....	43
Table 20; Table of CBR results at different plastic percentages.....	44