

CERTIFICATE

It is certified that the work contained in the thesis titled " **Liquefaction Propensity of Hydrocarbon Contaminated Sand**" by "**Ankita Singh**" has been carried out under our supervision and that this work has not been submitted elsewhere for a degree.

It is further certified that the student has fulfilled all the requirements of Comprehensive Examination, Candidacy and State of the Art (SOTA) for the award of Ph.D. Degree.

Dr. Bala Ramudu Paramkusam
(Supervisor)
Department of Civil Engineering
Indian Institute of Technology
(Banaras Hindu University)
Varanasi, India, 221005

Dr. Pabitra Ranjan Maiti
(Co-Supervisor)
Department of Civil Engineering
Indian Institute of Technology
(Banaras Hindu University)
Varanasi, India, 221005

DECLARATION BY THE CANDIDATE

I, **Ankita Singh**, certify that the work embodied in this thesis is my own bonafide work and carried out by me under the supervision of **Dr. Bala Ramudu Paramkusam** and co-supervision of **Dr. Pabitra Ranjan Maiti** from 21/07/2015 to 14/07/2021, at the **Department of Civil Engineering, Indian Institute of Technology (BHU), Varanasi**. The matter embodied in this thesis has not been submitted for the award of any other degree/diploma. I declare that I have faithfully acknowledged and given credits to the research workers wherever their works have been cited in my work in this thesis. I further declare that I have not willfully copied any other's work, paragraphs, text, data, results, etc., reported in journals, books, magazines, reports, dissertations, theses, etc., or available at websites and have not included them in this thesis and have not cited as my own work.

Date:

Place: Varanasi

Ankita Singh

CERTIFICATE BY THE SUPERVISOR(S)

It is certified that the above statement made by the student is correct to the best of our knowledge.

Dr. Bala Ramudu Paramkusam
(Supervisor)

Dr. Pabitra Ranjan Maiti
(Co-Supervisor)

Prof. P.K.S. Dikshit
(Head of the Department)
Department of Civil Engineering
Indian Institute of Technology (BHU)

COPYRIGHT TRANSFER CERTIFICATE

Title of the Thesis: *Liquefaction Propensity of Hydrocarbon Contaminated Sand*

Name of the Student: *Ankita Singh*

Copyright Transfer

The undersigned hereby assigns to the Indian Institute of Technology (Banaras Hindu University) Varanasi all rights under copyright that may exist in and for the above thesis submitted for the award of the "*Doctor of Philosophy*".

Date:

Place: Varanasi

Ankita Singh

Note: However, the author may reproduce or authorize others to reproduce material extracted verbatim from the thesis or derivative of the thesis for author's personal use provided that the source and the Institute's copyright notice are indicated.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

As I reach the final frontier of my academic training in what I hope will be a continuation of an interesting and rewarding career in future I would like to acknowledge the support of many without whom this work would not have been possible.

First and foremost, I take this opportunity to thank my supervisor Dr. Bala Ramudu Paramkusam and co-supervisor Dr. Pabitra Ranjan Maiti for their constant support, technical guidance and encouragement throughout this research. This work would not have taken the present shape without their guidance and motivation throughout this work. I thank them profusely from bottom of my heart for their vital role in developing my knowledge and confidence. I wish to extend my sincere gratitude towards my RPEC members, Prof. Arun Prasad as an internal expert and Dr. Debashish Khan as an external expert for their help, valuable suggestions and encouragement during entire research work.

I would also like to thank Prof. P.K.S Dikshit, Head, Department of Civil Engineering, Indian Institute of Technology (BHU), Varanasi for providing all facilities related to my research work. I wish to express my deep regards to, Dr. Suresh Kumar, Dr. Supriya Mohanty and Dr. Manas Chakraborty for their unconditional supports at every moment during the progress of my research. I also extend my heartfelt regards to all the faculty members of the Civil Engineering Department.

I am also grateful to our laboratory staff Mr. Basanta Prasad, Mr. Netra Pal, Mr. Deepak Kumar and Mr. Sharda Prasad for the assistance extended by them time to time during this research work. I would also like to thank Mr. Sudhanshu Pal for his constant help throughout my experimental work. I am grateful to all the office staff and authorities of Department of Civil Engineering, for their kind help during the period of my stay to complete the thesis work. I am also obliged to the authorities of Indian Oil Corporation Limited, Barauni, India for providing me the valuable materials to carry out my research. I would also like to extend my sincere thanks to Dr. Dharendra Pal, Precision Instruments, for his innovative ideas and guidance throughout the work.

I am thankful to my fellow friends Mrs. Deep Jyoti Singh, Mrs. Rashmi Shrivastava, Ms. Parul Rawat, Mr. Amit Kumar Ram, Mr. Niteesh Singh Bonal, Mr. Abhay Kumar, Mrs.

Sonam and Mrs. Pragya Singh for the thought-provoking discussions, their support, cooperation and sincere help in many ways. In particular, I specially want to thank Mr. Manish Kumar Mandal for his continuous encouragement, support and affectionate forbearance.

I would like to acknowledge my indebtedness to my parents Late Mr. Arun Kumar and Mrs. Meena Singh for encouraging me to pursue this study. Their love and support has always been my strength. I am also thankful to my sister Rashmi and brother Prasoon Kumar for their constant encouragement, love and moral support. I owe my deepest gratitude to Mr. Rajesh Ranjan, my husband, for his patience, attention, understanding and support to achieve my aspirations. My heartfelt regards are extended to my in-laws: Mr. Anuj Kumar Singh and Mrs. Shobha Sinha for their blessings, love and affection.

Finally, I bow with reverence and gratitude to thank the Almighty who has enriched me with such an excellent opportunity and infused the power in my mind to fulfill the work assigned to me.

Ankita Singh

Contents

Title Page	i
Certificates	iii-vii
Acknowledgement	ix
List of Figures	xvii
List of Tables	xxv
List of Notations/Abbreviations	xxvii
Preface	xxxii
1. Introduction	
1.1 General	1
1.2 Liquefaction Mechanism	3
1.3 Factors affecting Liquefaction	5
1.4 Hydrocarbon Contamination	5
1.4.1 Sources of Hydrocarbon Contamination	6
1.4.1.1 Small-scale contamination	7
1.4.1.2 Large-scale contamination	7
1.4.2 Oil Spill Statistics	8
1.4.3 Geotechnical Concerns	10
1.5 Motivation of the Study	11
1.6 Research Objectives	12
1.7 Organization of the thesis	13
2. Literature Review	
2.1 General	15
2.2. Liquefaction Susceptibility	16
2.3 Liquefaction Studies	18
2.3.1 Laboratory Investigations	18
2.3.1.1 Studies on Cyclic Triaxial Tests	19
2.3.1.2 Studies on Shake Table Tests	23
2.3.1.3 Studies on Shear wave velocity based assessment	27
2.3.2 Field Observed Phenomenon and In-situ Investigations	30
2.4 Dynamic Response of Hydrocarbon Contaminated Sand	35

2.5 Liquefaction Mitigation Strategies	37
2.5.1 Densification	37
2.5.2 Soil Reinforcement	39
2.5.3 Mixing of Fines	40
2.5.3.1 Non-plastic fines	40
2.5.3.2 Plastic fines	42
2.5.4 Application of waste materials	43
2.5.5 Bio-cementation	45
2.5.6 Induced Desaturation	46
2.5.7 Passive Site Remediation	47
2.5.7.1 Colloidal Silica Grouting	47
2.5.7.2 Grouting using Nanomaterials	48
2.6 Summary	51
3. Material and Methods	55
3.1 General	55
3.2 Soil Sampling	55
3.3 Crude Oil	57
3.4 Artificial Contamination of Soil	57
3.5 Geotechnical Properties of Guwahati Sand	58
3.5.1 Particle Size Distribution	58
3.5.2 Specific Gravity	59
3.5.3 Hydraulic Conductivity	61
3.5.4 Compaction Characteristics	64
3.5.5 Triaxial Tests	65
3.6 Mineralogical Studies	68
3.6.1 X-Ray Diffraction Studies	68
3.6.2 FTIR Studies	69
3.7 Morphological Studies	69
3.7.1 Scanning Electron Microscopy	69
3.7.2 Volumetric Oil Content	70
3.8 Methods of Liquefaction Assessment	71
3.8.1 Cyclic Triaxial Test	73
3.8.1.1 Pore Water Pressure based criterion	73
3.8.1.2 Strain/ Deformation based criterion	73
3.8.2 Liquefaction Assessment using Bender Element Test	74
3.8.3 Liquefaction Assessment through 1g-shake table testing	75
3.9 Methodology Adopted	75
3.10 Summary	77
4. Bender Element Test	
4.1 General	79

4.2 Description of Experimental Setup	80
4.2.1 Test Combinations and Selection of Parameters	80
4.2.2 Instrumentation Details	82
4.2.3 Sample Preparation and Test Procedure	83
4.3 Signal Interpretation	85
4.3.1 Peak-to-Peak Method	85
4.3.2 Start-to-Start Method	85
4.3.3 Boundary effects	87
4.4 Results Interpretation and Discussion	88
4.4.1 Effect of Excitation Frequency	88
4.4.2 Effect of Crude Oil Content on Homogeneously Contaminated Samples	92
4.4.3 Effect of Confinement	93
4.4.4 Comparison with Past Reported Results	96
4.4.5 Effect of Crude Oil Content on Layered Samples	98
4.4.6 Coupled Effect of Crude Oil content and Contamination Depth Ratio	101
4.5 Summary	102
5. Liquefaction Evaluation Using Shake Table Test	
5.1 General	105
5.2 Test Procedures and Conditions	105
5.2.1 Test Procedures	105
5.2.2 Test Conditions	106
5.2.3 Cone Penetration Test	108
5.2.4 Shake Table	110
5.3 Model Description	111
5.3.1 Sand	111
5.3.2 Container	111
5.3.3 Back Saturation Arrangement	111
5.3.4 Pore Pressure Sensors	113
5.3.5 Accelerometer	115
5.3.6 Shake Table Performance	116
5.3.7 Model Boundaries	117
5.4 Sample Preparation	117
5.5 Signal Conditioning and Data Acquisition System	119
5.6 Test Results	122
5.6.1 Influence of Hydrocarbon on Pore Pressure Response of Guwahati Sand	122
5.6.2 Cone Penetration Index and DPI Recovery	128
5.6.3 Effect of Depth of Contamination on Pore Pressure Response	131
5.6.4 Coupled effect of Degree and Depth of Contamination	142
5.7 Summary	143
6. Cyclic Triaxial Test and EICP Stabilization	

6.1 General	145
6.2 Test procedures and Conditions	146
6.2.1 Chemicals	146
6.2.2 Falcon Tube Tests	146
6.2.3 Specimen Preparation	148
6.2.4 Testing program	150
6.3 Experimental Results and Discussions	152
6.3.1 Pore Pressure Response of Hydrocarbon Contaminated Guwahati Sand	152
6.3.2 Pore Pressure Response of EICP treated Hydrocarbon Contaminated Sand	157
6.3.3 Cyclic Secant Shear Modulus and Modulus Degradation curve	165
6.4 Summary	173
7. Conclusions and Future Recommendations	
7.1 Conclusions of the Study	175
7.2 Contributions of the Study	179
7.3 Limitations and Future Scope of Study	180
References	181
Appendix A	215
Author's Publications	217

List of Figures

Fig. 1.1 (a) Toppling of a building during Niigata earthquake in 1964 (b) Sand boil during California, earthquake, 1979 (Steinbrugge Collection, Earthquake Engineering Research Center, University of California, Berkeley).....	2
Fig. 1.2 Grain size range of soil susceptible to liquefaction	3
Fig. 1.3 General liquefaction concept (Image source: Dash et al.,2010).....	4
Fig. 1.4 Distribution of potential sources of hydrocarbon contamination (Source: Global Oil Pollution Information Gateway, 2016).....	7
Fig. 1.5 A view of contaminated site at Bomu station due to severe spillage (Image source:www.google.com).....	8
Fig. 1.6 Global statistics of oil spill volume and number of incidents through different sources...	10
Fig. 1.7 The volumes of different types of hydrocarbon contaminations (2002–2015).....	10
Fig. 2.1 Grain size distribution curve for liquefiable soils as proposed by Tsuchida (1970) (redrawn after Marto and Tan 2012).....	16
Fig. 2.2 Chinese Criteria for liquefaction susceptibility (after Seed and Idriss 1982).....	17
Fig. 2.3 Modified chinese criteria for liquefaction susceptibility (after Seed and Idriss 1982)....	18
Fig. 2.4 Excess pore pressure-time history and typical stress strain curve for Nevada sand at $D_r = 40\%$ (redrawn after Yang et al. 2003).....	20
Fig. 2.5 Comparison of cyclic stress ratio versus number of cycles to liquefaction (Pathak et al. 2010).....	24
Fig. 2.6 Effect of relative density on PWP ratio (Varghese and Latha 2014).....	24
Fig. 2.7 Comparison of cyclic stress ratio versus relative density (Pathak et al. 2010).....	25
Fig. 2.8 Threshold frequency proposed by Varghese and Latha (2014).....	25
Fig. 2.9 Effect of shaking history on the pore pressure ratio (Wang et al. 2019).....	26
Fig. 2.10 Comparison of shear modulus measurements from resonant column and bender element test (Yang and Liu 2016).....	28
Fig. 2.11 Comparison of cyclic resistance of undisturbed block sample to reconstituted	

samples (Baxter et al. 2008).....	29
Fig. 2.12 Soil specific CSR – V_s relationship independent of sample preparation methods (Baxter et al. 2008).....	29
Fig. 2.13 Liquefaction criterion proposed for clean, uncemented soils from compiled case histories (Reproduced from Andrus and Stokoe 2000).....	32
Fig. 2.14 Plot showing means of field case histories of liquefaction (solid circles) and non- liquefaction (open circles) and new probabilistic curves (Kayen et al. 2013).....	33
Fig. 2.15 Development of correlation between (a) CPT tip resistance and (b) shear wave velocity and liquefaction resistance of artificial sand fill (Wichtman et al. 2019).....	34
Fig. 2.16 Effect of oil content on cyclic resistance of sandy soil (after Naeni and Shojaedin. 2014).....	35
Fig. 2.17 Shear wave velocity (m/s) of clean and crude oil contaminated firoozkooch sand (Rajabi and Sahrifipour 2017b).....	37
Fig 2.18 Effect of soil densification on pore pressure distribution(a) No densification effect (b) Densification effect included (after Selcuk and Kayabali 2015).....	39
Fig 2.19 Variation of cyclic resistant ratio (CRR) with silt content (after Karim and Alam 2014)..	41
Fig. 2.20 Effect of fine content on the minimum mean effective stress of the specimens (after Abedi and Yasrobi 2010).....	42
Fig. 2.21 Shear strain (γ) versus number of cycles (N) evolution of samples prepared at (a) different cement contents; (b) different curing ages (after Suaozo et al. 2016).....	43
Fig. 2.22 Effect of LS content on the undrained behavior of sandy silt under various loading conditions as a function of the number of cycles when $\sigma_3' = 30\text{kPa}$; (a) plastic axial strain; (b) normalized excess pore pressure (after Chen et al. 2014).....	44
Fig. 2.23 Effect of bio-cementation on the development on excess pore water pressure under constant confining stress and cyclic stress ratio (after Xiao et al. 2018).....	46
Fig. 2.24 Seismic response of saturated and desaturated sands under $a_{max} = 1.5 \text{ m/s}$ (after He et al. 2013).....	47
Fig. 2.25 Cyclic response of (a) bentonite treated soil (after El Mohtar 2012) (b) Laponite treated soil (after Huang and Wang 2016).....	49
Fig. 2.26 (a) Microstructure of sand-laponite suspensions (b) 3% laponite permeated specimen	

at 1000x magnification (after Howayek et al. 2014).....	49
Fig. 2.27 Research framework linking existing research topics in liquefaction to future research directions.....	53
Fig. 3.1 Soil sampling locations in Assam, India (Source: National Disaster Risk Reduction Portal).....	56
Fig. 3.2 Chart indicating initial assessment of relative liquefaction susceptibility of three samples based on Chinese criterion.....	57
Fig. 3.3 Particle size distribution curve of Guwahati sand.....	58
Fig. 3.4 Variation of apparent specific gravity with crude oil content.....	60
Fig. 3.5 Compaction curves for contaminated and uncontaminated sand.....	62
Fig. 3.6 Variation of OMC and MDD with crude oil content.....	62
Fig. 3.7 Oil evaporation study of contaminated sand.....	63
Fig. 3.8 Variation of coefficient of permeability with crude oil content.....	64
Fig. 3.9 Shear strength characteristics of uncontaminated and contaminated Guwahati sand	66
Fig. 3.10 Stress-strain curves of clean and contaminated Guwahati sands obtained under consolidated drained triaxial tests.....	67
Fig. 3.11 X-ray diffraction patterns of uncontaminated sand and crude oil contaminated sand.....	68
Fig. 3.12 FTIR analysis results of hydrocarbon contaminated Guwahati sand.....	69
Fig. 3.13 Scanning electron microscopy images for (a) uncontaminated sand (b) 4% contaminated sand (c) 8% contaminated sand and (d) 10% contaminated sand under x1000 magnification.....	70
Fig. 3.14 Volumetric oil content versus absolute oil content.....	71
Fig. 3.15 Liquefaction analysis approaches.....	72
Fig. 3.16 Workflow chart for research methodology.....	76
Fig. 4.1 Schematic depicting working of bender element test set-up	82
Fig. 4.2 Steps involved in sample preparation and assembly in bender element testing.....	84
Fig. 4.3 Schematic representation of samples for evaluation of depth of hydrocarbon contamination.....	84
Fig. 4.4 Typical oscilloscope screen showing input and output signals.....	86
Fig. 4.5 Typical oscilloscope screen indicating peaks of input and output signals.....	86

Fig. 4.6 Typical oscilloscope screen indicating arrival/start of input and output signals.....	87
Fig. 4.7 Bender element test results on clean oven-dried Guwahati sand with $\sigma_c=200\text{kPa}$ at various excitation frequencies.....	89
Fig. 4.8 Effect of excitation frequency on shear wave velocities of uncontaminated and contaminated dry sand specimens.....	90
Fig. 4.9 Effect of excitation frequency on shear wave velocities of uncontaminated and contaminated saturated sand specimens.....	91
Fig. 4.10 Variation of shear wave velocity with crude oil content at different confining pressures.....	92
Fig. 4.11(a) Shear wave velocity of clean and contaminated Guwahati sand under different confining pressures (b) Confinement induced change in shear wave velocity of clean and contaminated Guwahati sand.....	94
Fig. 4.12 Comparative chart for percentage change in shear wave velocity of clean and contaminated Guwahati sand under different confining stresses and saturation condition.....	95
Fig. 4.13 Comparison with past reported results for (a) S-wave velocity versus crude oil content and (b) S- wave velocity versus confining pressure.....	97
Fig. 4.14 Influence of hydrocarbon contamination on small strain shear modulus of sand	98
Fig. 4.15 Effect of contaminated-sand layer thickness on shear wave velocity for dry Specimens.....	99
Fig. 4.16 Effect of contaminated-sand layer thickness on shear wave velocity for saturated specimens.....	100
Fig. 4.17 Shear wave velocity profiles of layered samples for different β ratio at varying crude oil content in (a) dry and (b) saturated.....	102
Fig. 5.1 Schedule of multiple shaking events.....	107
Fig. 5.2 Specifications of DCPT unit.....	108
Fig. 5.3 Arrangement for CPT test.....	109
Fig. 5.4 Photographic view of shake table	110
Fig. 5.5 (a) Schematic diagram of test setup for shake table test (b) Experimental set-up on shake table	112
Fig. 5.6 (a) Pore Pressure transducers (b) Ceramic filters.....	114

Fig. 5.7 Pore pressure transducer calibration chamber.....	115
Fig. 5.8 Calibration and Performance check of Pore Pressure Transducers.....	115
Fig. 5.9 Accelerometer.....	116
Fig. 5.10 Base input acceleration and measured acceleration on shake table.....	116
Fig. 5.11 Adjustable sieve arrangement for rainfall technique.....	118
Fig. 5.12 Density calibration curves for uncontaminated and contaminated sand.....	118
Fig. 5.13 Krypton-3-STG Data Acquisition System.....	120
Fig. 5.14 Typical DEWESOFT interface showing excess pore pressure data without filter.....	120
Fig. 5.15 Filter application after data logging in DEWESOFT.....	121
Fig. 5.16 Excess pore pressure data after filter application.....	121
Fig. 5.17 Excess pore pressure-time histories at varying oil dosages for three shaking events at d=30 cm.....	123
Fig. 5.18 Excess pore pressure-time histories at varying oil dosages for three shaking events at d=15 cm.....	124
Fig. 5.19 Comparison of maximum excess pore pressure ratio, $r_{u, max}$, and time to liquefaction, T_L for homogenous sand bed at (a) d = 30cm and (b) d = 15cm.....	127
Fig. 5.20 Cone penetration test results before and after shaking events.....	129
Fig. 5.21 Variation of DPI recovery with oil content.....	130
Fig. 5.22 Schematic view of preparation of layered sand bed.....	132
Fig. 5.23 Excess pore pressure-time histories for different shaking events at varying oil content, ω , for $\beta = 0.356$ and d= 30cm.....	134
Fig. 5.24 excess pore pressure-time histories for different shaking events at varying oil content, ω , and $\beta = 0.356$ and d= 15cm.....	135
Fig. 5.25 Excess pore pressure-time histories for different shaking events at varying oil content, ω , and $\beta = 0.55$ at 15 cm depth.....	136
Fig. 5.26 Excess pore pressure-time histories for different shaking events at varying oil content, ω , for $\beta = 0.55$ and d = 30 cm.....	137
Fig. 5.27 Excess pore pressure-time histories for first and third shaking events at varying oil content, ω , for $\beta = 0.75$ and d = 15cm.....	138
Fig. 5.28 Excess pore pressure-time histories for first and third shaking events at varying oil content, ω , for $\beta = 0.75$ and d =30cm.....	139

Fig. 5.29 Comparison of maximum excess pore pressure ratio, $r_{l, \max}$, and time to liquefaction, T_L for homogenous sand bed at 30 cm depth for (a) $\beta = 0.356$, (b) $\beta = 0.55$, and (c) $\beta = 0.75$	141
Fig. 5.30 Coupled effect of variation in crude oil content, ω , and contamination depth ratio, β on normalized excess pore pressure ratio.....	143
Fig. 6.1 (a) Falcon tubes containing EICP solution (b) Filter papers containing calcite Precipitate.....	147
Fig. 6.2 Experimental setup for cyclic triaxial system.....	151
Fig. 6.3 Applied cyclic shear strain versus number of cycles.....	152
Fig. 6.4 Results of strain-controlled cyclic test for $\omega = 2\%$, $\sigma_c = 1.0 \text{ kg/cm}^2$, $\gamma = 1.0\%$ (a) deviatoric stress with cyclic shear strain; (b) deviatoric stress with no. of cycles; (c) effective stress path; (d) mean effective stress with number of cycles.....	154
Fig. 6.5 Normalized cyclic pore pressure response of crude oil contaminated Guwahati sand at $\gamma = 0.5\%$, $\sigma_c = 1.0 \text{ kg/cm}^2$	155
Fig. 6.6 Normalized cyclic pore pressure response of crude oil contaminated Guwahati sand at $\gamma = 0.5\%$, $\sigma_c = 1.0 \text{ kg/cm}^2$	157
Fig. 6.7 Normalized cyclic pore pressure response of EICP treated sand specimens for different crude oil content at $\gamma = 0.5$	159
Fig. 6.8 Normalized cyclic pore pressure response of EICP treated sand specimens for different crude oil content at $\gamma = 1.0\%$	160
Fig. 6.9 SEM images of untreated sand (a) at $\omega = 4\%$, (b) $\omega = 8\%$ and EICP uncontaminated sand exhibiting cementation (c) at grain to grain contact surface and (d) on the sand grain surface.....	162
Fig. 6.10 Coupled effect of crude oil contamination and EICP treatment on maximum pore pressure ratio at (a) $\gamma = 0.5\%$ and (b) $\gamma = 1.0\%$	163
Fig. 6.11 Variation of theoretically calculated cycles to liquefaction with crude oil content at (a) $\gamma = 0.5\%$ and (b) $\gamma = 1.0\%$	166
Fig. 6.12 Deviatoric stress versus cyclic shear strain profiles before and after EICP treatment for $\omega = 0\%$, 4% and 8% and $\gamma = 0.5\%$	168
Fig. 6.13 Deviatoric stress versus cyclic shear strain profiles before and after EICP treatment for $\omega = 0\%$, 4% and 8% and $\gamma = 1.0\%$	169

Fig. 6.14 Coupled effect of crude oil contamination and EICP treatment on G_{\max} values at (a) $\gamma = 0.5\%$ and (b) $\gamma = 1.0\%$	170
Fig. 6.15 Variation of degradation index, δ_N , with the number of cycles, N , and the degradation parameter, t , for untreated contaminated specimens at (a) $\gamma = 0.5\%$ and (b) $\gamma = 1.0\%$	171
Fig. 6.16 Variation of degradation index, δ_N , with the number of cycles, N , and the degradation parameter, t , for EICP treated specimens at $\gamma = 0.5\%$ for (a) 7 days and (b) 14 days curing.....	172
Fig. 6.17 Variation of degradation index, δ_N , with the number of cycles, N , and the degradation parameter, t , for EICP treated specimens at $\gamma = 1.0\%$ for (a) 7 days and (b) 14 days curing.....	173

List of Tables

Table 1.1 Major Oil Spills Occurred Worldwide (Source: Rajabi and Sharifipour (2019)).....	9
Table 2.1 Summary of some significant Laboratory Investigations over the past decade.....	21
Table 2.2 Earthquake-induced damage observed from field investigations.....	31
Table 2.3. Overview of past studies with geosynthetics as a liquefaction countermeasure.....	40
Table 2.4 Evolution of liquefaction mitigation techniques in recent years.....	50
Table. 3.1 Chinese criterion for soil liquefaction.....	56
Table 3.2 Properties of light crude oil.....	57
Table 3.3. Basic Properties of Guwahati sand.....	59
Table. 4.1 Variables along with their considered range.....	80
Table. 4.2 Summary of Bender element testing series in the present study.....	81
Table 4.3 Comparison of properties of Guwahati sand and other sands from past literature.....	96
Table 5.1. Summary of shake table tests.....	107
Table 5.2 Specifications of shake table.....	110
Table 6.1 Summary of tube tests.....	148
Table 6.2. Summary of cyclic triaxial tests conducted at $\sigma_c = 1.0 \text{ kg/cm}^2$ and void ratio, e = 0.749.....	150

List of Abbreviations/Notations

ASTM	American Society of Testing and Material
CPT	Cone Penetration Test
CRR	Cyclic Resistance Ratio
CSR	Cyclic Stress Ratio
DPI	Dynamic cone Penetration Index
EICP	Enzymatic-Induced Calcite Precipitate
FTIR	Fourier-Transform Infrared Spectroscopy
IS	Indian Standard
LL	Liquid Limit
MDD	Maximum Dry Density
MICP	Microbial Induced Calcite Precipitate
OMC	Optimum Moisture Content
PGA	Peak Ground Acceleration
PI	Plasticity Index
PPT	Pore Pressure Transducers
SEM	Scanning Electron Microscopy
SPT	Standard Penetration Test
XRD	X-Ray Diffraction
a_{max}	Peak horizontal ground acceleration
β	Contamination Depth Ratio
C_u	Coefficient of Uniformity
C_c	Coefficient of Curvature
d	Depth of pore pressure transducer from free surface
D_r	Relative Density

D_{50}	Particle size corresponding to 50% passing
D_{60}	Particle size corresponding to 60% passing
δ_N	Degradation index
e	Void ratio
e_{\min}	Minimum void ratio
e_{\max}	Maximum void ratio
f	Frequency
g	acceleration due to gravity (9.8m/s^2)
G_0	Initial cyclic secant shear modulus
G_N	Secant shear modulus at N^{th} cycle
G_{\max}	Maximum shear modulus
$G_{\max,\text{cont}}$	Maximum shear modulus of contaminated sand
$G_{\max,\text{clean}}$	Maximum shear modulus of clean sand
G_s	Specific gravity
L_{TT}	Wave travel distance
N	Number of loading cycles
N_L	Number of cycles to liquefaction
r_d	Stress reduction factor
R_d	Number of wavelengths in one sample length
r_u	Normalized pore pressure ratio
$r_{u\max}$	Maximum normalized pore pressure ratio
ρ	Mass density
σ_c	Confining stress
σ_c'	Effective confining stress
σ_{vo}	Total overburden stress
σ_{vo}'	Effective overburden stress
t	Degradation parameter
T_L	Time elapsed till liquefaction

τ_N	Cyclic shear stress amplitude at N th cycle
Δt	Wave travel time
Δu	Excess pore fluid pressure
Δu_{\max}	Maximum excess pore fluid pressure
V_s	Shear wave velocity
V_{s1}	Corrected shear wave velocity
$V_{s\text{-clean}}$	Shear wave velocity of clean sand
$V_{s\text{-6\%}}$	Shear wave velocity of 6% contaminated sand
$V_{s\text{-12\%}}$	Shear wave velocity of 12% contaminated sand
ω	Crude oil content
γ	Cyclic shear strain