

WILFORD H. BARBOUR

PHYSICAL PROPERTIES OF MICHIGAN MARLS THESIS FOR DEGREE OF B. S. W. H. BARBOUR 1926

THESIS

.



in in

WPPLEMEN MATERIAL IN BACK OF BOOK



•

1 .

`

•

PHYSICAL PROPERTIES OF LICHIGAN MARLS.

A Thesis Submitted to The Faculty of

NICHIGAN STATE COLLEGE

CF

AGRICULTURE AND APPLIED SCIENCE

Ву

W, H. Barbour

Candidate for the Degree of

Bachelor of Science.

June 1926.

THESIS

INTRODUCTION

.

93837

PREFACE.

It is the purpose of this thesis to tell something about the physical properties of Lichigan marks. Nothing has ever been written concerning these in any textbooks and the results given here are obtained by actual experimentation with the mark and checked as close as possible with the ideas concerning them held by men who have been in close association with mark for a number of years.

The material found in this book will not be found in print anywhere else and it is hoped that this material will be of value to anyone who desires to carry on any further investigations regarding these properties, and to give some beneficial information regarding weight and shrinkage which would be of assistance to the engineering world.

In obtaining this material it has been necessary to interview the chemists at several cement plants as well as actually making the tests with the mark. The origin of marl has been discussed a great deal. It is now ascribed to the action of fresh water algae, which precipitate it or throw it down from solution.

Whether this be the truth or not, it's close and intimate connection with fresh water lakes is too patent to be denied. In searching for it, therefore, the obvious method is to observe the locality for flat meadows or marshes, which have the appearance of having been at one time the site of glacial lakes.

harl consists of the amorphous or organic form of calcium carbonate mixed with varying amounts of soil, sand humus, snails, shells, etc. It is a soft, damp, gray or blackish earth somewhat like bulk sugar in appearance; it has little plasticity when worked up with water like a clay, and still less hardness or strength when dried. It dissolves in any acid, even vinegar, with much effervescence and foaming.

Earl beds run in strata and **var**y in the calcium carbonate content and depth within a very few feet to a great extent. A map is shown which well illustrates the topography of a marl bed.

Narl.

It is necessary in order to make a correct analysis to have a set of sampling tools to get accurate and uniform samples under as nearly as possible the same conditions.

A description of two kinds of samplers will be given one of which has been in use for about two years and the other only a montr.

Che sampler consists of a one-half inch pipe cut in sections three feet long with a T shaped handle. A halfinch brass tube six inches long is fastened to each she of these thre foot sections in such a manner so that by rotating the rod the pressure of the earth forces this tube to turn about the pipe so that by pushing the rod six inches further into the ground the tube will be filled and byotating the rod in the opposite direction the tube will again close. A drawing is shown which better illustrates the idea.

This sampler gives a very accurate sample and also gives the depth the sample is taken below the level of the ground. It is best for obtaining samples for chemical analysis. The main fault of this which is quite a seriour one is that if the marl is a little samay or contains some such similar material the samd will get in the swivel and will not open or close and is very hard to clean, sometimes having to be taken apart. If **she** person handling this sampler is not careful it is very easily bent and if a larger pipe is used with the same principle it is hard to push into the ground.

The second sampler which has just been devised consists of a one inch pipe made in three foot lengths which can be put together with pipe sleeves. It has a T shaped handle and a slot is cut in the bottom section which when the pipe is rotated fills with marl or material at that depth.

This sampler does not give as accurate samples but it always works and is more easily pushed into and withdrawn from the soil. It is not easily bent when the needed weight is a plied to force it into the ground. The samples that are obtained with this are subficiently accurate for the general run of tests that re made on marl.

The method of sampling used was to take a post-hole digger and remove the top-soil and go a foot into the marl and then fill a pint carton with the material.

This method was used because the greatest variation of marl in this bed was found at depths of about five feet and larger samples were needed than could be obtained with either of the above-mentioned samplers.

Procedure:

- 1.Percentage of marl that is water. Weighed fifty grams of sample to be tested and then placed sample on oven and baked until all moisture had left. Weighed the material that was left and computed the percentage water.
- 2.Shrinkage. Filled a 2" cubical tin cup level full of the marl and baked until moisture left. With the aid of calipers the area of the volume remaining was computed. The marl remaining after the water was taken out was then pulverized and the volume of this measured. The shrinkage was then computed.
 3.Weight per cubic yard of wet and dry. Weighed the marl in a tube wet and computed weight. Then dried the sample by baking and weighed the material remaining.

Sample #1.

Chemical Thalysis	lhysical Analysis.
Si0 ₂ 1.50	Wt. with water 100g.
k ₂ 03 1.53	Wt. without water 46.33.
CaC 46.83	S of marl water is 46.3
CaCC ₃ 88.96	Shrinkage measured with cal-
lg0 1.71	ipers and computed of cube
lgCU3 3.03	was 13.2% of original volume.
Vol.12t. 46.29	After being broken up into
100.94	fine particles it was 22.1%
Crganic Latter 5.33	Wt. of saryle/cu.yd. wet 2420#
	lit. of sample/cu.yd. dry 1300#
	Color- Grey.

Sample 72.

Chemical	Analysis	Physical Analysis.
SiC_2	1.74	Color- Grey-scapy.
R_2C_3	1.60	Wt. with water $50g$.
CaO	48.18	Wt. without water $25.6g$.
Cacu ₃	86.03	\checkmark of marl water 51.2 by wt.
LEC	1.92	Shrinkage measured with
LgCU3	4.61	calipers 14.4%
Vol. Ma	at. <u>46.43</u>	After being broken up 18.6%
	99.98	Wt. of sample/cu.yd. wet 2440#
Crganic 1	atter 6.55	Wt. of sample/cu.yd. ary $1210^{\frac{3}{2}}$

Sample "3.

Chemical /nalysis	Thysical Analysis
SiC ₂ 3.33	Color- greyish black.
E2C3 2.12	Jt. with water 50g.
CaC 45.72	Wt. without water 19.6g.
CaCC3 81.64	% of marl water 60.8
lg(1.71	Shrinkage measured with cali-
lgCC3 3.57	pers in [18.4.
Vcl.Lat. 47.32	Shrinkage after being broken
100.15	into fine particles 20.2%
Organic latter 9.54	Wt. of sam./cu.yd. wet 1750#
	Wt. of sam./cu.yd. dry 1000#

Sample #4.

Chemical a	analysis	Thysical Analysis
SiC_2	1.32	Color-Iron grey
¹² 2 ^C 3	1.40	Wt. with water CCg.
Cal	49.82	W. without water 30.9g.
CaCC3	88.96	% of marl water by wt. 58.8
1C	1.91	Chrinkase neasured with cali-
lgCC3	4.00	pers 17.3%
Vol.Lat.	45.96	Surinase after being broken
	100.41	into time particles 23.3%
Organic La	tter 9.54	Wt. of sam./cu.yd. dry 1120#
		Wt. of sim./cu.yd. wet 2720#

•

E Emple #5

Chemical Analysis	Physical Analysis
SiC ₂ .70	Color- Elackish grey.
R ₂ C ₃ 1.14	Wt. with water 50g.
Ca(51.62	Wt. without water 21.2g.
CaCC ₃ 91.18 ·	C of marl water 57.6 by wt.
1.84	Shrinhage as neasured by cal-
Ng003 3.86	ipers was 15.7%
Vol. lat <u>.44.31</u>	Shrinkage after being pulver-
99.01	ized 19.7
Organic latter 2.73	.t. of sam./cu.yd. 1090# try
	Wt. of sam./cu.ye. 2575# wet

Sample #6

Chemical analysis	Itysical Analysis
SiC ₂ 1.28	Color- grey
R ₂ 0 ₃ 1.62	wt. with water 50g.
Cac 49.71	wt. without water 28.4
CaC63 88.71	of marl water 49.2 by wt.
1gC 1.91	Sirinkage is reasured by cal-
LECC3 3.99	ipers 14.4%
Vol. Lat. 46.22	Chrinkage after being pulver-
100.74	izea 23.2%
	Wt. of sam./cu.yd. 1300% ary
	Wt. of sam. cu.yc. 2560# wet

Sample # 7.

Chemical A:	nalysis	Physical Analysis
Sicz	.83	Color- whitish grey-chalk.
R ₂ C ₃	1.12	Wt. with water 50g.
Cal	51.59	Wt. without water 30.9g.
CaCCz	87.88	5 of marl water by wt. 38.2
I. ج (،	1.75	Shrinkage as neasured by
LgCC3	3.81	calipers was 14.6 %
Vol.lat.	44:71	Shrinkage after being pulverized
	99.95	17.6 %
Organic Lat	ter 2.65	Wt. of sem./cu.yd. 1450# dry.
		Wt. of sam./cu.yd. 2345# wet

Sample #8

Chemic: 1 Analysis	Flysical Analysis
SiC ₂ 1.24	Cclor- blackish grey.
^H 2 ^O 3 1.57	Wt. with water 50g.
Cal 48.64	Wt. without water 25g.
CaCC ₃ 87.18	" water 50
kgC 1.37	Shrinkage as measured by
LCCC3 3.97	calipers 18.54
Vol.1at. <u>46.68</u>	Shrinkage after being pulver-
100.10	ized 27.7%
Organic Latter 5.03	Wt. of sam./cu.yd. 12904 dry
	Wt. of sam., cu.yd. 2580# wet

Chemical Analysis	Physical Analysis
SiC ₂ 2.50	Color- grey.
R2C3 2.64	Wt. with water 50g.
Ca C 46.44	Wt. without water 27.5g.
CaCC3 82.94	🥙 water by wt. 45
lg0 1.60	Chrinkage by drying 28%
ligCO ₃ 3.34	Shringage after pulverizing
Vol.lat. <u>46.53</u>	35 ^(*)
103.(5	Wt. of samele/cu.yd. 1400# dry
Organic Matter 8.29	Wt. of s ample cu.yc. 2550#wet

.

Sample #10.

Chemical A	nalysis	Physical Analysis
SiO_2	1.20	Color - chalk.
F_2O_3	1.62	Wt. with water 50g.
Cau	49.92	Wt. without water 29.6g.
CaCO3	89.20	% water by wt. 40.8
LgO	1.80	Strin age by drying 18%
LgCC ₃	3.77	Shrinkese after pulverizing
Vol. Lat	. 46.18	26%
	100.72	Wt. of sample/cu.yd. 1380# dry
Crganic la	tter 4.93	at. of san_le/cu.yd. 2340# wet

Sample	#11.	

Chemical A	nalysis	Physical Analysis.
\mathtt{SiO}_2	2.54	Color- grey-soary.
Е ₂ 0 ₃	2.00	Wt. with water 50g.
CaC	47.16	Wt. without water 25.6g.
CaCC3	34.21	💋 water by wt. 48,8
1 ق 0	1.69	Shrinkage by drying 17.7%
ligC0 ₃	3.50	Shrinkage after pulver-
V.N .	46.24	izing 27.7%
	9 9.6 3	Wt. of sample/cu.yd. 1255#dry
Organic la	atter 5.34	Wt.of semple/cu.ye. 2450#wet

Sample #12.

Chemical	Analysis	
SiC2	5.26	Color- brownish grey
R ₂ 0 ₃	3.48	Wt. with water 50g.
Ca O	37.74	Wt. without water 20g.
CaCOz	67.39	💋 water by wt. 60%
leC	1.54	Shrinkage afger drying 22%
l.gC ≬ 3	4.06	Shrinkese after pulveriming
V.L.	51.32	33%
	9 9.7 4	Wt. of sample/cu.yd. 940# dry
Grganic	latter 19.55	Wt. of sample, cu.yd. 2350#wet
High in	silica, low	

in line.

	Sample	<i>#</i> 13.	10.
	Chemica	l analysis	Fhysical Analysis
	Si02	1.22	Color - chalk grey.
y	R_20_3	1. <i>6</i> 0	Wt. with water 50g.
	CaO	48.49	Wt. without water 26.9g.
	Ce.CO3	86.59	% w ater by wt. 46.2
	lgO	1.94	Shrinkage by drying 18.3%
	NgCC3	4.06	Shrinkaee after pulver-
	V.L.	46.88	izing 28.3%
		100.13	Wt. of sample/cu.yd. 1290# dry
	Crganic	Latter 6.66	Wt. of sample/cu.yd. 2400# wet

Sample $\frac{4}{11}$ 14.

.

• .

6 hemical	Analysis	Fhysical Analysis
Si02	1.16	Color- chaik.
$\mathbb{R}_{2}^{}0_{3}^{}$	1.68	Wt. with water 50g.
CaO	50.1	Wt. without water 29.4g.
Ca C O 3	89.46	% water by wt. 41.2
l.gC	1.84	Shrinkage by drying 19.8%
hgC03	3.86	Shrinkage by drying and pul-
V.L.	45.15	verizing 26.7
	99.93	Wt. of sample/cu.yd. 1420# dry
Organic 1	atter 3.77	Wt. o_fsample/cu.yd. 2420# wet

Chemical Analysis	Physical inalysis
SiO ₂ 3.44	Color- grey
R ₂ 0 ₃ 1.72	Wt. with water 50g.
Ce.0 48.69	Wt. without water 24g.
CaCC ₃ 86,∕94	% water by wt. 52
Le0 1.56	Shrinkage after drying 19.1 $\%_4$
LgC0 ₃ 3.76	Shrinkage after drying and
V.E. <u>44.27</u>	pulverizing 29.1%
99.68	Wt. of sam./cu,fd. 1080# dry
Organic Latter 4.3	32 Wt. of sam./cu.yd. 2260# wet

1**1.**

Sample "16

Chemical Analysis	Physical Analysis
SiO ₂ 1.26	Color- blackish-soapy.
K203 1.16	Wt. with water 50g.
CaC 49.62	Wt. without water 22.1g
CaCC3 88.61	% water by wt. 55.8
Lg0 1.72	Shrin.age after drying 18.3%
lg003 3.61	Shrinkage after drying and
V.M. <u>46.52</u>	pulverizing 28.8%
100.2 8	Wt. of sam./cu.yc. $105C_{ii}^{\mu}$ dry
Crganic Latter 5.	64 Wt. of sam./cu.yd. 2380# wet

Chemical	Analysis	Physical Analysis
\mathtt{SiC}_2	.70	Color- white-chalk.
R203	1.14	Wt. with water 50g.
Cau	51.62	Wt. without water 24g.
CaCC3	9 1.1 8	% water by wt. 52.
lgC	1.84	Shrinkage after drying 14.3 $\%$
lĭgCC3	3.86	Shrinkage after drying and
V.M.	44.31	pulverizing 17.8 %
	99.61	Wt. of sam./cu.yd. 1090# dry
Organic 1	Latter 2.73	Wt. of sam./cu.yd. 2280#wet

Sample #18.

Chemical Analysis	Physical Analysis
Si0 ₂ .72	Color- Elackishggrey
R203 .96	Wt. with water 50g.
CaC 49.32	Wt. without water 25g.
CaCC3 88.07	% water by wt. 42.
h g0 1.91	Shrinkage after drying 13.9%
LgCC ₃ 3.99	Shrin.a.e after drying and
V.L. <u>48.06</u>	pulverizing 16.6%
100.97	Wt. of sam./cu.yd. 1490∦ dry
Organic Latter 7.23	Wt. of sam./cu.yd. 2560# wet

Chemica]	Analysis	Physical Analysis
Si02	3.68	Celor- brownish-grey
R203	2.20	Wt.with water 50g.
CaC	47.16	Wt. without water 22.5g.
C& C \$ 3	84.11	% water by wt. 55
) lg0	1.72	Shrinkage after drying 21.2%
lgCO3	3.60	Surinkage after drying and
V.L.	45.77	pulverizing 25.1 🛒
	100.53	Wt. of sam./cu.yd. 1050# dry
C r_eanic	latter 6.90	Wt. of sam./cu.yd. 2340# wet

Sample #20

Chemical	Analysis	Physical Analysis
SiC_2	1.28	Color- grey
R203	1, 8€	Wt. with water 50g.
CaO	49.33	Wt. without water 25.5g.
CaCO3	88.09	S water by wt. 49
L gC	1.71	Shrinkage after drying 18.5%
KgC03	3.59	Shrinkage after drying and
V.L.	<u>46.17</u> T	pulverizing 20.2 %
	100.35	Wt. of sam./cu.yd. 1300# dry
Crganic 1	atter 5.53	Wt. of sam./cu.yd. 2550# wet

Sample	#	21.	
--------	---	-----	--

Chemical	Analysis	Physical Analysis
SiC ₂	1.66	Color- Greyish black
R ₂ 03	1.26	Wt. with water 50g.
CaO	50.53	Wt. without water 26.5g.
CaCO3	90.23	% water by wt. 47.
l.gO	1.79	Shrinkase after drying 12.2%
NgC0 ₃ -	3.74	Shrinkage after drying and
V.L.	44.42	pulverizing 18.6%
	99.66	Wt. of sam./cu.yd. 1310# dry
(r _c anic l	.atter 2.77	Wt. of sam.?cu.yd. 2480# wet

.

Somple #22. Chemical Analysis Si02 1.54 R_2C_3 1.12 CaC 49.71 CE CO3 88.77 lgC 1.79 lgC03 3.74 V.Ľ. 45.94 99.32 Organic Latter 4.93

Ph ysical Analysis
Color- chalk
Wt. with water 50g.
W. without water 29.5g.
% water by wt. 41.5
Shrinkase after drying 10.0%
Shrinkage after drying and
pulverizing 17.3%
Wt. of sam./cu.yd. 1380# dry
Wt. of sam./cu.ya. 2350# wet

Sample# 23.

Chemical	Analysis.	Physical Analysis
Si0 ₂	1.12	Color:Grey-chalk
R_20_3	1.10	Wt. with water 50g.
CaO	50.82	Wt. without water 24.5g.
CaCC3	50 .7 5	🤇 water by wt. 51
1 .gC	1.76	Shrinkage after drying 15.1%
lgCC3	3.68	Shrinkage after drying and
V.l.	45.64	pulverizing 27.37
	100.44	Wt. of sam./cu.yd. 1180# dry
Crganic 1	atter 4.79	Wt. of sam./cu.yd. 2410# wet

Sample #24.

Chemical	Analysis	Thysical Analysis
Sic2	1.08	Color: grey
R203	.94	wt. with water 50g.
CaO	50.61	Wt. without water 28.2g.
Cacc3	90.3 8	g water by wt. 43.6
КgC	1.78	Shrinkage after drying 10.2%
lgCC3	3.72	Shrinkage after drying and
V.L.	45.23	pulverizing 199%
	99.64	Wt. of sam./cu.yd. 1290# dry
Crganic I	atter 3.52	Wt. of sam./cu.yd. 2290# wet

Chemical	Analysis	Physical Analysis
Sic ₂	2.13	Color: blackish-grey.
^{1.} 2 ⁰ 3	1.32	Wt. with water 50g.
CaO	49.82	Wt. without water 28.2
CaCC 3	88.96	% water by wt. 43.6
Dg.I	1.58	Shrinkage after drying 13.2%
1.gCC3	3.30	Shrinkage after drying and
V.1.	45.13	pulverizing 17.7%
	100.03	Wt. of sam./cu.yd. 1400 $\#$
Organic 1	atter 4.11	Wt. of sam./cu.yd. 2490#

Sample #26

Chemical	Analysis	Inysical Analysis
SiC2	1.24	Color: Grey-soapy
R_2C_3	1.12	Wt. with water 50g.
Caû	50.42	Wt. without water 26.6
CaCC3	85.92	<pre>% water by wt. 46.8</pre>
l g0	1.72	Shrinkaee after drying 14.9%
ligCC ₃	3.48	Shrinlage after drying and
V.L.	45.51	pulverizing 26.6%
	100.01	Tht. of sample/cu.yd. 1310# dry
Cr ₅ anic I	latter 5.43	Wt. of sample/cu.yd. 2460# wet

Chemical Analysis	Physical Analysis
SiC ₂ 3.24	Color: Blackish-grey
R ₂ C ₃ 2.08	Wt. with water 50g.
CaO 45.68	Wt. without water 21.2
CaCO ₃ 80.48	% water by wt. 57.6
lgC 1.83	Shrinkage after drying 14.7%
LgCC ₃ 3.84	Shrinkage after drying and
V.1. 47.16	pulverizing 28.8%
99.59	Wt. of sam./cu.yd. 1030# dry
Organic latter 9.04	Wt. of sam.%cu.yd. 24404 wet

.

Sample # 23.

Chemical	Analysis	Physical Analysis
Si02	4.83	Color: Lark-brownish-grey.
K203	3.82	Wt. with water 50g.
CaC	40.42	Wt. without water 20g
CaCC3	72.56	% water by wt. 60
l ig0	1.87	Shrinkage after dirying 12.1%
LgC03	4.02	Shrinkage after drying and
V.L.	48.78	pulverizing 26.8%
	99 .7 2	Wt. of sam./cu.yd. 960# dry
Organic (Latter 17.36	Wt. ofsam./ cu.yd. 2400# wet
High in	silica, low	

.

in lime.

Chemical	Analysis	Physical Analysis
Si02	2.50	Wt. with water 50g.
R203	2.01	Wt. without water 26.8g.
Cac	47.02	% water by wt. 🛢 46.2
CaCC3	84.11	Shrinkage after drying 11.2%
lgC	1.70	Shrinkage after drying and
lgC03	3.50	pulverizing 27.2 %
V.M .	47.79	Wt. cf sam./cu.yd. 1380# dry
	101.02	Wt. of sam./cu.yd. 2560# wet

Organic Latter 5.34

From the data given the following resultsare determined:

- Color. Could not check results close enough to make any definite statements inregard to this physical property.
- 2. Cohesion. harl does not have any cohesive qualities. There does not seem to be any chemical reaction taking place in the marl itself except when acid or some similar reagent is introduced.
- #. Water Content. The water content varies with the organic matter. High organic matter results in high moisture.
- 4. Adhesion. Some of the samples taken were made into brickets and baked for a sufficient length of time to be thoroughly free of moisture and were then put in a concrete testing machine and broken. They held approximately 5# in tension. The results of this test were not apparently beneficial or did not have any bearing on anything concerning the physical properties of especial importance.
- 5. Shrinkage. The average shrinkage for allsamples taken of both the dried and the dried and pulverized was exactly 20%. The lowest was 10.2% and the highest 29.1 of original volume.

20. 6. Weight per cubic yard. The average wt. of marl per cubic yard wet was found to be 2420#. The average wt. of marl per cubic yard dry was found to be 1235 pounds.

--



