

A METHOD FOR CHARACTERIZING THE BULK DENSITY OF COMPRESSIBLE PARTICULATE MATERIALS

D. Guenther
Research Assistant

S. Schaub
Graduate Student

J. Leonard
Professor

Department of Agricultural, Food and Nutritional Science,
University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada, T6G 2P5

INTRODUCTION

Any description of a material would be incomplete without consideration of the physical properties of that material. For materials that exist as particles in a bulk, the properties of the bulk material are often as important as properties of the individual particles, and perhaps the most basic bulk property is that of bulk density. This is simply defined as the mass of a bulk material divided by the volume that the mass occupies.

For relatively hard materials, such as soil or grain, measurement of bulk density can be carried out very simply by measuring the mass of material required to fill a container of known volume or measuring the volume occupied by a known mass of the material (Mohsenin 1986; Stroshine and Hamann 1994). If the particles are incompressible, this can be assumed to give the maximum bulk density of the material. However, if the material is compressible, bulk density values obtained from small, disturbed samples will reflect only the properties of material on the surface of a bin or pile. Material at some depth will have higher bulk densities due to compression under the weight of the material above it. This could be of significance in determining the mass of material in a pile of a given volume, in the estimation of other physical parameters (such as thermal conductivity, porosity, or resistance to air flow) deep within piles of such a material, or in the design of storage structures and materials-handling systems.

Consequently, the first problem of characterizing the bulk density of compressible materials is how to obtain a value at any location in a pile. This invariably involves disturbing the sample to some extent, or disturbing the surrounding material so that the load on the sample is changed, or both. This paper describes an alternative approach in which the loading at any depth in the bulk is simulated to obtain a relationship between depth and bulk density. This relationship can then be used to derive a value for the effective bulk density of the entire mass of material.

The objective was to develop a laboratory method of characterizing bulk density that was cheap, simple, precise, and accurate. Since it has the potential to be applied to a wide range of materials, the approach was tested with compost, wood shavings, straw, and peat moss.

METHOD

The basic apparatus required was a container for the material, a set of weights with which to apply vertical loads, and a platform scale. In order to minimize wall effects, a large steel cylindrical container, approximate diameter 500mm and height 750mm, was used. However, this container size was too large for practical in-field use. Therefore, smaller containers have been designed using schedule 40 pipe (approximate diameter 300mm and height 400mm). Results using the small containers are not available at this time as data are in the process of being collected.

The containers were weighed and a line was marked on the inside, from the bottom. Material was filled to the 500mm mark for the larger container and to the 250mm mark for the smaller container. The containers were filled with water to these marks and weighed. Assuming the density of water to be 1000 kg/m^3 , the volume of the container to the mark ($V_{500 \text{ or } 250}$) was determined.

The material to be measured was placed in the container to a level exceeding the mark and shaken to ensure that the material settled. Material above the mark was removed then the container was weighed and the bulk density (D) of the material was determined.

This represents the bulk density in the top 500mm or 250mm of a pile. The next step was to determine the bulk density in the next 500mm or 250mm layer. To do this, a load equivalent to the mass of material was applied to the material in the container, by placing known masses on top of the material. To ensure uniform loading, the masses were placed on a plywood disk with the diameter slightly less than the container. This loading compressed the material and was applied for about one hour so that the material could consolidate to a constant volume.

Compression distances were measured and the values used to determine how much material needed to be added to bring the level back to the mark. After adding this material, and after a 1 minute consolidation time with the load applied, the level of material was checked to see if it was at the selected mark. Adjustments were made as required adding or subtracting material until the level was at the desired mark. The added mass plus the previous mass of material represented the final mass of the second layer.

The above procedure could be repeated for any number of layers. In general, the bulk density (D_n) of the n th layer is given by:

$$D_n = \frac{M_t - (M_c + \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} M_{mi})}{V_{500 \text{ or } 250}} \text{ kg/m}^3 \quad (1)$$

Where:

- M_t = Total mass of the material and container
- M_c = Mass of the container, and
- M_m = Mass of material in i th layer
- = Mass of applied load

The trials conducted were repeated, layer by layer, to a simulated depth of 3.5m (1.75m for the small containers) and resulted in a set of bulk density determinations corresponding to successive 500mm or 250mm layers of material. These were plotted against depth and a least-squares regression routine was used to fit curves to the plotted points.

Once a bulk density versus depth curve had been obtained, an effective bulk density (D_{eff}) could be defined as the bulk density which, if constant with depth (z), would give the same area under a bulk density-depth curve as the experimental values.

This is expressed mathematically in Equation 2 as follows:

$$D_{\text{eff}} = \frac{1}{z} \int_0^z D(z) dz \text{ kg/m}^3 \quad (2)$$

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The method of bulk density characterization presented above was conceptually simple and did not require any expensive or particularly sophisticated equipment. Results from the large container experiment, tested in two separate trials, indicate similar trends in describing the characteristics of the materials tested and the density as a

result of a load exerted upon the material. This was seen by the similarity between equations to curves for like materials and the high R^2 values ranging from 0.88 to 0.99.

In fitting curves to the data, the selected best-fit equation was a power function, of the form $y=Ax^B$. This regression equation was selected as it could describe the behaviour or properties of materials. Thus, y represents the bulk density, x represents depth, and A and B are constants that depend on the material.

The coefficients (A) provide an indication of the order of magnitude of the bulk density of the material. The exponents (B), on the other hand, give an indication of the compressibility of the materials. The higher the exponent, the higher the compressibility. A completely incompressible material whose bulk density was constant with depth would have an exponent of zero. Examination of the equations shows that wood shavings was the least compressible of the materials tested and had a minimum exponent of 0.0518, while compost was the most compressible material and had a maximum exponent of 0.28.

Of the materials tested, the most variable was compost. This may have been due to the physical differences of the material being initially compressed and the material having had another year for decomposition. On the other hand, peat moss had the least variance which may be explained by the relatively homogeneous and stable make-up of peat.

Although power function equations, as described above, provide a convenient description of the bulk density of compressible materials, practicality demands a single number to characterize this property. Effective density (D_{eff}) is proposed as this number on the grounds that it is more representative and, potentially, of greater practical significance than a simple average of a number of measurements. By definition, determination of D_{eff} requires measurements of bulk densities at a range of compressions and, the larger the range, the better will be the estimate of D_{eff} . This encourages a complete characterization of the behaviour of the material rather than simply taking a few measurements at the surface or at low levels of compression which are not representative of most of the bulk.

The formula for D_{eff} (Equation 2) is based on the area under the density-depth curve. This area has units of kg/m^2 which, by multiplying by grams, is easily converted to N/m^2 and, thus, is an indicator of the vertical load exerted by a pile of material with a height corresponding to the integration interval in Equation 4. Similarly, the total mass of material in a pile can be calculated easily using D_{eff} directly without the need to make further allowances for variation of density with depth.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The work described in this paper was carried out with funding from the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada.

REFERENCES

Mohsenin, N.M., 1986. *Physical Properties of Plant and Animal Materials*. Gordon and Breach Scientific Publishers. New York, NY.



CANADIAN LAND RECLAMATION ASSOCIATION

ASSOCIATION CANADIENNE DE RÉHABILITATION DES SITES DÉGRADÉS

*Conservation and Reclamation:
An Ecosystem Perspective*

Canadian Land Reclamation Association's
21st Annual Meeting

Calgary, Alberta
September 18-20, 1996

Conservation and Reclamation:

An Ecosystem Perspective

Canadian Land Reclamation Association's
21st Annual Meeting

Calgary, Alberta
September 18-20, 1996

This report may be cited as:

Powter, C.B., M.A. Naeth and D.A. Lloyd (compilers), 1996. Conservation and Reclamation: An Ecosystem Perspective. 21st Annual Meeting, Canadian Land Reclamation Association, Calgary, Alberta. 153 pp.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The compilers acknowledge the assistance of Jamie Legarie, Alberta Environmental Protection, Land Reclamation Division in preparing the manuscript. We also thank the authors for providing their papers on short notice.

The compilers edited some of the papers for format and length. We apologize for any errors that may have resulted.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF SPONSORS	vi
INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES	
Industrial Site Decommissioning in Alberta	1
Walter J. Ceroici	
Changing Knowledge Needs for Wellsite Reclamation	3
Jim Smith	
The Orphan Facilities and Pipeline Program: An Industry/Government Responsibility	7
David Lloyd and David Sandmeyer	
In-Situ Amelioration of Sodic Mine Spoil Using Sulfur, Gypsum and Crop Management ...	11
Jeff J. Sansom, M. Anne Naeth, and David S. Chanasyk	
Bioremediation of Contaminated Sites	13
Christopher Schneider	
Contaminant Metal Concentration in Alberta Soils Under Different Land Uses	17
Gerry Lutwick, Gordon D. Dinwoodie, David Gower and G. E. Nason	
Waste Disposal Guidelines from a Testing Lab's Perspective	19
John Ashworth	
Reclamation of a Former Heavy Oil Plant in Northeastern Alberta	23
Tim R. Bossenberry, J. Jeffrey Wilson, David Evans, Darrell Chollak and George Walker	
Nutrient and Metal Levels and Dynamics on a 30-year Revegetated Copper-Nickel Tailings Site at Copper Cliff, Ontario	27
Jeremy Niemi, John Giffen and Keith Winterhalder	
FORESTS	
Land Application of BCTMP Mill Waste Research in Alberta	31
Terry M. Macyk	
Reclamation to Native Forest Ecosystems in the Oil Sand Region	33
Steve Tuttle	
Land Capability Classification for Forest Ecosystems	37
Leonard A. Leskiw, Steve Tuttle and Earle Anderson	
Forest Land Restoration on Vancouver Island	39
David Polster	

Lichen Diversity in the Reclaimed Areas of Sudbury, Ontario	43
S. Wainio and Peter Beckett	

MOUNTAINS

Application of Population Biology, Conservation Biology and Succession Theory to the Reclamation of a High Elevation Coal Mine	47
Clint R. Smyth	

Plant Community Changes in Response to Anchor Chaining and Seeding on Pinyon/Juniper Sites in Central Utah	51
J. Gregory Sutor	

Tailings Disposal and Reclamation at the Coal Valley Mine	53
Dane McCoy	

In-Pit Disposal Program for Acid Generating Waste Rock	57
Jamie Quesnel and S. W. Stogran	

Reclamation, Trans Canada Highway Twinning, Banff National Park	63
Otto Hammer	

GENERAL ISSUES

Railway Reclamation: Issues and Opportunities	67
Chris B. Powter and David A. Lloyd	

Experiences in Reclaiming Railways Under Alberta's new Reclamation Guidelines	71
Mark Polet	

Pipeline Abandonment: A Discussion Paper	73
Karen Etherington	

Legal Perspectives on Land Reclamation	75
Gilbert Van Nes	

Liability for Reclamation: Enforcement at Common Law	77
Adrian Currie	

WATER AND WETLANDS

Coursier Reservoir: The Planning and Costs Associated with the Reconstruction and Revegetation of a Subalpine Lake	81
J. Leah Jackson	

Spray Lakes Reclamation Project	85
Margwyn R. Zaccaruk	

The Pine Coulee Project: Linking Reclamation Planning to Impact Assessment	89
Ron Middleton	

Design and Construction Management Aspects of Constructed Wetlands	93
Bernard Amell and Kim Eastlick	

Natural Revegetation of an Alberta Peatland after Horticultural Peat Extraction	97
Wayne S. Tedder and Larry W. Turchenek	

RUNOFF/EROSION

Computer Modelling of Soil Erosion from Reclaimed Land	101
Les Sawatsky, Wes Dick and Senarath Ekanayake	

Runoff and Sediment Yield under Grazing in Foothills Fescue Grassland of Alberta	103
M. Anne Naeth and David S. Chanasyk	

Runoff Curve Numbers for Two Reclaimed Watersheds in Central Alberta	107
Ted E. Harms and David S. Chanasyk	

Vegetation Characteristics, Grazing Disturbance and Soil Erosion	111
Suzanne I. Gill, M. Anne Naeth, David S. Chanasyk and V. S. Baron	

PRAIRIE

Renewing the Ecological Integrity of Disturbed Native Prairie	113
Heather S. Gerling	

Mixed Grass Prairie habitat Restoration Project: Landscape Restoration in the Moist Mixed Grass Prairie	117
Dean Nerberg	

Native Prairie Regeneration After Pipeline Construction: A Comparison Between Topsoil Stripping versus No Topsoil Stripping During Construction	119
Gordon Dunn and Gina Fryer	

Restoration of Native Sandhills Vegetation after Pipeline Construction in the Great Sand Hills Region of Saskatchewan	123
David G. Walker, Laurier Kremer and Wayne Marshall	

The Effects of Grazing, Mowing, Glyphosate and Burning on Smooth Brome in Fescue Grassland	125
D. J. Brown and M. Anne Naeth	

VEGETATION

Avoiding Downy Brome When Buying Seed	127
Kerby Lowen and Sarah Foster-Stubbs	

Biodiversity and Reclamation: How Many Species do we Need in a Seed Mix?	131
Dana Bush and M. Anne Naeth	
Germination and Survivability of Selected Native and Introduced Grasses and Legumes	133
William E. Pelech and M. Anne Naeth	
Road Maps for Repairing Ecological Damage	135
Andy Hammermeister	
Ecovar Developments in Western Canada	137
Les Wetter and Brent Wark	
Plant Growth on Aggregated Oil Sands Processing Wastes	139
Xiaomei Li, Jim Storey, Paul Y. P. Yeung and Martin Y. P. Fung	
The Clover Bar Landfill: A State of the Art Landfill Reclamation Process	141
Ann Smreciu, Nolan Turner and Don Barron	
BULK DENSITY	
A Method of Characterizing the Bulk Density of Compressible Particulate Material	145
D. Guenther, Stacy Schaub and J. Leonard	
Near-Surface Compaction Under Grazing of Annual and Perennial Forages	149
Dennis Twerdoff, David S. Chanasyk, M. Anne Naeth and V. S. Baron	
Grazing Impacts on Bulk Density and Soil Strength in the Foothills Fescue Grasslands of Alberta, Canada	151
David S. Chanasyk and M. Anne Naeth	
Computer Modelling of Soil Erosion from Reclaimed Land	155
Les Sawatsky, Wes Dick and Senarath Ekanayake	

LIST OF SPONSORS**Diamond Level**

Alberta Environmental Centre
TransCanada Pipeline Limited

Gold Level

AGRA Earth & Environmental Limited
CHEMEX Labs Alberta Inc.
Government of the Northwest Territories
TransAlta Utilities Corporation

Silver Level

Canadian Energy Pipeline Association
Cardinal River Coals Ltd.
Inco Limited
Olds College
Imperial Oil Resources

Bronze Level

Alberta Treasury Branches
Cigar Lake Mining Corporation
Enron Oil Canada Ltd.
Estevan Coal Corporation
Hudson Bay Mining & Smelting Co. Ltd.
Inland Industrial Materials
Manalta Coal Ltd.
Nelson Dynes & Associates Inc.
NOVA Gas Transmission Ltd.
PanCanadian Petroleum Limited

Iron Level

EnviResource Consulting Ltd.
Morgan Hydrocarbons Inc.
Petroleum Industry Training Service
Western Ecological Systems Management Consulting Inc.