

**DESIGN OF BRIDGING LAYERS IN GEOSYNTHETIC-REINFORCED
COLUMN-SUPPORTED EMBANKMENTS**

Miriam E. Smith

Dissertation submitted to the faculty of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University in
partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy
In
Civil and Environmental Engineering

George Filz
Thomas Brandon
Joseph Dove
Marte Gutierrez
Jack Lesko

July 8, 2005
Blacksburg, VA

Keywords:
Bridging layer
Column-supported embankment
Geosynthetic reinforcement
Settlement
Load Transfer

DESIGN OF BRIDGING LAYERS IN GEOSYNTHETIC-REINFORCED, COLUMN-SUPPORTED EMBANKMENTS

By

Miriam E. Smith

George M. Filz, Chairman
Via Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering

ABSTRACT

Column-supported geosynthetic-reinforced embankments have great potential for application in soft ground conditions when there is a need to accelerate construction and/or protect adjacent facilities from the settlement that would otherwise be induced by the new embankment load. The columns in column-supported embankments can be driven piles, vibro-concrete columns, deep-mixing-method columns, stone columns, or any other suitable type of column. A bridging layer consisting of several feet of sand or sand and gravel is also used to help transfer the embankment load to the columns. Geosynthetic reinforcement is often employed in bridging layers to enhance load transfer to the columns and increase the spacing between columns. Several methods have been developed to calculate the load on the geosynthetic reinforcement, but the calculated loads differ by over an order of magnitude in some cases, and there is not agreement on which method is correct.

In this research, a new method was developed for calculating the load on the geosynthetic reinforcement. The new method employs one of the existing mechanistically-based approaches, and combines it with consideration of the stiffnesses of the embankment, geosynthetic, column, and subgrade soil. The new method was verified against the results of a large numerical parameter study, for which the numerical procedures themselves were verified against closed-form solutions for membranes, pilot-scale experiments, and instrumented field case histories.

The results of the numerical analyses and the new calculation procedure indicate that the net vertical load on the portion of the geosynthetic reinforcement between columns increases with

increasing clear spacing between columns and increasing geosynthetic stiffness. The net vertical load on the geosynthetic decreases with increasing stiffness and strength of the foundation and embankment soils and with increasing elevation of the geosynthetic above the top of the columns or pile caps. A key finding of the research is that, if the subgrade support is good, geosynthetic reinforcement does not have a significant effect on system performance.

The new calculation procedure is implemented in an easy-to-use spreadsheet, and recommendations for designing geosynthetic-reinforced bridging layers are provided.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Professor George Filz made significant contributions to every aspect of this research. I would like to express my gratitude to Professor Filz for inviting me to work with him on this research. I have learned much from his approach to solving engineering problems, and under his supervision, I have grown as a researcher and an engineer.

I would like to thank my committee members Professors Tom Brandon, Joseph Dove, Marte Gutierrez, and Jack Lesko for their advice and suggestions during this research, and for providing the engineering skills that I have gathered from their classes. The work of all the committee members in reviewing the manuscript is gratefully acknowledged.

I would also like to thank Mike Navin and Meeok Kim for sharing their knowledge of FLAC and FLAC3D with me. Their help with these numerical modeling applications proved invaluable.

I would also like to thank Professor Nancy Love for her continuous advice, moral support and encouragement. Professor Love is a very important mentor - and friend - to me.

Financial support for the work was provided by the Virginia Transportation Research Council, the National Deep Mixing Program, the National Science Foundation, and AdvanceVT.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract	ii
Acknowledgements	iv
Table of Contents	v
List of Tables	x
List of Figures	xi
Chapter 1: INTRODUCTION	
1.1 Description of Column Supported Embankments	1
1.2 Need for Research on Column-Supported Embankments	2
1.3 Objectives and Scope of Research	3
1.4 Overview of Dissertation	4
Chapter 2: REVIEW OF THE CURRENT STATE OF PRACTICE OF THE DEEP MIXING METHOD	
2.1 Introduction	7
2.2 Applications and Limitations	8
2.3 Installation and Production of DMM Columns	11
2.3.1 Japanese Installation Methods	11
2.3.2 Scandinavian Installation Methods	14
2.3.3 Typical Installation Geometries	15
2.4 Material Property Values of Soils Stabilized by Deep Mixing	16
2.4.1 Unconfined Compressive Strength	17
2.4.2 Shear Strength	19
2.4.2.1 Undrained Shear Strength	19
2.4.2.2 Drained Shear Strength	21
2.4.2.3 Residual (Post-Peak) Strength	22
2.4.3 Compressibility	22
2.4.3.1 Modulus of Elasticity, E	23
2.4.3.2 Confined Modulus, M	24
2.4.4 Unit Weight	25
2.4.5 Tensile Strength	26

2.4.6	Permeability	26
2.4.7	Changes with Time	27
2.4.8	Laboratory Testing versus Field Testing	28
2.4.9	Effects of Installation Process and Sequence	29
2.5	Existing Methods for Calculating Settlement	29
2.5.1	Definition of Terms	30
2.5.2	Japanese Method for Calculating Settlement	32
2.5.3	Scandinavian Method for Calculating Settlement	34
2.6	Closing Remarks	39
Chapter 3: REVIEW OF THE CURRENT STATE OF PRACTICE FOR DESIGN OF GEOSYNTHETIC REINFORCED BRIDGING LAYER		
3.1	Introduction	40
3.2	Arching Effects	41
3.3	Definition of Terms	43
3.4	Stress Reduction Ratio, SRR	46
3.4.1	BS8006 Method	47
3.4.2	Adapted Terzaghi's Method 1 and 2	50
3.4.3	Hewlett and Randolph Method	51
3.4.4	German Method	54
3.4.5	Adapted Guido Method	55
3.4.6	Swedish Method	56
3.4.7	Stress Reduction Ratio: Discussion of the Methods	58
3.5	Tension in Geosynthetic Reinforcement	61
3.5.1	BS8006 Method	62
3.5.2	Kempfert et al. (2004) Method	65
3.5.3	Russell et al. (2003) Method	69
3.6	Closing Remarks	70
Chapter 4: CASE STUDY: I-95/ROUTE 1		
4.1	Introduction	72
4.2	History and Site Conditions	73

4.3	Test Embankment Construction	76
4.4	Results of Instrumentation Data	78
4.5	Closing Remarks	80
Chapter 5: NUMERICAL MODELING OF I-95/ROUTE 1 TEST EMBANKMENT		
5.1	Introduction	85
5.2	Material Properties Values and Constitutive Models	86
5.3	Three Dimensional Finite Difference Analyses Using FLAC3D	90
5.3.1	“True” Three-Dimensional Geometry	91
5.3.2	Three-Dimensional “Axisymmetric” Geometry	92
5.3.3	Results of Three-Dimensional Analyses	93
5.4	Two-Dimensional Finite Difference Analyses Using FLAC	95
5.5	Two-Dimensional Finite Element Analyses Using SAGE	97
5.5.1	SAGE Drained Analyses	98
5.5.2	SAGE Consolidation Analyses	99
5.6	Conclusions of Verification Analyses	102
Chapter 6: PARAMETRIC STUDY WITHOUT GEOGRID		
6.1	Introduction	103
6.2	Review of Definition of Terms	104
6.3	Base Case Description and Material Property Values	106
6.3.1	Column Strength and Modulus	108
6.3.2	Embankment Fill	110
6.3.3	Upper and Lower Sand Layers	111
6.3.4	Clay Compressibility and Thickness	111
6.3.5	Column Diameter and Spacing	113
6.4	Results of Parametric Study	114
6.4.1	Column Strength and Modulus	114
6.4.2	Embankment Fill	117
6.4.3	Upper and Lower Sand Layers	117
6.4.4	Compressibility of Normally-Consolidated Clay	119

6.4.5	Degree of Overconsolidation of the Clay	119
6.4.6	Clay Thickness	120
6.4.7	Column Diameter and Spacing	120
6.5	Summary and Conclusions of the Initial Parametric Study	123
6.6	Dilation Effects	124
6.7	Additional Numerical Analyses	125
6.8	Closing Remarks	126
Chapter 7: NUMERICAL VERIFICATION STUDY WITH GEOSYNTHETIC REINFORCEMENT		
7.1	Introduction	130
7.2	Model Test Dimensions	130
7.3	Material Property Values	131
7.4	FLAC Numerical Analyses	133
7.5	Closing Remarks	136
Chapter 8: PARAMETRIC STUDY WITH GEOGRID		
8.1	Introduction	137
8.2	Definition of Terms	138
8.3	Model Description and Material Property Values	138
8.3.1	Geosynthetic Stiffness and Location	141
8.3.2	Embankment Fill	142
8.3.3	Upper and Lower Sand Layers	142
8.3.4	Clay Compressibility	143
8.3.5	Column Diameter and Spacing	144
8.4	Results of Parametric Study Analyses	145
8.4.1	Geosynthetic Stiffness and Location	145
8.4.2	Geosynthetic Location	146
8.4.3	Embankment Fill	146
8.4.4	Upper and Lower Sand Layers	148
8.4.5	Degree of Overconsolidation of the Clay	148
8.4.6	Column Diameter and Spacing	149

8.5	Summary and Conclusions of the Parametric Study	150
8.6	Closing Remarks	151
Chapter 9: DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION OF CALCULATION PROCEDURE		
9.1	Introduction	155
9.2	Basis of Calculation Procedure	155
9.3	Development of Spreadsheet	162
9.4	Design Procedure	165
9.5	Design Examples	168
9.6	Closing Remarks	177
Chapter 10: SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS		
10.1	Introduction	179
10.2	Summary of Work Accomplished	180
10.3	Conclusions	181
10.4	Recommendations for Further Research	184
REFERENCES		185
APPENDIX A: MEMBRANE (GEOSYNTHETIC) VERIFICATION STUDIES		194
APPENDIX B: MEMBRANE DEFLECTION STUDY		210
APPENDIX C: REVIEW OF THE CURRENT STATE OF PRACTICE OF STONE COLUMNS		214

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1. Typical Japanese mixing installation parameters (from Kaiqui 2000)	12
Table 2.2. Specified values of q_u on deep mixing projects in the U.S.	18
Table 2.3. Summary of published relationships between E_{50} and q_u	24
Table 3.1. SRR values from seven existing methods	60
Table 5.1. Material property values and models used in the numerical analyses	88
Table 5.2. Stresses determined by numerical analyses and measured by pressure cells	97
Table 6.1. Base case material property values	108
Table 6.2. Values of column strength and modulus	110
Table 6.3. Range of material property values for embankment fill and lower sand	110
Table 6.4. Embankment placement	111
Table 6.5. Clay parameter values	112
Table 6.6. Column and model diameters	113
Table 6.7. Geometries representative of columns installed in the field	113
Table 6.8. Summary of analyses performed	127
Table 7.1. Summary of material property values used in verification study	133
Table 8.1. Base case material property values	139
Table 8.2. Range of material property values for embankment fill and upper sand	142
Table 8.3. Embankment placement	142
Table 8.4. Column and model diameters, Case 2	145
Table 8.5. Summary of analyses performed	153

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1.1. Schematic of pile-supported embankment with geosynthetic reinforcement	2
Figure 2.1. Three examples of Japanese deep mixing machines (from Kaiqiu 2000)	13
Figure 2.2. Manufacture of dry method deep mixed columns (from Schaefer 1997)	14
Figure 2.3. Undrained shear strength of lime/cement column (from Kivelo 1997)	20
Figure 2.4. Illustration of stress-distribution for column-type deep mixed foundation	31
Figure 2.5. Stress-strain relationship in dry mixed columns	35
Figure 2.6. Stress distribution beneath the stabilized volume for Case 1 (from Broms 1991)	38
Figure 2.7. Stress distribution beneath the stabilized volume for Case 2 (from Broms 1991)	39
Figure 3.1. Schematic of pile-supported embankment with geosynthetic reinforcement	40
Figure 3.2. Relationship between n and SRR	46
Figure 3.3. Representation of deep foundation areas supported embankment fill	47
Figure 3.4. BS8006 critical height concept (from Kempton et al. 1998)	48
Figure 3.5. Representation of Hewlett and Randolph (1988) soil arching model	51
Figure 3.6. Representation of the Swedish soil arching model	57
Figure 3.7. Geosynthetic strain versus dimensionless geosynthetic loading parameter, K_g	64
Figure 3.8. Plan view of foundation and geogrid (from Kempfert et al. 2004)	66
Figure 3.9. Maximum strain in geosynthetic reinforcement (from Kempfert et al. 2004)	67
Figure 3.10. Geosynthetic strain versus dimensionless geosynthetic loading parameter, K_g	68
Figure 3.11. Geosynthetic strain versus $\frac{d}{(s - a)}$	69
Figure 3.12. Plan view of base of embankment (from Russell et al. 2003)	70
Figure 4.1. View of I-95/Route 1 Interchange	72
Figure 4.2. Test embankment subsurface profile	75
Figure 4.3. Typical section of the test embankment and subsurface conditions	77
Figure 4.4. Schematic of plan view of base of test embankment with instrument and column locations	81
Figure 4.5. Data from horizontal inclinometer (from VDOT 2001)	82
Figure 4.6. Location of pressure cells (elevation view) (from VDOT 2001)	82
Figure 4.7. Pressure cell data from pressure cells installed above widely spaced columns (from VDOT 2001)	83

Figure 4.8: Pressure cell data from pressure cells installed above closely spaced columns (from VDOT 2001)	84
Figure 5.1. Idealized profile used in numerical analyses	87
Figure 5.2. Tributary area associated with each column	92
Figure 5.3. Plan view of the 3D representation of widely spaced columns	92
Figure 5.4. Plan view of the 3D axisymmetric representation	93
Figure 5.5. FLAC3D and FLAC calculated stresses (21" above top of column)	94
Figure 5.6. FLAC3D and FLAC calculated stresses (3" above top of column)	95
Figure 5.7. Stresses in fill layer above the columns as determined by axisymmetric analyses	97
Figure 5.8. Stresses in fill layer as determined by SAGE and FLAC analyses	99
Figure 5.9. Calculated stresses from SAGE drained and consolidation analyses	100
Figure 5.10. Time-dependent results of SAGE consolidation analyses	101
Figure 6.1. Base case profile	107
Figure 6.2. Alternative strength characterizations of DMM column material	109
Figure 6.3. Variation of CSR and SRR with column modulus and embankment height (for columns that did not fail)	115
Figure 6.4. Variation of CSR and SRR with column modulus and embankment height (for columns that experienced failure)	116
Figure 6.5. Effect of embankment fill on SRR	117
Figure 6.6. Effect of thickness of upper sand layer on SRR	118
Figure 6.7. Effect of overconsolidation on SRR	120
Figure 6.8. Variation of CSR and SRR with column diameter, area replacement ratio, and embankment height	121
Figure 7.1. Model test dimensions and configuration	131
Figure 7.2. Stress distribution: FLAC versus model tests (H =14 in.)	135
Figure 7.3. Stress distribution: FLAC versus model tests (H = 28 in.)	135
Figure 7.4. Geogrid displacement: FLAC results versus model tests	136
Figure 8.1: (a) Case 1 model geometry, and (b) Case 2 model geometry	140
Figure 8.2. Variation of SRR_{net} with geogrid stiffness and embankment height	146
Figure 8.3. Variation of SRR_{net} with geogrid location and embankment height	147
Figure 8.4. Effect of embankment fill on SRR_{net}	147
Figure 8.5. Variation of SRR_{net} with thickness of upper sand layer and embankment height	148

Figure 8.6. Effect of overconsolidation on SRR_{net}	149
Figure 8.7. Effect of clear spacing on SRR_{net} (for $H = 16$ ft)	150
Figure 9.1. Definition sketch in plan view	156
Figure 9.2. Definition sketch in profile view	156
Figure 9.3. Definition of variables for case with two layers of embankment fill	163
Figure 9.4. Comparison of SRR values from the simplified theory with SRR values from FLAC	164
Figure 9.5. Area supported by geosynthetic spanning directly between columns	165
Figure 9.6. Subsurface profile for Example One	171
Figure 9.7. Results from spreadsheet analysis of Example One	172
Figure 9.8. Results from spreadsheet analysis of Example One with 6-ft-thick upper sand layer	173
Figure 9.9. Subsurface profile for Example Two	176
Figure 9.10. Results from spreadsheet analysis of Example Two	177