

## List of Figures

Figure D-1.	Four-year-old Owen William Green watching cartoons in Daddy's office while waiting for Daddy to arrive home late from school.....	v
Figure 1-1.	An example of a sand boil that occurred during the Loma Prieta earthquake.....	1
Figure 1-2.	Photograph of intact structures overturned as a consequence of soil liquefaction during the 1964 Niigata, Japan earthquake.....	2
Figure 1-3.	Organization of Thesis.....	8
Figure 2-1.	Stress reduction factor ( $r_d$ ) to account for soil column deformability.....	12
Figure 2-2.	Magnitude scaling factors proposed by various investigators.....	13
Figure 2-3.	Cyclic resistance ratio ( $CRR$ ) curve.....	15
Figure 2-4.	Recommended values for overburden pressure correction factor $K_\sigma$ .....	16
Figure 2-5.	Iterative solution of Equation (2-11) to determine the effective shear-strain ( $\gamma$ ) at a given depth in a soil profile.....	18
Figure 2-6.	Plots of the Ishibashi and Zhang (1993) shear modulus degradation curves for various initial mean effective confining stresses.....	19
Figure 2-7a.	Laboratory test results conducted on samples of varying relative densities. The shear strain at which excess pore pressures are measured for all the samples is slightly greater than $10^{-2}$ percent.....	21
Figure 2-7b.	Laboratory test results conducted on samples of varying initial effective confining stresses and prepared by various methods. The shear strain at which excess pore pressures are measured for all the samples is slightly greater than $10^{-2}$ percent.....	22

Figure 2-8a. Commonly used measures of site-to-source distance.....	24
Figure 2-8b. Comparison of the central tendencies of various earthquake magnitude scales, with moment magnitude ( $M_w$ ) currently being the most accepted scale. Although in the past the term “Richter magnitude” was used synonymously with $M_L$ , it currently is used to refer to a conglomeration of magnitude scales (e.g., Krinitzski et al. 1993).....	25
Figure 2-9. Liquefaction chart proposed by Davis and Berrill (1982).....	27
Figure 2-10. Material attenuation factor ( $A$ ) as a function of the dimensionless distance ( $a$ ).....	29
Figure 2-11. Liquefaction chart proposed by Berrill and Davis (1985).....	30
Figure 2-12. Liquefaction chart proposed by Law, Cao, and He (1990).....	32
Figure 2-13. Comparison of the boundaries proposed by Davis and Berrill (1982) and Trifunac No.1 to separate the data points representing liquefaction and no-liquefaction.....	35
Figure 2-14. Graphical illustration of the site-to-source distance $r^*$ .....	41
Figure 2-15. Results of a statistical analysis of the variation of $r_b$ as a function of depth in a soil profile.....	42
Figure 2-16. Liquefaction curve proposed by Kayen and Mitchell (1997).....	44
Figure 2-17. Liquefaction curve proposed by Running (1996).....	46
Figure 2-18. Correlation of the dimensionless parameter Normalized Maximum Energy ( $NME$ ) and maximum acceleration ( $a_{max}$ ).....	47
Figure 2-19. Correlation between relative density ( $D_r$ ) and energy ratio ( $ER$ ).....	48
Figure 2-20. $FS$ -profiles for the stress-based procedure: a) Profiles have constant $N_{1,60} = 5, 10, 15 blws/ft$ and $gwt$ at approximately $11ft$ . b) Profiles have constant $N_{1,60} = 15 blws/ft$ and $gwt$ depths $0, 11, \text{ and } 25ft$ .....	54

Figure 2-21. <i>FS</i> -profiles for the strain-based procedure: a) Profiles have constant $N_{1,60} = 5, 10, 15 \text{ blws/ft}$ and <i>gwt</i> at approximately 11ft. b) Profiles have constant $N_{1,60} = 15 \text{ blws/ft}$ and <i>gwt</i> depths 0, 11, and 25ft.....	55
Figure 2-22. <i>FS</i> -profiles for Davis and Berrill (1982): a) Profiles have constant $N_{1,60} = 5, 10, 15 \text{ blws/ft}$ and <i>gwt</i> at approximately 11ft. b) Profiles have constant $N_{1,60} = 15 \text{ blws/ft}$ and <i>gwt</i> depths 0, 11, and 25ft.....	57
Figure 2-23. <i>FS</i> -profiles for Berrill and Davis (1985): a) Profiles have constant $N_{1,60} = 5, 10, 15 \text{ blws/ft}$ and <i>gwt</i> at approximately 11ft. b) Profiles have constant $N_{1,60} = 15 \text{ blws/ft}$ and <i>gwt</i> depths 0, 11, and 25ft.....	58
Figure 2-24. <i>FS</i> -profiles for Law, Cao, and He (1990): a) Profiles have constant $N_{1,60} = 5, 10, 15 \text{ blws/ft}$ and <i>gwt</i> at approximately 11ft. b) Profiles have constant $N_{1,60} = 15 \text{ blws/ft}$ and <i>gwt</i> depths 0, 11, and 25ft.....	59
Figure 2-25. <i>FS</i> -profiles for Trifunac No.1: a) Profiles have constant $N_{1,60} = 5, 10, 15 \text{ blws/ft}$ and <i>gwt</i> at approximately 11ft. b) Profiles have constant $N_{1,60} = 15 \text{ blws/ft}$ and <i>gwt</i> depths 0, 11, and 25ft.....	60
Figure 2-26. <i>FS</i> -profiles for Trifunac No.3: a) Profiles have constant $N_{1,60} = 5, 10, 15 \text{ blws/ft}$ and <i>gwt</i> at approximately 11ft. b) Profiles have constant $N_{1,60} = 15 \text{ blws/ft}$ and <i>gwt</i> depths 0, 11, and 25ft.....	61
Figure 2-27. <i>FS</i> -profiles for Trifunac No.4: a) Profiles have constant $N_{1,60} = 5, 10, 15 \text{ blws/ft}$ and <i>gwt</i> at approximately 11ft. b) Profiles have constant $N_{1,60} = 15 \text{ blws/ft}$ and <i>gwt</i> depths 0, 11, and 25ft.....	62
Figure 2-28. <i>FS</i> -profiles for Trifunac No.5: a) Profiles have constant $N_{1,60} = 5, 10, 15 \text{ blws/ft}$ and <i>gwt</i> at approximately 11ft. b) Profiles have constant $N_{1,60} = 15 \text{ blws/ft}$ and <i>gwt</i> depths 0, 11, and 25ft.....	63
Figure 2-29. <i>FS</i> -profiles for Kayen and Mitchell (1997): a) Profiles have constant $N_{1,60} = 5, 10, 15 \text{ blws/ft}$ and <i>gwt</i> at approximately 11ft. b) Profiles have constant $N_{1,60} = 15 \text{ blws/ft}$ and <i>gwt</i> depths 0, 11, and 25ft.....	64

Figure 2-30. <i>FS</i> -profiles for Running (1996): a) Profiles have constant $N_{1,60} = 5, 10, 15 \text{ blws/ft}$ and <i>gwt</i> at approximately 11ft. b) Profiles have constant $N_{1,60} = 15 \text{ blws/ft}$ and <i>gwt</i> depths 0, 11, and 25ft.....	65
Figure 2-31. <i>FS</i> -profiles for Alkhatib (1994): a) Profiles have constant $N_{1,60} = 5, 10, 15 \text{ blws/ft}$ and <i>gwt</i> at approximately 11ft. b) Profiles have constant $N_{1,60} = 15 \text{ blws/ft}$ and <i>gwt</i> depths 0, 11, and 25ft.....	66
Figure 2-32. a) Soil profile having a liquefiable layer lying below a stiff desiccated crust. b) Duplication of <i>in-situ</i> stresses using simple shear device on a soil sample from the liquefiable layer.....	69
Figure 2-33. Comparison of expressions for duration of strong ground motion as a function of magnitude.....	72
Figure 2-34. Comparison of the “depth reduction factors” $r_b$ for the Arias Intensity approach and $(r_d)^2$ from the stress-based approach.....	73
Figure 2-35. Comparison of Arias intensity liquefaction curve and <i>CRR</i> .....	74
Figure 3-1. Conceptualization of the energy imparted to the soil by an earthquake and the portions dissipated by friction and viscous drag.....	79
Figure 3-2. Contact forces and stresses between two equal sized spheres of radius $R$ .....	81
Figure 3-3. Radius of the contact area ( $a$ ) and the normal stress ( $\sigma_c$ ) across the contact area of the two spheres.....	82
Figure 3-4. Relative slippage of the spheres: no slippage at $T = 0$ ; gross slippage at $T = f \cdot N$ . At intermediate values $0 < T < f \cdot N$ , there is an annulus of slippage surrounding a zone of no slippage.....	83
Figure 3-5. Photograph of an actual sphere, which in contact with another sphere was subjected to an oscillating tangential force $0 < T < f \cdot N$ . Wear marks formed by the annulus of slippage between the spheres can be clearly identified.....	84

Figure 3-6. Typical acceleration time history with the arrival of the large amplitude shear waves occurring early in the record.....	84
Figure 3-7. Comparison of the variation of logarithmic decrement with amplitude for dry and saturated Ottawa sand in torsional oscillation.....	86
Figure 3-8. Comparison of the variation of logarithmic decrement with amplitude for dry and saturated glass beads in torsional oscillation.....	87
Figure 3-9. Hysteresis loop resulting from: a) the application and removal of a tangential force $T$ . b) the application and removal of a shear stress $\tau$ .....	88
Figure 3-10. Hysteresis loops from a stress-controlled cyclic triaxial test.....	89
Figure 3-11. Graphical definitions of stored energy and total dissipated energy.....	89
Figure 3-12. Rheological models and corresponding hysteresis loops for hysteretic and equivalent linear materials.....	91
Figure 3-13. Quantities used in defining damping ratio ( $D$ ).....	92
Figure 3-14. Development of shear modulus degradation curves.....	93
Figure 3-15. Plots of the Ishibashi and Zhang (1993) shear modulus degradation curves for various initial mean effective confining stresses.....	95
Figure 3-16. Stresses acting on a differential element a) tensor-suffix notation b) engineering notation.....	98
Figure 3-17. The dissipated energy per unit volume for a soil sample in cyclic triaxial loading is defined as the area bound by the deviator stress - axial strain hysteresis loops, Equation (3-18).....	101
Figure 3-18. Stress conditions for a hollow cylinder triaxial-torsional shear test.....	102

Figure 4-1. Procedure for determining calibration parameters for <i>YTI</i> Model from laboratory test data.....	111
Figure 4-2. Graphic illustration of how <i>PEC</i> is determined from cyclic test data. The data shown in this figure is from a cyclic triaxial test conducted on Yatesville clean sand.....	121
Figure 4-3a. Comparison of measured and computed residual excess pore pressures in various silt-sand mixtures having varying densities. Symbols are values computed using the <i>GMP</i> Model and the lines are the measured values. All samples were run in stress controlled cyclic triaxial tests.....	122
Figure 4-3b. Comparison of measured and computed residual excess pore pressures in samples tested in various configurations. Symbols are values computed using the <i>GMP</i> Model and the lines are the measured values.....	123
Figure 4-4. Correlations among <i>CSR</i> , <i>PEC</i> , and <i>Dr</i> for Monterey silt-sand mixtures ( $FC \leq 30\%$ ).....	125
Figure 4-5. Correlations among <i>CSR</i> , <i>PEC</i> , and <i>Dr</i> for Yatesville silt-sand mixtures ( $FC \leq 30\%$ ).....	125
Figure 4-6a. Alternate plot of the correlation relating <i>PEC</i> , <i>Dr</i> , and <i>CSR</i> for Yatesville fine grained sand-silt mixtures.....	127
Figure 4-6b. Alternate plot of the correlation relating <i>PEC</i> , <i>Dr</i> , and <i>CSR</i> for Monterey medium grained sand-silt mixtures.....	128
Figure 5-1. Quantities used in defining damping ratio ( <i>D</i> ).....	130
Figure 5-2. Iterative solution of Equation (5-6) to determine the effective shear-strain ( $\gamma$ ) at a given depth in a soil profile.....	132
Figure 5-3. The determination of shear modulus and damping ratios from the respective degradation curves.....	133
Figure 5-4. Graphical representation of the dissipated energy per unit volume for an equivalent cycle of loading.....	133

Figure 5-5. A correlation relating earthquake magnitude and equivalent number of cycles. The data points labeled S-I and A-1 are assumed to be from a different study than the rest of the data. Also shown in this figure are several $M-N_{eqv}$ pairs that are commonly presented in tabular form in published literature.....	135
Figure 5-6. Illustration of the procedure used to develop the $N_{eqv}$ correlation. In this procedure, the dissipated in a layer of soil, as computed from a site response analysis, is equated to the energy dissipated in an equivalent cycle of loading multiplied by $N_{eqv}$ .....	136
Figure 5-7. Shear-stress shear-strain hysteresis loops, output by SHAKEVT, for a given depth in a soil profile subjected to an earthquake acceleration time history.....	137
Figure 5-8. A comparison of the $NED$ values computed by SHAKEVT and Equation (5-7) multiplied by $N_{eqv}$ . Figures a) and b) correspond to the two horizontal components of motion at the same site. The sum of the $N_{eqv}$ for each component represents the $N_{eqv}$ for total motions experienced at the site.....	138
Figure 5-9. A fit surface to the computed $N_{eqv}$ for one of the profiles shown in Appendix 5b. The black dots shown in this plot are the computed $N_{eqv}$ values.....	139
Figure 5-10. Contour plot of the average fit surface for each of the 12 profiles used in the parameter study. The contours are of constant $N_{eqv}$ as a function of epicentral distance and Richter magnitude. The near field - far field boundary superimposed on the contour plot is that proposed by Krinitzsky et al. (1993); note this boundary is only given up to $M7.5$ .....	141
Figure 5-11a. Energy-based <i>Capacity</i> curve developed from 126 liquefaction field case histories.....	144
Figure 5-11b. Energy-based <i>Capacity</i> curve developed from 126 liquefaction field case histories.....	145

Figure 5-12. <i>FS</i> -profiles computed using the proposed energy-based procedure: a) Profiles have constant $N_{1,60} = 5, 10, 15 \text{ blws/ft}$ and <i>gwt</i> at approximately 11 <i>ft</i> . b) Profiles have constant $N_{1,60} = 15 \text{ blws/ft}$ and <i>gwt</i> depths 0, 11, and 25 <i>ft</i> .....	153
Figure 5-13. <i>FS</i> -profiles for the stress-based procedure: a) Profiles have constant $N_{1,60} = 5, 10, 15 \text{ blws/ft}$ and <i>gwt</i> at approximately 11 <i>ft</i> . b) Profiles have constant $N_{1,60} = 15 \text{ blws/ft}$ and <i>gwt</i> depths 0, 11, and 25 <i>ft</i> .....	154
Figure 5-14. <i>FS</i> -profiles for the strain-based procedure: a) Profiles have constant $N_{1,60} = 5, 10, 15 \text{ blws/ft}$ and <i>gwt</i> at a approximately 11 <i>ft</i> . b) Profiles have constant $N_{1,60} = 15 \text{ blws/ft}$ and <i>gwt</i> depths 0, 11, and 25 <i>ft</i> .....	155
Figure 5-15. Stress-strain hysteresis loops for a) total stress numerical analysis, b) stress controlled cyclic triaxial test and c) strain controlled cyclic triaxial test.....	156
Figure 5-16. Two idealized hysteresis loops for a stress-controlled, undrained cyclic test, where loop 1 occurs earlier in the test than loop 2.....	158
Figure 5-17. The ratio of the energies dissipated during two cycles of loading in an undrained stress controlled cyclic test.....	160
Figure 5-18. Normalized dissipated energies computed from cyclic triaxial test data using Equations (5-15a) and (5-15b). The data shown in this figure is that listed as m0e76c28 in Table 5-2a.....	163
Figure 5-19. <i>NEC</i> values computed from stress controlled cyclic triaxial tests for samples having silt contents below the limiting value. Also shown is the capacity curve derived from field case histories. The negative relative densities were generated by moist tamping the laboratory samples, thus creating specimens having larger void ratios than the maximum predicted by the index tests using dry soil.....	166

Figure 5-20. <i>NEC</i> values computed from stress controlled cyclic triaxial tests for samples having silt contents above the limiting value. Also shown is the capacity curve derived from field case histories.....	167
Figure 5b-1. Profiles 1, 5, and 9 used in the parameter study to develop the correlation relating Richter Magnitude ( $M$ ), epicentral distance from the site to the source ( $ED$ ), and number of equivalent cycles ( $N_{eqv}$ ): a) Profiles in terms of shear wave velocity, b) Profiles in terms of $N_{1,60}$ .....	182
Figure 5b-2. Profiles 2, 6, and 10 used in the parameter study to develop the correlation relating Richter Magnitude ( $M$ ), epicentral distance from the site to the source ( $ED$ ), and number of equivalent cycles ( $N_{eqv}$ ): a) Profiles in terms of shear wave velocity, b) Profiles in terms of $N_{1,60}$ .....	183
Figure 5b-3. Profiles 3, 7, and 11 used in the parameter study to develop the correlation relating Richter Magnitude ( $M$ ), epicentral distance from the site to the source ( $ED$ ), and number of equivalent cycles ( $N_{eqv}$ ): a) Profiles in terms of shear wave velocity, b) Profiles in terms of $N_{1,60}$ .....	184
Figure 5b-4. Profiles 4, 8, and 12 used in the parameter study to develop the correlation relating Richter Magnitude ( $M$ ), epicentral distance from the site to the source ( $ED$ ), and number of equivalent cycles ( $N_{eqv}$ ): a) Profiles in terms of shear wave velocity, b) Profiles in terms of $N_{1,60}$ .....	185
Figure 5c-1. Capacity curve developed from cyclic triaxial laboratory tests. Each point on the plot represents a separate test. Each test is conducted on similar samples subjected to varying amplitude <i>CSR</i> . For isotropically consolidated cyclic triaxial tests, the $CSR = \sigma_d/2 \cdot \sigma'_o$ , where $\sigma_d$ is the applied deviator stress, and $\sigma'_o$ is the initial effective confining stress.....	186
Figure 5c-2. Illustration of how <i>MSF</i> were developed from laboratory liquefaction curves.....	187

Figure 5c-3. Illustration of liquefaction curve plotted on log-log scales.....	188
Figure 5c-4. Contour plot of $N_{eqv}$ as a function of epicentral distance and Richter magnitude.....	190
Figure 5c-5. A comparison of Ambraseys' $MSF$ curve and the set of curves developed in this study.....	192
Figure 5c-6. Liquefaction data computed using Ambraseys' $MSF$ curve.....	193
Figure 5c-7. Liquefaction data computed using the set of $MSF$ curves developed in this study.....	194
Figure 6-1. Example de-aggregation matrix for a 2500 year return period event obtained from the USGS web site.....	197
Figure 6-2a. Early curves quantifying the amplification ratios as function of site conditions and amplitude of rock acceleration.....	201
Figure 6-2b. Curve quantifying the amplification ratios for soft soil sites.....	201
Figure 6-3. Comparison of average 5% damped response spectral shapes computed from strong-motion data recorded at rock sites in CEUS (solid line) and WUS (dashed line). CEUS average shape is from recordings of the $m_b = 6.4$ Nahanni aftershock (Canada). The WUS average shape is from recordings for the San Fernando $M_L = 6.4$ and Imperial Valley $M_L = 6.6$ events (California).....	202
Figure 6-4. Example of the seismic data retrieved from the USGS web site.....	205
Figure 6-5. Curves quantifying the amplification ratios used in the NEHRP provisions.....	206
Figure 6-6. Illustration of proposed approach for determining $a_{max}$ .....	209
Figure 6-7. Characteristics and analytical geometry of the parabolic representation of UHS.....	211

Figure 6-8a. Parabolic approximation of uniform hazard spectrum (UHS) for Salt Lake City, UT for seismic hazard having a 500 year return period (i.e., 10% probability of exceedance in 50 years). The spectrum is plotted on three scales (i.e., log-log, semi-log, and arithmetic) to facilitate the comparison of the actual spectral acceleration values and the parabolic approximation. The curves shown in the above plots were computed using Equation (6-8), and the black dots are the  $pga$ ,  $S_s$ , and  $S_l$  values obtained from the USGS web site. The open circles are additional spectral acceleration values obtained from the USGS.....213

Figure 6-8b. Parabolic approximation of uniform hazard spectrum (UHS) for Memphis, TN for seismic hazard having a 2500 year return period (i.e., 2% probability of exceedance in 50 years). The spectrum is plotted on three scales (i.e., log-log, semi-log, and arithmetic) to facilitate the comparison of the actual spectral acceleration values and the parabolic approximation. The curves shown in the above plots were computed using Equation (6-8), and the black dots are the  $pga$ ,  $S_s$ , and  $S_l$  values obtained from the USGS web site. The open circles are additional spectral acceleration values obtained from the USGS..... 213

Figure 6-9. Response ratios and parabolic approximations for 4 different impedance ratios ( $IR$ ). Each point in the above plot represents a separate site response analysis.....219

Figure 6-10.  $a_{max}$  spectra for San Francisco, CA, corresponding to  $IR = 2, 5, 10, 15,$  and  $20$ . The largest amplification occurs for sites having a fundamental period close to  $T_{max}$  of the rock outcrop motion (i.e.,  $T \approx 0.222sec$ ).....222

Figure 6-11a. Estimated characteristic periods for rock motions as a function of distance from the causative fault.....223

Figure 6-11b. Comparison of earthquake period – distance relations for <i>M</i> 7 events. The correlations of Seed et al. (1969) and Idriss (1991) define the characteristic period of the ground motion as the period corresponding to the largest spectral acceleration value for the actual earthquake response spectrum. The correlation proposed by Rathje et al. (1998) defines the characteristic period as the period corresponding to the largest spectral acceleration for the smoothed response spectrum of the ground motion.....	223
Figure 6-12a. Skyline time history recorded on a rock outcrop at approximately 70km from the epicenter of the Loma Prieta earthquake.....	225
Figure 6-12b. Response spectrum of the Skyline time history and its parabolic approximation. Also shown is the 500 year UHS for San Francisco, scaled to the <i>pga</i> of the Skyline motion.....	225
Figure 6-13. Procedure for approximation of the $a_{max}$ spectrum for the Skyline motion ( $T_{pga} = 0.133sec$ ) by scaling the $a_{max}$ spectrum computed for a parabolic response spectrum having a similar shape to the Skyline spectrum with $T_{pga} = 0.044sec$ .....	227
Figure 6-14. $a_{max}$ spectra for representative long and short epicentral distance motions for the 1989 Loma Prieta earthquake.....	228
Figure 6-15. Comparison of amplification curve and $a_{max}$ values computed using the proposed procedure.....	229
Figure 6a-1. Chart used in determining the fundamental period of soil profile.....	232
Figure 7-1. General trends of how the physical processes for reducing liquefaction susceptibility affect the stress-based liquefaction curve.....	236
Figure 7-2. Applicable grain-size ranges for liquefiable soil improvement methods.....	237

Figure 7-3. Commonly used grid patterns for compaction points for implementing vibro-compaction techniques to large areas.....	240
Figure 7-4. A 1937 photograph of an early vibrocompaction system or “Pfeilerruetzler” (vibrating pile).....	241
Figure 7-5. Schematic diagram of the equipment and process of soil densification using vibrocompaction technique.....	242
Figure 7-6. Densified zones resulting from vibrocompaction.....	243
Figure 7-7. Common vibrators used in vibrocompaction. The relative sizes of the vibrators are not to scale.....	244
Figure 7-8. Conical movement of vibrator unit.....	245
Figure 7-9. Illustration of the horizontal impacting forces and torsional shear induced by the vibroflot.....	247
Figure 7-10. Approximate variation of post-compaction relative density and tributary area per compaction point.....	248
Figure 7-11. Variation of post-treated CPT tip resistance with distance from compaction point for two different vibrators.....	249
Figure 7-12. Conceptual illustration of the orientation of the exciting force of the vibratory probe.....	250
Figure 7-13. Conceptualization of the vibratory probe-soil interaction.....	251
Figure 7-14. Terra-Probe, not to scale.....	252
Figure 7-15. a) Double rod probe, and b) Probe with projectives.....	253
Figure 7-16. Penetration resistance of pre- and post-treated soil as a function of fines content.....	254
Figure 7-17. Swedish vibro-wing.....	255
Figure 7-18. Franki TriStar probe or Y-probe.....	256
Figure 7-19. <i>K</i> -factor as a function of pile impedance.....	258

Figure 7-20. Double-Y or Flexi probe. Not to scale; no dimensions given.....	259
Figure 7-21. Results from study comparing the influence of vibratory frequency on densification.....	261
Figure 7-22. Velocity time history recorded at 3.5m from the vibratory probe during switch on.....	262
Figure 7-23. Frequency spectra of vertical peak particle velocities for the Y- and double-Y probes.....	263
Figure 7-24. Relationship between optimal vibration frequency and the distance between velocity transducer and probe.....	264
Figure 7-25. Compactability of soils for the vibratory probe technique, based on the electric cone penetration test (CPT) with friction sleeve measurements.....	265
Figure 7-26. Correlation relating initial penetration resistance, layer thickness, and the required vertical peak ground acceleration to densify the soil.....	266
Figure 7-27. Correlation relating the peak ground acceleration, initial penetration resistance, and average induced settlement of treated layer.....	267
Figure 7-28. Conceptual illustration of deep dynamic compaction.....	268
Figure 7-29. Grouping of soils for dynamic compaction. Zone 1 soils are most suitable for deep dynamic compaction.....	269
Figure 7-30. Stages of soil conditions as a result of successive passes of deep dynamic compaction.....	270
Figure 7-31. The effects of the high and low energy phases of deep dynamic compaction and the effects of aging.....	272
Figure 7-32. Trends between apparent maximum depth of influence and $W \cdot H$ .....	273
Figure 7-33. Lateral movements 3m from the centerlines of the drop points.....	275
Figure 7-34. Relationship between tamper mass and drop height.....	277

Figure 7-35. Partition of energy among the three waves for vertical vibration of a disk on an elastic half-space.....	279
Figure 7-36. Schematic illustration of the times histories from the cyclic expansion and contraction of the gas bubble: a) radius of gas bubble, b) gas pressure, c) displacement of the bubble wall, and d) velocity of the bubble wall.....	284
Figure 7-37. Shear strain resulting from the conical shaped wave front.....	285
Figure 7-38. Proposed mechanism of blast induced liquefaction resulting from the differences in the bulk compressibilities of the pore water and soil skeleton and the plastic volume change of the soil skeleton.....	287
Figure 7-39. Illustration of undrained, high pressure, isotropic consolidation test that induces liquefaction. Not to scale. Such tests were performed on sands to verify the proposed blast-induced liquefaction mechanism.....	288
Figure 7-40a. Settlements of the ground surface due to blasting at a depth of 7m.....	289
Figure 7-40b. Results of pre- and post-blast screw plate load test settlements. Ratios less than 1.0 indicate decreased strength and stiffness, while ratios greater than 1.0 show increases.....	290
Figure 7-41. Functional relationship between pore pressure ratio ( $\Delta u_{sd}/\sigma'$ ) and $HN$ . The above figure was taken from a hand drawn figure, and the scales are not exact.....	291
Figure 7-42. Optimal $R-W$ combination required for densification is shown as the dark shaded zone.....	293
Figure 7-43. Correlation relating $HN$ and surface settlement expressed in terms of vertical strain.....	293
Figure 7-44. Comparison of the vertical strain corresponding to $\Delta u_{sd}/\sigma' = 0.8$ for blast data to the vertical strain from earthquake data.....	295

Figure 7-45. Comparison of observed strains to maximum values predicted by Equation (7-15d) and from Figure 7-4.....	298
Figure 7-46. Comparison of measured and predicted final normalized tip resistances.....	299
Figure 7-47. Current log recorded during vibrocompaction.....	301
Figure 8-1. First order model of the vibratory probe method.....	310
Figure 8-2. Iterative solution of Equation (8-3) to determine the shear-strain ( $\gamma$ ) at a given distance from the vibratory probe.....	311
Figure 8-3. The determination of shear modulus and damping ratios from the respective degradation curves.....	312
Figure 8-4. Comparison of attenuation relations given by Equation (8-5) (i.e., geometrical spreading only) and given by Equation (8-6) (i.e., combined geometrical spreading and material damping). The data points shown in the plot are peak particle velocities resulting from the dropping of a 6ton tamper from 27m.....	318
Figure 8-5. Attenuation of peak ground acceleration with distance from the vertically vibrating probe excited at 16 and 25hz.....	319
Figure 8-6. Comparison of attenuation expressions to measured field data for three excitation frequencies.....	322
Figure 8-7. Measured vibration levels at a depth of 14ft during the placement of stone columns.....	323
Figure 8-8. For a triangular grid pattern, the distance from a compaction point to the center of the compaction points is approximately 60% of the distance between the compaction points.....	325
Figure 8-9. Simple model predictions using peak particle velocities: a) The maximum extent of liquefaction for 20 and 50hz excitation frequencies, b) Liquefaction fronts for 0.5, 1, 5, 10, and 15sec of vibrations at 20hz.....	326

Figure 8-10. Simple model predictions using steady state particle velocities: a) The maximum extent of liquefaction for 20 and 50hz excitation frequencies, b) Liquefaction fronts for 1, 5, and 25sec of vibrations at 20hz.....	327
Figure 8-11. Conical surface depression created by vibrocompacting without backfill.....	329
Figure 8-12. Viscously damped, single degree of freedom oscillator used to represent the soil profile.....	330
Figure 8-13. The influence on boundary conditions on $E'$ . a) Condition of zero lateral stress, b) Condition of zero lateral strain.....	334
Figure 8-14. Comparison of $E_y$ , $E_c$ , and $E_{La}$ as a function of Poisson's ratio.....	335
Figure 8-15. An infinitely long rod may be modeled using an appropriately selected damper.....	336
Figure 8-16. A comparison of computed and recorded acceleration time histories. The recorded time histories are from Mayne and Jones (1983).....	339
Figure 8-17. Predicted and measured peak acceleration values as a function of drop height of the tamper.....	340
Figure 8-18. Truncated cone used to model induced stresses from impacting tamper on the surface of a profile. The soil modulus is assumed to vary parabolically from $E_{La}$ at a depth of 10ft to $E_c$ at a depth of 40ft, as shown in Figure 8-19b. Above a depth of 10ft, the soil modulus is assumed equal to $E_{La}$ .....	343
Figure 8-19. Variation of: a) propagation velocity of a compression-extension wave, and b) soil modulus, as a function of depth in the profile.....	345
Figure 8-20. Variation of the constant of proportionality relating deviatoric and axial strains as a function of depth.....	346
Figure 8-21. General axial stress-strain behavior of soil subjected to impact loading.....	348

Figure 8-22a. Modified shear modulus degradation curve to incorporate strain hardening effects.....	348
Figure 8-22b. Axial stress-strain relation corresponding to modified Ishibashi and Zhang shear modulus degradation curve shown in Figure 8-22a. For comparison, the commonly used hyperbolic stress-strain relation is shown, which does not account for strain hardening effects.....	349
Figure 8-23. Comparison of the predicted depth of induced liquefaction using the numerical model proposed by the author to the predicted depth of improvement using empirical expressions.....	351
Figure 8-24. Relative contribution of the $\epsilon_{rr}$ and $\epsilon_{\theta\theta}$ as for two distances from the cavity wall.....	355
Figure 8-25. Empirical attenuation relations for deep, concentrated charges; refer to Table 8-3.....	357
Figure 8-26. Comparison of the predicted radial extent of induced liquefaction using the numerical model proposed by the author to the predicted radial extent of improvement using empirical guidelines proposed by Ivanov (1967) and Kok (1981).....	360
Figure V-1. Just South of the DMZ in Korea, nineteen-year-old Lance Corporal Green stands guard of the General's latrine, ensuring no enlisted Marines use the facility. (February 1986, 2:00am, -10°F).....	394