

Passive Site Remediation for Mitigation of Liquefaction Risk

Patricia M. Gallagher

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 Engineering

Dr. James K. Mitchell, Chair
Dr. Thomas L. Brandon
Dr. James R. Martin
Dr. J. Donald Rimstidt
Dr. Mark A. Widdowson

October 27, 2000
Blacksburg, Virginia

Keywords: Liquefaction, remediation, ground improvement, groundwater modeling,
colloidal silica

Passive Site Remediation for Mitigation of Liquefaction Risk

Patricia M. Gallagher
Dr James K. Mitchell, Chair
Via Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering

ABSTRACT

Passive site remediation is a new concept proposed for non-disruptive mitigation of liquefaction risk at developed sites susceptible to liquefaction. It is based on the concept of slow injection of stabilizing materials at the edge of a site and delivery of the stabilizer to the target location using the natural groundwater flow. The purpose of this research was to establish the feasibility of passive site remediation through identification of stabilizing materials, a study of how to design or adapt groundwater flow patterns to deliver the stabilizers to the right place at the right time, and an evaluation of potential time requirements and costs.

Stabilizer candidates need to have long, controllable gel times and low viscosities so they can flow into a liquefiable formation slowly over a long period of time. Colloidal silica is a potential stabilizer for passive site remediation because at low concentrations it has a low viscosity and a wide range of controllable gel times of up to about 100 days.

Loose Monterey No. 0/30 sand samples ($D_r = 22\%$) treated with colloidal silica grout were tested under cyclic triaxial loading to investigate the influence of colloidal silica grout on the deformation properties. Distinctly different deformation properties were observed between grouted and ungrouted samples. Untreated samples developed very little axial strain after only a few cycles and prior to the onset of liquefaction. Once liquefaction was triggered, large strains occurred rapidly and the samples collapsed within a few additional cycles. In contrast, grouted sand samples experienced very little strain during cyclic loading. What strain accumulated did so uniformly throughout loading and the samples remained intact after cyclic loading. In general, samples stabilized with 20 weight percent colloidal silica experienced very little (less than two percent) strain during cyclic loading. Sands stabilized with 10 weight percent colloidal silica tolerated cyclic loading well, but experienced slightly more (up to eight percent) strain. Treatment with colloidal silica grout significantly increased the deformation resistance of loose sand to cyclic loading.

Groundwater and solute transport modeling were done using the codes MODFLOW, MODPATH, and MT3DMS. A “numerical experiment” was done to determine the ranges of hydraulic conductivity and hydraulic gradient where passive site remediation might be feasible. For a treatment area of 200 feet by 200 feet, a stabilizer travel time of 100 days, and a single line of low-head (less than three feet) injection wells, it was found that passive site remediation could be feasible in formations with hydraulic conductivity values of 0.05 cm/s or more and hydraulic gradients of 0.005 and above. Extraction wells will increase the speed of delivery and help control the down gradient extent of stabilizer movement. The results of solute transport modeling indicate that dispersion will play a large role in determining the concentration of stabilizer that will be required to deliver an adequate concentration at the down gradient edge. Consequently, thorough characterization of the hydraulic conductivity throughout the formation will be necessary for successful design and implementation of passive site remediation.

The cost of passive site remediation is expected to be competitive with other methods of chemical grouting, i.e. in the range of \$60 to \$180 per cubic meter of treated soil, depending on the concentration of colloidal silica used.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Many people have contributed to my success at Virginia Tech. I am especially thankful to have had the opportunity to work with Dr. James K. Mitchell. This experience has been one of the highlights of my career. I also appreciate the input and suggestions from the rest of my committee: Dr. Tom Brandon, Dr. Jimmy Martin, Dr. Don Rimstidt and Dr. Mark Widdowson. Special thanks to Dr. Widdowson for his detailed help and guidance on groundwater and stabilizer transport modeling and to Dr. Rimstidt for his geochemical expertise and many conversations about silica.

Financial support was provided by the Charles E. Via, Jr. Fellowship and the Multi-Disciplinary Center for Earthquake Engineering Research. The Via Fellowship included a one-semester instructorship that enabled me to teach an undergraduate soil mechanics course. This opportunity was invaluable in helping me to prepare for an academic career.

Numerous organizations provided materials and equipment to carry out the laboratory testing phase of this research. I would like to thank the following people and organizations for their help. Mr. Chris Gause of Master Builders contributed materials for laboratory testing of microfine cement grouts and expertise on all things related to grouting. Dr. Carmine Polito taught me how to run cyclic triaxial tests. Mr. Jim Coffey helped me with the laboratory testing program. Mr. Denson Graham made molds for testing stabilized sands. Mr. Clark Brown fixed many of the things I broke and lent me all kinds of things. Ms. Julie Petruska lent me equipment and provided supplies for the testing program. Ms. Stacey Reubush provided access to and instructions for use of the viscometer. Dr. Ernst Ahrens of Sandia National Laboratory and Mr. Henry Pringer of Blue Circle contributed cement for testing. Mr. Jim Akins of T.E. Byerly provided use of a high-speed shear mixer. DuPont provided a portion of the colloidal silica used in the testing program.

My interactions with colleagues and friends in the civil engineering department made the day-to-day process enjoyable and stimulating. Thanks to Mia Kannik, Jen Schaeffer, Russell Green, Harry Cooke, C.J. Smith, Alan Rauch, Jesus Gomez, Youngjin Park, Miguel Pando, Afonso

Marques, Jeremy Britton, Mary Ruth McDonald, Clark Brown, Sami Arsoy, Chris and Diane Baxter, Carmine Polito, Brendan Sheehan, Ken Huber, Laura Henry, Wayne Herring, Kathy Patterson, Steve Brauner, and Steve Phifer. Naxin Song and Christian Girsang kept me company in Ozawa Library during the long nights of writing my dissertation. Special thanks to Jim Coffey for providing a home for me and my cats during my last few months in Blacksburg. My friends Darleen Pryds, Jane Keppel-Benson, Amanda Serra, Donna Lisker, Chris Zobel, Melody Thomas, Tina Renick, Julie Petruska, Lisa Barroso and Jean Elliott made my life better, happier and a lot more fun. I appreciate your friendship.

My family and friends across the country were supportive of this whole endeavor from start to finish. The list is long: Mary Ellen Gallagher, John Gallagher, Sheila Gallagher, Andrea Bellavia and Joe Jagiello, Brian Gallagher, Tom, Nancy and Kevin Gallagher, Kathy, Lee, Drew and Blair Gatewood, Mary Jane Gallagher, Eleanor and Bill McComas, Holly Anderson, Amanda Alvarado-Anderson, Rickie Ampudia, Miriam Bartha, Cindy Elston, Stefanie Chenkin, Michael McGrorty, Jon and Donna Demarest, Bill Wolfe, and my friends at BBC&M. Thanks for your constant encouragement, support, and love. I am so grateful to have you in my life. Heartfelt gratitude to Tammy Anderson for her enduring support and encouragement throughout this process.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0 INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Statement of the Problem	1
1.2 Scope of Research	3
2.0 PERFORMANCE CRITERIA.....	6
2.1 Performance Criteria for Potential Stabilizers	6
2.2 Time required for Stabilizer to Travel through Liquefiable Formation	7
2.3 Performance Criteria for Stabilized Formation.....	9
2.4 Conclusion.....	10
3.0 POTENTIALLY SUITABLE MATERIALS, DELIVERY SYSTEMS AND MODELING TECHNIQUES	16
3.1 Rheology of Potential Stabilizers.....	16
3.2 Penetrability of Cement Grout	17
3.3 Microfine Cement Grouts.....	19
3.4 Set-Retarding Admixtures.....	21
3.5 Extended Set Control Admixtures.....	23
3.6 Colloidal Silica.....	23
3.6.1 Gel Time Control.....	24
3.6.2 Strength, Hydraulic Conductivity and Durability Characteristics.....	26
3.6.3 Pilot and Field Testing Using Colloidal Silica Grouts	27
3.7 Chemical Grouts.....	29
3.7.1 Sodium Silicate.....	29
3.7.2 Acrylamide	31
3.7.3 Acrylate	31
3.7.4 Iron Precipitation Grouts	32
3.7.5 Epoxy.....	33
3.7.6 Polysiloxane	33
3.8 Permeable Reactive Barriers for Controlling Groundwater Contamination	33
3.8.1 Geochemical Reactions Between Zero-Valent Iron and Groundwater	34
3.8.2 Colloidal Zero-Valent Iron	37
3.8.3 Ferric Chloride	37
3.9 Biological Materials	38
3.10 Delivery Systems.....	41
3.10.1 Injection or Extraction Wells.....	41
3.10.2 Magnetic Fluids	41
3.10.3 Electrokinetic Processing	42
3.11 Computer Modeling	43
3.11.1 Previous Modeling Studies to Design Colloidal Silica and Permeable Reactive Barriers	44
3.11.2 Codes Considered for Passive Site Remediation	46
3.11.3 Conclusion.....	50

4.0 EVALUATION BASED ON PERFORMANCE CRITERIA	56
4.1 Cement-based grouts	56
4.2 Colloidal silica.....	56
4.3 Chemical grouts.....	57
4.3.1 Sodium Silicate.....	57
4.3.2 Acrylamide	58
4.3.3 Acrylate	58
4.3.4 Iron precipitation grouts	59
4.3.5 Epoxy.....	59
4.3.6 Polysiloxane	59
4.4 Zero-valent iron.....	60
4.5 Biological Materials	60
4.6 Delivery Systems.....	61
4.7 Groundwater Modeling	62
4.8 Selection of Materials for Testing, Delivery Systems, and Modeling Codes	63
5.0 MICROFINE CEMENT GROUT LABORATORY TESTING AND RESULTS ..	66
5.1 Introduction	66
5.2 Microfine Cement Grout Testing Program	66
5.2.1 Properties Measured	67
5.2.2 Materials.....	68
5.2.3 Methods	68
5.2.3.1 Mix Design.....	68
5.2.3.2 Sample Preparation.....	68
5.2.3.3 Stability Testing	69
5.2.3.4 Rheological Testing.....	70
5.2.3.5 Measurement of Set Time	72
5.3 Microfine Cement Grout Testing Results	72
5.3.1 Summary	72
5.3.2 Stability Testing Results.....	73
5.3.3 Rheological Testing Results	76
5.3.4 Differences in Cements Tested.....	77
5.3.5 Set Time Results.....	78
5.4 Conclusion.....	79
6.0 COLLOIDAL SILICA AND LABORATORY TESTING RESULTS	91
6.1 Introduction	91
6.2 Colloidal Silica Gel Time and Viscosity Testing.....	91
6.2.1 Properties Measured	91
6.2.2 Materials	92
6.2.3 Methods	93
6.2.3.1 Sample Preparation.....	93
6.2.3.2 Gel Time Testing.....	94
6.2.3.3 Viscosity Testing	96
6.3 Strength Testing of Stabilized Sands	96
6.3.1 Properties Measured	99

6.3.2	Materials	101
6.3.3	Methods	102
6.3.3.1	Preparation of Molds and Platens.....	102
6.3.3.2	Sample Preparation.....	103
6.3.3.3	Testing	105
6.4	Colloidal Silica Gel Time and Viscosity Testing Results	109
6.4.1	Summary	109
6.4.2	Colloidal Silica Gel Time Testing Results	110
6.4.3	Colloidal Silica Viscosity Testing Results	111
6.5	Results of Strength Testing of Stabilized Sands	111
6.5.1	Summary	111
6.5.2	Cyclic Triaxial Test Results	114
6.5.2.1	Results for Samples Made by Permeation Grouting	116
6.5.2.2	Effect of Curing Time on Cyclic Resistance	116
6.5.2.3	Effect of Different Grades of Colloidal Silica on Cyclic Resistance	117
6.5.3	Unconfined Compression Test Results	118
6.5.4	Unconsolidated Undrained Test Results	119
6.6	Conclusion.....	120
7.0	GROUNDWATER AND STABILIZER TRANSPORT MODELING	138
7.1	Introduction	138
7.2	Conceptual Model	139
7.3	Numerical Model.....	140
7.3.1	Mathematical Models	140
7.3.2	Grid Design and Boundary Conditions	143
7.3.3	Layer Definition	143
7.3.4	Flow System	144
7.3.5	Water Budget.....	147
7.3.6	Colloidal Silica	148
7.4	Results	149
7.4.1	Purely Advective Flow	149
7.4.2	Combined Advection and Dispersion.....	150
Case 1:	Regional Flow Used to Deliver Stabilizer	152
Case 2:	Stabilizer delivered Via 7 Injection Wells	156
Case 3:	Stabilizer delivered Via 3 Injection Wells.....	159
7.5	Conclusion.....	160

8.0 FEASIBILITY OF PASSIVE SITE REMEDIATION	194
8.1 Introduction	194
8.2 Will Colloidal Silica Grout Adequately Stabilize the Soil?	194
8.3 Can the Stabilizer be Delivered to the Formation?	196
8.4 How Much Will it Cost?	200
8.5 How Long Will it Take?.....	201
8.6 Conclusion.....	202
9.0 SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE WORK	204
9.1 Key Findings	204
9.2 Recommendations for Future Work.....	209
10.0 REFERENCES	210
APPENDIX 1 - MICROFINE CEMENT GROUT TESTING RESULTS	218
APPENDIX 2 - COLLOIDAL SILICA VISCOSITY TESTING RESULTS	232
APPENDIX 3 - STABILIZED SAND SAMPLE DETAILS AND CYCLIC TESTING RESULTS	234
VITA	238

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2-1	Performance Criteria for Stabilizer Candidates	7
Table 3-1	Grouting Ratios for Most Liquefiable Soils	18
Table 4-1	Evaluation of Grouts with Respect to Performance Criteria	65
Table 5-1	Components of Representative Mixes	74
Table 5-2	Pressure Filtration Coefficients for Representative Mixes	75
Table 5-3	Comparison of Results between Rheocem-900 and NewCem Slag Cement.....	77
Table 5-4	Comparison of Results between Rheocem-900 and Type V Premium Cements	78
Table 6-1	Properties of Ludox Colloidal Silica Sols.....	93
Table 6-2	Colloidal Silica Samples for Gel Time Curves.....	94
Table 6-3	Gel States of Colloidal Silica.....	95
Table 6-4	Index Properties for Monterey Sand.....	102
Table 7-1	Typical Values of Hydraulic Conductivity for Sands.....	144
Table 7-2	Typical Values of Porosity for Sands	145
Table 7-3	Example Variation in Hydraulic Conductivity by Layer for Dispersion.....	146
Table 7-4	Travel Times for Advective Flow.....	162
Table 7-5	Travel Times and Delivery Widths for Advective Flow	162
Table 8-1	Cost of Ludox-SM Based on Concentration.....	200

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1-1	Passive treatment for mitigation of liquefaction risk	5
Figure 2-1	Viscosity of an ideal grout	11
Figure 2-2	Grain size ranges for most liquefiable soils	12
Figure 2-3	Hydraulic conductivity versus time required for water to travel 200 feet	13
Figure 2-4	Effect of treatment on liquefaction potential.....	14
Figure 2-5	Cyclic triaxial behavior of loose and dense sands.....	15
Figure 3-1	Rheological laws for (1) Newtonian fluid and (2) Bingham body.....	51
Figure 3-2	Rheological behavior of typical grouts	52
Figure 3-3	Formation of siloxane bonds as colloidal silica particles gel.....	53
Figure 3-4	Behavior of colloidal silica particles at different pH's	54
Figure 3-5	Layout of injection and extraction wells in sandbox experiment.....	55
Figure 5-1	API Filter press and cell assembly, exploded view.....	80
Figure 5-2	Chart to determine apparent viscosity from Marsh viscosity and cohesion....	81
Figure 5-3	Marsh funnel and Lombardi plate cohesion meter.....	82
Figure 5-4	API mud balance	83
Figure 5-5	Bleed versus time, mixes with single stabilizer	84
Figure 5-6	Bleed versus time, mixes with two stabilizers	85
Figure 5-7	Marsh viscosity versus time, mixes with one stabilizer	86
Figure 5-8	Marsh viscosity versus time, mixes with two stabilizers	87
Figure 5-9	Cohesion versus time, mixes with one stabilizer	88
Figure 5-10	Cohesion versus time, mixes with two stabilizers	89
Figure 5-11	Apparent viscosity versus time, all mixes.....	90
Figure 6-1	Cyclic resistance curve for untreated Monterey sand, $D_r = 22\%$	121
Figure 6-2	Grain size curve for Monterey #0/30 sand.....	122
Figure 6-3	Stainless steel mold, platen and PVC mold for forming stabilized sand samples	123
Figure 6-4	Triaxial testing system	124
Figure 6-5	Ludox-SM 10% concentration gel time curves.....	125
Figure 6-6	Ludox-SM 7.5% concentration gel time curves.....	126
Figure 6-7	Ludox-SM 5% concentration gel time curves.....	127
Figure 6-8	Ludox-HS gel time curves.....	128
Figure 6-9	Ludox-TM gel time curves.....	129
Figure 6-10	Evolution of viscosity, 15% Ludox-HS	130
Figure 6-11	Cyclic stress-strain behavior of Monterey sand, $D_r = 22\%$, CSR=0.27	131
Figure 6-12	Cyclic stress-strain behavior of Monterey sand treated with 10% Ludox SM, $D_r = 22\%$, CSR=0.27	132
Figure 6-13	Percent Ludox-SM versus strain during cyclic loading at CSR=0.40.....	133
Figure 6-14	Unconfined compressive strength of stabilized sands.....	134
Figure 6-15	Unconfined compressive strength of stabilized sands after cyclic loading....	135
Figure 6-16	Undrained strength versus strain during cyclic loading	136
Figure 6-17	Strain during cyclic loading for samples of different ages.....	137
Figure 7-1	Model domain and boundary conditions	163
Figure 7-2	Lower and upper limits for travel time.....	164

Figure 7-3	Case 1-1: Regional flow used to deliver stabilizer. Constant concentration delivered through infiltration trench, $k_{TA}=k_R$	165
Figure 7-4	Case 1-2: Regional flow used to deliver stabilizer. Constant concentration delivered through infiltration trench, $k_{TA} = \frac{1}{2} k_R$	167
Figure 7-5	Case 1-1: With extraction wells. Constant concentration = 100 g/l, delivered through infiltration trench, $k_{TA}=k_R$	169
Figure 7-6	Case 1-2: With extraction wells. Constant concentration = 100 g/l, delivered through infiltration trench, $k_{TA} = \frac{1}{2} k_R$	169
Figure 7-7	Case 1-3: Regional flow used to deliver stabilizer. Profiles through centerline. Constant concentration = 100 g/l, delivered through infiltration trench, variable k , $k_{TA}=k_R$	170
Figure 7-8	Case 1-3: Regional flow used to deliver stabilizer. Constant concentration = 100 g/l, delivered through infiltration trench, variable k , $k_{TA}=k_R$. Layers 1-5 after 100 days	171
Figure 7-9	Case 1-3: Regional flow used to deliver stabilizer. Profiles through centerline. Constant concentration = 150 g/l, delivered through infiltration trench, variable k , $k_{TA}=k_R$	172
Figure 7-10	Case 1-3: With extraction wells. Regional flow used to deliver stabilizer. Profiles through centerline. Constant concentration = 100 g/l, delivered through infiltration trench, variable k , $k_{TA}=k_R$. Extraction wells withdraw 7500 cfd	173
Figure 7-11	Case 1-3: With extraction wells. Regional flow used to deliver stabilizer. Profiles through treatment area. Constant concentration = 100 g/l, delivered through infiltration trench, variable k , $k_{TA}=k_R$. Extraction wells withdraw 7500 cfd	174
Figure 7-12	Case 1-3: With extraction wells separated by 80 feet. Regional flow used to deliver stabilizer. Profiles through treatment area. Constant concentration = 100 g/l, delivered through infiltration trench, variable k , $k_{TA}=k_R$. Extraction wells withdraw 7500 cfd	175
Figure 7-13	Case 1-4: With extraction wells. Regional flow used to deliver stabilizer. Profiles through treatment area. Constant concentration = 100 g/l, delivered through infiltration trench, variable k , $k_{TA} = \frac{1}{2} k_R$. Extraction wells withdraw 7500 cfd	176
Figure 7-14	Case 1-4: With extraction wells. Regional flow used to deliver stabilizer. Profiles through treatment area. Constant concentration = 150 g/l, delivered through infiltration trench, variable k , $k_{TA} = \frac{1}{2} k_R$. Extraction wells withdraw 7500	177
Figure 7-15	Case 2-1: Stabilizer delivered via 7 injection wells delivering 7000 cfd total. Extraction wells extract 7000 cfd total, Constant concentration = 100 g/l, $k_{TA}=k_R$	178
Figure 7-16	Case 2-1: Stabilizer delivered via 7 injection wells delivering 7000 cfd total. Extraction wells extract 7000 cfd total, Constant concentration = 150 g/l, $k_{TA}=k_R$	179
Figure 7-17	Case 2-2: Stabilizer delivered via 7 injection wells delivering 7000 cfd total. Extraction wells extract 7000 cfd total, Constant concentration, $k_{TA} = \frac{1}{2} k_R$	180

Figure 7-18	Case 2-3: Stabilizer delivered via 7 injection wells delivering 7000 cfd total. Extraction wells extract 7000 cfd total, Constant concentration = 100 g/l, variable k, $k_{TA} = k_R$. Profiles through treatment area.	182
Figure 7-19	Case 2-3: Stabilizer delivered via 7 injection wells delivering 7000 cfd total. Extraction wells extract 7000 cfd total, Constant concentration = 150 g/l, variable k, $k_{TA} = k_R$. Profiles through treatment area.	183
Figure 7-20	Case 2-4: Stabilizer delivered via 7 injection wells delivering 7000 cfd total. Extraction wells extract 7000 cfd total, Constant concentration = 100 g/l, variable k, $k_{TA} = \frac{1}{2}k_R$. Profiles through treatment area.	184
Figure 7-21	Case 2-4: Stabilizer delivered via 7 injection wells delivering 7000 cfd total. Extraction wells extract 7000 cfd total, Constant concentration = 150 g/l, variable k, $k_{TA} = \frac{1}{2}k_R$. Profiles through centerline	185
Figure 7-22	Cases 3-1 and 3-2: Stabilizer delivered via 3 injection wells delivering 7500 cfd total. Extraction wells extract 7500 cfd total, Constant concentration = 100 g/l, uniform k.....	186
Figure 7-23	Case 3-3: Stabilizer delivered via 3 injection wells delivering 7500 cfd total. Extraction wells extract 7500 cfd total, Constant concentration = 100 g/l, $k_{TA} = k_R$, variable k. Profiles through centerline	188
Figure 7-24	Case 3-3: Stabilizer delivered via 3 injection wells delivering 7500 cfd total. Extraction wells extract 7500 cfd total, Constant concentration = 100 g/l, $k_{TA} = k_R$, variable k. Layers 1-5 after 102 days, $k_{TA} = k_R$	189
Figure 7-25	Case 3-3: Stabilizer delivered via 3 injection wells delivering 7500 cfd total. Extraction wells extract 7500 cfd total, Constant concentration = 100 g/l, $k_{TA} = k_R$, variable k. Profiles through treatment area	190
Figure 7-26	Case 3-3: Stabilizer delivered via 3 injection wells delivering 7500 cfd total. Extraction wells extract 7500 cfd total, Constant concentration = 100 g/l, $k_{TA} = \frac{1}{2} k_R$, variable k. Profiles through centerline	191
Figure 7-27	Case 3-4: Stabilizer delivered via 3 injection wells delivering 7500 cfd total. Extraction wells extract 7500 cfd total, Constant concentration = 100 g/l, $k_{TA} = \frac{1}{2} k_R$, variable k. Layers 1-5 after 102 days	192
Figure 7-28	Case 3-4: Stabilizer delivered via 3 injection wells delivering 7500 cfd total. Extraction wells extract 7500 cfd total, Constant concentration = 100 g/l, $k_{TA} = \frac{1}{2} k_R$, variable k. Profiles through treatment area	193