

**A STUDY ON THE BEARING CAPACITY OF SHALLOW
FOUNDATIONS ON GEOSYNTHETIC REINFORCED SAND**

C. Sanjei

158012A

Degree of Master of Science

Department of Civil Engineering

University of Moratuwa

Moratuwa

Sri Lanka

January, 2017

A STUDY ON THE BEARING CAPACITY OF SHALLOW FOUNDATIONS ON GEOSYNTHETIC REINFORCED SAND

Chitravel Sanjei

158012A

The research thesis was submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the
Degree of Master of Science

Supervised by Dr. L.I.N. De Silva



Department of Civil Engineering

University of Moratuwa

Moratuwa

Sri Lanka

January, 2017

DECLARATION

I declare that this is my own work and this thesis does not incorporate without acknowledgement any material previously submitted for a Degree or Diploma in any other University or institute of higher learning and to the best of my knowledge and belief it does not contain any material previously published or written by another person except where the acknowledgement is made in the text.

Also, I hereby grant to University of Moratuwa the non-exclusive right to reproduce and distribute my thesis, in whole or in part in print electronic or other medium. I retain the right to use this content in whole or part in future works (such as articles or books)

.....

Date: January 7, 2017

C.Sanjei

The above candidate has carried out research for the Master thesis under my supervision.

.....

Date: January 7, 2017

Dr. L.I.N. De Silva

ABSTRACT

A study on the bearing capacity of shallow foundations on geosynthetic reinforced sand

This thesis demonstrate a research study aimed at investigating the significance of bearing capacity improvement of shallow foundation supported on geocell, geogrid and combination of geocell and geogrid reinforced sand. To implement the objective, laboratory model test, numerical study using PLAXIS 3D and theoretical study were performed to investigate the behavior of reinforced soil foundation. Honeycomb shape HDPE geocell and biaxial geogrid were used in laboratory model test.

For geocell, initially single layer geocell was experimented with different cover thickness (geocell placing depth). From the results, suitable cover thickness was found at [depth (U)/width (B)] ratio between 0 and 0.5 for a square pad footing. Numerical modeling of the geocell has been an immense challenge due to their curved shape. The equivalent composite approach (ECA) is widely used to model the geocells. However, the composite method has a number of limitations, including the disregard of the effect of shape. The shape has a major influence in stress distribution. Hence a realistic model approach is essential to simulate the same experimental condition in numerical analysis. In this study, a 3D Auto Cad model was imported to PLAXIS 3D and modeled using geogrid structural element. Then the model was validated using experimental results where the results satisfied each other. According to the numerical analysis, optimum cover thickness for sand was found as 0.1B (width of footing). The static load test showed that with the provision of HDPE geocells, bearing capacity of soil can be improved by a factor up to 2.5 times of unreinforced soil. Further numerical investigations were carried out using double layer geocell for prototype footing to compare the bearing capacity improvement with single layer geocell. The results clearly depict that bearing capacity is improved by a factor of 2.75 and 3.5 times of unreinforced soil when using single layer and double layer geocell respectively. When doubly reinforced geocell was used, footing size is reduced by 40% and cost is reduced by 65%. It is apparent that using double reinforced geocell will lead to cost effective foundation designs. These ultimate bearing capacity results were validated by theoretical approaches. A good matching was found between experimental, numerical and theoretical approach.

For geogrid, laboratory model test and numerical modelling were performed to find the correlation between number of geogrid and bearing capacity, using optimum cover thickness and spacing. The experimental results show that both surface heaving and settlement are reduced with number of geogrid mattress. Moreover it was also observed that bearing capacity of reinforced soil increases with increasing number of reinforcement layers (at same vertical spacing). However, the significance of an additional reinforcement layer decreases with the increase in number of layers, and bearing capacity is improved by a factor of 2.86 times of unreinforced soil when four layer geogrid was used. Further validations were performed using (FHWA/LA.08/424) technical report.

Finally, a combination of geocell and geogrid was used as reinforcement. Two different cases were investigated, namely 'geocell+geogrid' combination and 'geogrid+geocell' combination. Optimum bearing capacity was obtained when geogrid was placed at the base and on the top of geocell in which bearing capacity is improved by a factor of 4.3 and 3.8, times of

unreinforced soil respectively. It shows that a layer of planar geogrid placed at the base of the geocell mattress improves the bearing capacity significantly compared with provision of geogrid above the geocell layer.

Based on the overall study, key recommendations are made, which can be made for the improvements of reinforced soil foundation design. The results stated in this study will be useful in construction of building and pavements on the weak soils to significantly improve the bearing capacity of shallow foundation.

Key words: Bearing capacity, shallow foundation, geosynthetic, honeycomb shape geocell, PLAXIS 3D, feasibility study

DEDICATION

To my ever-loving teachers

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

First of all, I would like to express my sincere thanks and appreciation to my advisor, Dr. L.I.N. De Silva, senior lecturer at the Department of Civil Engineering of University of Moratuwa, for his patient guidance all through my master study. Without his advice, support, and encouragement, this thesis would not have been accomplished. It has been a great honor for me to have him as my advisor. His help and support are really appreciated. And I would like to thank to Dr. N.H. Priyankara and Dr. U. P. Nawagamuwa for serving on my progress review committee. I am truly grateful for their time and valuable comments.

I would like to extend my gratitude to Head of the Department, Prof. J.M.S.J. Bandara and former head Prof. S.M.A Nanayakkara, Department of Civil Engineering, University of Moratuwa in providing this opportunity. A special gesture of appreciation is also conveyed to department research coordinator, Prof. A.A.D.A.J. Perera, for giving his full support in research and evaluation.

The assistance received from Mr. K.R. Pitipanaarachchi, technical officer, Mr. D.G.S. Vithanage, technical officer and Mr. Ajith, lab assistant, of the Soil Mechanics Laboratory of the University of Moratuwa, during the laboratory-testing programme is acknowledged. Many thanks are extended to University of Moratuwa for the services provided during the research and to the Senate research council of University of Moratuwa (SRC/Capital/14/07), Sri Lanka for funding this research.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- DECLARATION.....i
- ABSTRACT.....ii
- DEDICATION.....iv
- ACKNOWLEDGEMENT.....v
- TABLE OF CONTENTS.....vii
- LIST OF FIGUERS.....ix
- LIST OF TABLES.....xi
- LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.....xii
- 1 INTRODUCTION-----1**
 - 1.1 Research background ----- 1
 - 1.2 Research Problem ----- 3
 - 1.3 Objectives----- 4
 - 1.4 Limitations----- 4
 - 1.5 Research approach----- 5
 - 1.6 Dissertation Outline ----- 6
- 2 LITERATURE REVIEW-----7**
 - 2.1 Overview----- 7
 - 2.2 Geocell Reinforced Foundations ----- 7
 - 2.2.1 Introduction 7
 - 2.2.2 Experimental Studies on Geocell Reinforced Soil Foundation..... 8
 - 2.2.3 Finite Element Studies on Geocell Reinforced Soil Foundations 15
 - 2.3 Geogrid Reinforced Foundations-----21
 - 2.3.1 Introduction 21
 - 2.3.2 Experimental Studies on Geogrid Reinforced Soil Foundation 21
 - 2.3.3 Finite Element Studies on Geogrid Reinforced Soil Foundations 26
- 3 EXPERIMENTAL STUDIES -----30**
 - 3.1 Overview-----30
 - 3.2 Material used -----30
 - 3.2.1 Sand..... 30
 - 3.2.2 Geocell 32
 - 3.2.3 Geogrid..... 33
 - 3.3 Test setup and procedure -----33
 - 3.3.1 Testing program-Geocell..... 34

3.3.2	Testing program-Geogrid.....	36
3.3.3	Testing program-Geogrid –Geocell combinations.....	39
3.4	Summary-----	40
3.4.1	Geocell	41
3.4.2	Geogrid.....	41
3.4.3	Geocell-Geogrid combination	41
4	NUMERICAL ANALYSIS -----	42
4.1	The Finite Element Approach -----	42
4.1.1	Description of PLAXIS	42
4.2	Foundation material properties -----	43
4.2.1	Sand.....	43
4.2.2	Timber	44
4.3	Numerical analysis of Geocell-----	44
4.3.1	Numerical analysis - Equivalent Composite Approach-ECA	44
4.3.2	Numerical analysis-3D Modelling	47
4.3.3	Numerical analysis of model footing on the Geogrid reinforced soil	58
4.3.4	Bearing capacity of shallow foundations on Geogrid –Geocell combinations .	62
4.4	Summary-----	65
4.4.1	Geocell	65
4.4.2	Geogrid.....	66
4.4.3	Geogrid –Geocell combinations.....	66
5	THEORETICAL ANALYSIS -----	67
5.1	Overview-----	67
5.2	Theoretical Analysis-geocell reinforced soil -----	67
5.2.1	Unreinforced subgrade bearing capacity (p_u).....	67
5.2.2	Confinement effect improvement.....	67
5.2.3	Stress dispersion effect.....	68
5.2.4	Bearing capacity of geocell-reinforced soil (p_{τ})	69
5.2.5	Theoretical bearing capacity calculation.....	69
5.3	Theoretical approach of estimating the bearing capacity of geogrid-----	72
5.3.1	Analytical solution	72
5.3.2	Theoretical bearing capacity calculation-geogrid reinforced soil	75
5.3.3	Comparison of Ultimate Bearing Capacity	78
5.4	Summary-----	79
5.4.1	Geocell	79

5.4.2	Geogrid.....	79
6	COST FEASIBILITY STUDY OF GEOCELL REINFORCED SHALLOW FOUNDATION -----	80
6.1	Cost feasibility study for geocell reinforcement -----	80
6.2	Summary-----	81
7	CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS -----	82
7.1	Conclusions from experimental studies -----	82
7.1.1	Geocell	82
7.1.2	Geogrid.....	82
7.2	Conclusions from numerical studies-----	83
7.2.1	Geocell	83
7.2.2	Geogrid.....	83
7.2.3	Geocell-Geogrid combination	84
7.3	Conclusions from theoretical studies -----	84
7.3.1	Geocell	84
7.3.2	Geogrid.....	84
7.4	Recommendations for reinforced soil foundation design-----	85
7.5	Recommendations for Future Research -----	86
8	REFERENCES -----	87

LIST OF FIGUERS

Figure 1.1 Different types of geosynthetics	1
Figure 1.2 Geocell (a) honey comb shape geocell; (b) application of geocell	2
Figure 1.3 Geogrid (a) uniaxial; (b) biaxial; (c) with triangular apertures	2
Figure 3.1 Particle size distribution of sand.....	31
Figure 3.2 Density variation with falling height –Pluviation technique	31
Figure 3.3 Sequence of filling of geocell (John, 1987).....	32
Figure 3.4 Air pluviation technique of sample preparation (Towhata, 2008).....	32
Figure 3.5 Model test setup	34
Figure 3.6 Geometry of the geocell reinforced foundation.....	34
Figure 3.7 Bearing pressure – settlement behaviour of footing under various condition .	35
Figure 3.8 Geometry of the geogrid reinforced foundation	36
Figure 3.9 Variation of bearing pressure with different number of geogrid layers	38
Figure 3.10 Variation of bearing capacity ratio with the number of geogrids	38
Figure 3.11 Geometry view of (a) Geocell– Geogrid layer reinforced soil (b) Geogrid – Geocell	39
Figure 3.12 Bearing pressure – settlement behaviour of footing under various	40
Figure 4.1 3D soil elements with 10-node tetrahedrons	43
Figure 4.2 FEM model of equivalent composite approach-PLAXIS.....	46
Figure 4.3 Settlement Vs Bearing pressure curve of ECA model.....	47
Figure 4.4 3D model of foundation.....	47
Figure 4.5 3D model of foundation	48
Figure 4.6 Generated 3D mesh of foundation.....	48
Figure 4.7 (a) Honey comb 3D model of geocells (b) geocell front elevation	48
Figure 4.8 very fine mesh of PLAXIS 3D models.....	49
Figure 4.9 3D model of foundation.....	49
Figure 4.10 Placement of geocell.....	49
Figure 4.11 geocell with displacement vectors	50
Figure 4.12 Bearing pressure – settlement behaviour of footing under various	50
Figure 4.13 Vertical stress distribution of reinforced and unreinforced conditions.....	51
Figure 4.14 Vertical displacement of reinforced and unreinforced conditions.....	52
Figure 4.15 Bearing pressure vs settlement of footing under various cover thickness.....	53
Figure 4.16 Bearing pressure – settlement of footing for different aspect ratios.....	54
Figure 4.17 3D model of foundation.....	55
Figure 4.18 placement of geocell	55
Figure 4.19 Bearing pressure – settlement behaviour of footing under various.....	56
Figure 4.20 Variation of bearing capacity bearing capacity ratio (BCR)	56
Figure 4.21 Vertical displacement of.....	57
Figure 4.22 Vertical stress of unreinforced soil.....	57
Figure 4.23 Vertical displacement of singly.....	57
Figure 4.24 Vertical stress of singly.....	57
Figure 4.25 Vertical displacement of doubly.....	57
Figure 4.26 Vertical stress of doubly	57
Figure 4.27 mesh of PLAXIS 3D model and 3D view of geogrid reinforced soil	58

Figure 4.28 Bearing pressure – settlement behaviour of footing under various	59
Figure 4.29 Vertical stress distribution of reinforced and unreinforced conditions.....	60
Figure 4.30 Vertical displacement of reinforced and unreinforced conditions.....	61
Figure 4.31 Geometry view of (a) Geocell– Geogrid layer reinforced soil (b) Geogrid – Geocell	62
Figure 4.32 (a) Geocell– Geogrid layer reinforced soil (b) Geogrid –Geocell layer	63
Figure 4.33 Vertical Stress (1.a and 1.b) and displacement (1.c and 1.d) of reinforced and unreinforced conditions.....	64
Figure 5.1 cross sectional view and unitary pocket shear force	68
Figure 5.2 illustration of the stress dispersion effect	68
Figure 5.3 Geometry of the geocell reinforced foundation.....	69
Figure 5.4 failure mode of reinforced soil foundation-failure within reinforced zone.....	72
Figure 5.5 Simplified distribution of vertical settlement in sand (Sharma et.al 2008)	73
Figure 5.6 Strain influence factor distribution diagrams (Sharma et.al 2008).....	74
Figure 5.7 Geometry of the geogrid reinforced foundation	75
Figure 5.8 Comparison of Ultimate Bearing Capacity.....	78

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1 Experimental studies reviewed on geocell-reinforced soil supporting static load...	12
Table 3.1 Properties of sand used in experimental studies	30
Table 3.2 Geocell Specification (from manual) used in experimental studies.....	33
Table 3.3 Properties of geogrid used in experimental studies.....	33
Table 3.4 Parameters used in geocell experimental studies	35
Table 3.5 Modulus of subgrade reaction (Ks) of geocell reinforced soil.....	36
Table 3.6 Optimum parameters used in experimental studies	37
Table 3.7 Geometry parameters of model.....	37
Table 3.8 Modulus of subgrade reaction (Ks) of geogrid reinforced soil	39
Table 3.9 Geometry parameter of model foundation	40
Table 4.1 <i>sand properties</i>	43
Table 4.2 Timber properties	44
Table 4.3 properties of sand and geocells	45
Table 4.4 equivalent composite properties of geocell layer.....	46
Table 4.5 Geocell properties	49
Table 4.6 cover thickness (u) for geocell reinforced soil foundation.....	53
Table 4.7 properties of geogrid	58
Table 4.8 Geometry parameter of model foundation	63
Table 5.1 Dimensions of geometry	69
Table 5.2 material properties of the soil and other design parameters.....	70
Table 5.3 comparison of bearing capacity using different methods	71
Table 5.4 Properties of different material used in calculation	75
Table 5.5 Settlement at the first layers of reinforcement	76
Table 5.6 Settlement at the different layers.....	76
Table 5.7 Settlement at the different layers.....	77
Table 5.8 bearing capacity improvement at the different layers	77
Table 5.9 bearing capacity of reinforced soil for different N.....	78
Table 5.10 Summary of bearing capacity for different approaches	78
Table 6.1 summary of cost calculation.....	80
Table 7.1 Recommended design parameters for geocell reinforcement layout	85
Table 7.2 Recommended design parameters for geogrid reinforcement layout	85

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

Abbreviations	Description	Unit
ϕ	Friction angle	[°]
c	cohesion	[kN/m ²]
δ	Interface friction angle	[°]
k	Coefficient of permeability	[m/day]
γ	Dry unit weight	[kN/m ³]
BCR	Bearing capacity ratio	-
M	Secant modulus of the geocell material	[kN/m]
K_e	Young's modulus parameter of the unreinforced sand	-
n	Modulus exponent of the unreinforced soil	-
K_r	Young's modulus parameter of the geocell-reinforced sand	-
P_a	Atmospheric pressure	[kPa]
D ₁₀	Effective particle size	[mm]
D ₅₀	Mean particle size	[mm]
C _u	Coefficient of uniformity	-
C _c	Coefficient of curvature	-
G _s	Specific gravity	-
RD	Relative density	[%]
t	Thickness	[mm]
E	Young modulus	[MPa]
k	Interface shear modulus	[MPa/m]
T	Tensile strength	[kN]
J	Tensile modulus	[kN/m]
U	Cover thickness	[mm]
X	Spacing	[mm]
B _x	Width	[mm]
k _o	coefficient of active earth pressure	-
p	surcharge load	[kN/m]

c	cohesion of soil	[kN/m ²]
N_c	bearing capacity factor	-
S_c	loading shape factor related to cohesion	-
N_q	bearing capacity factor	-
S_q	loading shape factor related to surcharge load	-
B	loading width	[m]
N_γ	bearing capacity factor	-
S_γ	loading shape factor related to the soil unit weight	-
h/d	geocell aspect ratio	-
e	stress redistribution parameter	-
d	Geocell pocket size	[mm]
h	Geocell height	[mm]
D_f	embedment depth	[m]
E_s	Elastic modulus of sand	[kN/m ²]
$I_{\varepsilon p}$	strain influence factor	-