

ENHANCEMENT OF THE STABILITY AT THE SITE OF AN ANCIENT LANDSLIDE IN A ROAD CUTTING WITH DRAINAGE AND REINFORCEMENT – CASE HISTORY AT GINIGATHHENA

S.O.A.D. Mihira Lakruwan

168968R

Supervised by Prof. S A S Kulathilaka

Master of Engineering in Foundation Engineering and Earth Retaining Systems

> Department of Civil Engineering University of Moratuwa Sri Lanka

> > August 2019

ENHANCEMENT OF THE STABILITY AT THE SITE OF AN ANCIENT LANDSLIDE IN A ROAD CUTTING WITH DRAINAGE AND REINFORCEMENT – CASE HISTORY AT GINIGATHHENA

Samarasekara Okandapala Arachchige Don Mihira Lakruwan

168968R

Thesis/Dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Science / Master of Engineering in Foundation Engineering and Earth Retaining Systems

Department of Civil Engineering

University of Moratuwa

Sri Lanka

August 2019

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 to the best of our 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)

Signature of the candidate:....

Date:.....

S.O.A.D. Mihira Lakruwan

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

Signature of the supervisor:....

Date:....

Professor S.A.S Kulathilaka,

BSc. Eng. Hons(Moratuwa), PhD(Monash), CEng, MIE(SL)

Department of Civil Engineering,

University of Moratuwa,

Sri Lanka.

ABSTRACT

Engineers involved in infrastructure development projects in the hilly terrain of Sri Lanka encounter ancient landslides which could be triggered by rainfall or construction activities. One such landslide was encountered during the widening of a bridge in the main connecting road between central hill country and capital; Avissavella – Hatton – Nuwaraeliya road at bridge no. 48/2 near Ginigathhena. Extensive mitigation measures had to be designed with detailed attention to construction sequence in order to prevent reactivation of the slide.

A valley area had been formed by the previous landslide. Morphology of the area is a sloping land with undulating topography towards upper slope. This has led to the formation of a waterlogged marshy area on a flat land at immediate upper slope and a stream flowing through valley. Water table of the area is quite high. The landslide got activated due to a minor excavation at the toe region for the bridge widening. There had been no rain when the slide was activated. Subsequent rain cause further activation of the landslide. Further widening is necessary according to the new highway design.

Ground water regime management and geometry modification are the two primary approaches used in enhancing the safety margins of the site. Surface and subsurface drainage improvement by various methods such as; cutoff drains, berm drains, trench drains and horizontal drains were introduced for lowering the ground water table. The stability of the steep cuts necessary to accommodate the increased road width was enhanced further by the use of soil nailing. Top down approach was adopted to ensure the safety of the slope during construction. Drainage measures were very effective in economizing the soil nailing design. The analysis and design of stabilizing measures were done using GeoStudio Seep/W and Slope/W software.

Design outcomes were confirmed by monitoring of ground water table and surface movements of the slope.

Key Words - Landslide, Stabilization, Drainage Improvement, Reinforcement, Monitoring

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

First and foremost, I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my supervisor, Prof. Athula Kulathilaka, Professor at Civil Engineering Department of University of Moratuwa, for his great insights, perspectives, guidance and dedication. The numerous comments, criticisms and suggestions he made, based on his deep insight and vast experience in the field of geotechnical engineering, contributed greatly to the success of this work. My sincere thanks go to the Dr. L.I.N. De Silva as the course coordinator and all the academic staff of Geotechnical Engineering: Prof. U.G.A. Puswewala, Dr. U.P. Nawagamuwa and Dr. (Mrs.) A.S. Ranathunga for helping in various ways to clarify the issues related to my academic works in time with excellent cooperation and guidance. Also my sincere gratitude is also extended to the people who serve in the Soil Mechanics Laboratory in Department of Civil Engineering, University of Moratuwa.

I should really pay my sincere gratitude to Eng. (Dr) W.A. Karunawardena, Director General of National Building Research Organization (NBRO), for his guidance and continuous support throughout the masters. It is my obligation to acknowledge the commitment and continues support given in every possible ways by Eng. P.R.C. Ariyarathne, In charge of Design Unit of NBRO and all the other colleague of Design Unit of NBRO. I should extend my sincere gratitude to Mr. R.M.S. Bandara, Director, Landslide Research and Risk Management Division (LRRMD) and all the staff of NBRO for their support.

I would like to thank Mr. U.K.N.P. Dharmasena, Senior Engineer (Construction) of CRIP-Road Project for his support throughout the project period. Assistance received from Mr. Prasad Dharmasena, Technical Officer for help given in monitoring.

Last but not least, I would like to personally thank my wife Hasitha Madhubhashini for the valuable advices, guidance, encouragement and specially for sacrificing lot of things for my success. I also like to thank my Mother, Brother for helping me all the possible ways they could.

S.O.A.D. Mihira Lakruwan 21st August 2019

TABLE OF CONTENT

DECLA	ARATION I
ABSTR	RACTII
ACKN	OWLEDGMENTS III
TABLE	E OF CONTENT IV
LIST O	OF FIGURESVII
LIST O	DF TABLES XI
CHAP	FER 1 - INTRODUCTION1
1.1	Background1
1.2	Basic description of the landslide2
1.3	Conceptual design of the rectification and monitoring3
1.1	Scope and objectives of the thesis4
1.2	Thesis outline5
CHAP	FER 2 - LITERATURE REVIEW
2.1	Landslides in Sri Lanka6
2.1.1	Introduction
2.1.2	Classification of landslides7
2.1.3	Landslide situation in Sri Lanka9
2.2	Assessment of slope stability11
2.2.1	Factor of Safety11
2.2.2	Deterministic methods for stability analysis15
2.2.3	Finding of critical failure surface17
2.2.4	Stability analysis with SLOPE/W (GEO-SLOPE International Ltd., 2017)18
2.3	Seepage analysis19
2.3.1	Requirement of seepage analysis
2.3.2	Saturated and unsaturated condition of soils
2.3.3	Hydraulic properties of unsaturated soil
2.3.4	Process of infiltration

2.3.5	Determination of characteristics of unsaturated soils in Sri Lanka	22
2.3.6	Seepage analysis with SEEP/W - (GEOSLOPE International Ltd., 2017)	24
2.3.7	Modeling with SEEP/W	25
2.3.8	Coupled analysis of SEEP/W and SLOPE/W	28
2.4	Design of mitigation measures / slope strengthening measures	
2.4.1	Drainage improvement	30
2.4.2	Use of earth retaining structures	35
2.5	Combine effect of drainage improvement and soil nailing	
2.6	Case histories	
2.6.1	Rectification of Watawala landslide	39
2.6.2	Rectification of Badulusirigama landslide	41
2.6.3	Rectification of failure at Welipenna on Southern Expressway	43
2.6.4	Rectification of failures at Kandy - Mahiyangana road	44
2.6.5	Rectification of valley failure on Sothern Expressway Extension	46
2.7	Concluding comments	47
СНАР	TER 3 - BACKGROUND OF THE FAILURE, DETAIL INVESTIG	ΑΤΙΟΝ
	IERS - DICKOROULD OF THE FILLORE, DETHE INVESTIG	AHUN,
-	EN OF MITIGATION MEASURES AND MONITORING	,
-		49
DESIG	IN OF MITIGATION MEASURES AND MONITORING	
DESIG 3.1	IN OF MITIGATION MEASURES AND MONITORING	49 49 49
DESIG 3.1 3.1.1	EN OF MITIGATION MEASURES AND MONITORING Reactivation of the Ginigathhena landslide Background	49 49 52
DESIG 3.1 3.1.1 3.1.2	EN OF MITIGATION MEASURES AND MONITORING Reactivation of the Ginigathhena landslide Background Geological and hydrological features	49 49 52 54
DESIG 3.1 3.1.1 3.1.2 3.1.3	EN OF MITIGATION MEASURES AND MONITORING Reactivation of the Ginigathhena landslide Background Geological and hydrological features Mechanism of failure	
DESIG 3.1 3.1.1 3.1.2 3.1.3 3.2	EN OF MITIGATION MEASURES AND MONITORING Reactivation of the Ginigathhena landslide Background Geological and hydrological features Mechanism of failure Conceptual design of rectification measures	
DESIG 3.1 3.1.1 3.1.2 3.1.3 3.2 3.3	EN OF MITIGATION MEASURES AND MONITORING Reactivation of the Ginigathhena landslide Background Geological and hydrological features Mechanism of failure Conceptual design of rectification measures Detail investigation for the design of rectification measures	
DESIG 3.1 3.1.1 3.1.2 3.1.3 3.2 3.3 3.3.1	EN OF MITIGATION MEASURES AND MONITORING Reactivation of the Ginigathhena landslide Background Geological and hydrological features Mechanism of failure Conceptual design of rectification measures Detail investigation for the design of rectification measures Topographical survey	
DESIG 3.1 3.1.1 3.1.2 3.1.3 3.2 3.3 3.3.1 3.3.2	EN OF MITIGATION MEASURES AND MONITORING Reactivation of the Ginigathhena landslide Background Geological and hydrological features Mechanism of failure Conceptual design of rectification measures Detail investigation for the design of rectification measures Topographical survey Field investigation	
DESIG 3.1 3.1.1 3.1.2 3.1.3 3.2 3.3 3.3.1 3.3.2 3.3.3	AN OF MITIGATION MEASURES AND MONITORING Reactivation of the Ginigathhena landslide Background Background Geological and hydrological features Mechanism of failure Conceptual design of rectification measures Detail investigation for the design of rectification measures Topographical survey Field investigation Laboratory testing	
DESIG 3.1 3.1.1 3.1.2 3.1.3 3.2 3.3 3.3.1 3.3.2 3.3.3 3.3.4	Reactivation of the Ginigathhena landslide	49 49 52 54 54 56 56 57 59 60 62
DESIG 3.1 3.1.1 3.1.2 3.1.3 3.2 3.3 3.3.1 3.3.2 3.3.3 3.3.4 3.4	AN OF MITIGATION MEASURES AND MONITORING Reactivation of the Ginigathhena landslide Background Geological and hydrological features. Mechanism of failure Conceptual design of rectification measures Detail investigation for the design of rectification measures Topographical survey. Field investigation Laboratory testing Development of subsoil profile Design of rectification measures	

3.4.4	Modification of slope geometry	70
3.4.5	Reinforcing the slope	71
3.5	Field monitoring	74
СНАРТ	TER 4 - STUDY OF THE BEHAVIOR OF RECTIFIED S	LOPE UNDER
CRITIC	CAL RAINFALL	75
4.1	Computer software for seepage analysis	75
4.1.1	Developing the SEEP/W model	75
4.1.2	Model verification	79
4.2	Analysis the response of the slope to critical rainfall	82
4.2.1	Rainfall	
4.2.2	Drainage improvement and initial ground water level	
4.2.3	Reshaping and reinforcement of the slope	85
4.3	Summary of types of analyses done	
4.3.1	Effect of drainage improvement on ground water regime	
4.4	Effect of drainage and reinforcement on slope stability	91
4.4.1	Construction Stage 1	
4.4.2	Construction Stage 2	94
4.4.3	Construction Stage 3	97
4.4.4	Summary of the stability analyses	
4.5	Economizing the nailing design by drainage improvement	
4.5.1	Without any drainage measures	101
4.5.2	With surface drainage only	
4.5.3	Cost comparison	
4.3.2	Importance of the staged construction	
СНАРТ	TER 5 - CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	
REFER	ENCES	109
ANNEX	X A - INVESTIGATION	110

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1.1 : Geology Map of Sri Lanka (Cooray, 1984)1
Figure 2.1 : Example of FoS variation with time (Popescu, 2002)7
Figure 2.2 : Rotational Slides (British Geological Survey, 2019)
Figure 2.3 : Translational Slides (British Geological Survey, 2019)
Figure 2.4 : Distribution of Landslides in Sri Lanka (Bandara & Jayasingha, 2018)10
Figure 2.5 : Number of Deaths due to Landslides (Bandara & Jayasingha, 2018)10
Figure 2.6 : Forces during Landslide Movement (Rotaru, et al., 2007)13
Figure 2.7 : Saturated and Unsaturated Zones of Soil (Belciu, et al., 2017)19
Figure 2.8 : Idealized Soil-Water Characteristic Curve (Fredlund & Rahardjo, 1993)21
Figure 2.9 : Hydraulic Conductivity vs Matric Suction – Sandy Silt (Vasanthan, 2016)23
Figure 2.10 : SWCC for Silty Sand form Various Methods (Vasanthan, 2016)24
Figure 2.11 : SEEP/W Model with Boundary Condition (Sujeevan & Kulathilaka, 2011)26
Figure 2.12 : Results of Case 1 _ Section 1-1 (Sujeevan & Kulathilaka, 2011)27
Figure 2.13:- Results of Case 3 _ Section 1-1 (Sujeevan & Kulathilaka, 2011)27
Figure 2.14 : Critical Failure Surface at Dry Condition (Kulathilaka & Sujeevan, 2011)28
Figure 2.15 : Critical Failure Surface at Wet Condition (Kulathilaka & Sujeevan, 2011)29
Figure 2.16 : Variation of FoS with Duration of Rainfall (Kulathilaka & Sujeevan, 2011)29
Figure 2.17 : Results of Case 1 _ Section 1-1 (Kulathilaka & Kumara, 2013)31
Figure 2.18 : Variation of FoS with Duration of Rainfall (Kulathilaka & Kumara, 2013)32
Figure 2.19 : Failure at Welipenna on Southern Expressway (Idirimanna, 2016)33
Figure 2.20 : FoS Variation with Time (Idirimanna, 2016)
Figure 2.21 : Perforated Pipe for HD (National Building Research Organisation, 2016)34
Figure 2.22 : Arrangement of HD (National Building Research Organisation, 2016)34
Figure 2.23 : Soil nailing system (GEO, Hong Kong, 2008)
Figure 2.24 : Forces on Potential Failure Mass (Kulathilaka & Mettananda, 2002)37
Figure 2.25 : Watawala Landslide after Failure (Rajaratnam & Bhandari, 1994)40
Figure 2.26 : Slip Surface of Watawala Landslide (Rajaratnam & Bhandari, 1994)40
Figure 2.27 : Mitigation Measures of Watawala Landslide (Rajaratnam & Bhandari, 1994).41
Figure 2.28 : Cross Section through the Landslide (Amada, 2016)41
Figure 2.29 : Plan View of Mitigation Measures of Badulusirigama (Amada, 2016)42

Figure 2.30 : Mitigation Measures of Welipenna Landslide (Idirimanna, 2016)	44
Figure 2.31 : Failure at Welipenna on Southern Expressway (Idirimanna, 2016)	44
Figure 2.32 : Kandy – Mahiyangana Road Location 08	45
Figure 2.33 : Soil Nailing and Facing with Shotcreting and Vegetation	46
Figure 2.34 : Mitigation Measures with Soil Nailing and Facing with Individual Pill	OWS
Connected by High Tensile Wire Mesh, and Vegetation	46
Figure 2.35 : Failure at 41 km on Southern Expressway Extension	47
Figure 3.1 : Location Map	49
Figure 3.2 : Landslide on June 2014 (National Building Research Organisation, 2014)	50
Figure 3.3 : Ginigathhena Landslide Body	51
Figure 3.4 : Landslide Body (National Building Research Organisation, 2014)	51
Figure 3.5 : Exposed bedrock (National Building Research Organisation, 2014)	53
Figure 3.6 : Water Log at Marshy Area (National Building Research Organisation, 2014).	53
Figure 3.7 : Streams in Marshy Land (National Building Research Organisation, 2014)	54
Figure 3.8 : Survey Map (National Building Research Organisation, 2016)	57
Figure 3.9 : Boreholes Locations Map and Cross Section	
Figure 3.10: Subsoil Profile (National Building Research Organisation, 2014)	61
Figure 3.11 : SLOPE/W Model Developed	64
Figure 3.12 : Stability of the Natural Slope Prior to and Excavation	66
Figure 3.13 : Stability of the Slope after Excavation	67
Figure 3.14 : Stability of the Slope after First Failure	67
Figure 3.15 : Stability of the Slope after Second Failure	67
Figure 3.16 : Plan view of proposed mitigation measures	69
Figure 3.17 : Detail of surface and trench drain	69
Figure 3.18 : Slope Stability Analysis – Geometry Modification with High GWT	70
Figure 3.19 : Slope Stability Analysis – Geometry Modification with Low GWT	71
Figure 3.20 : Slope Stability Analysis of Nailing System with High GWT	72
Figure 3.21 : Slope Stability Analysis of Nailing System with Low GWT	73
Figure 3.22 : Cross section of proposed mitigation measures	73
Figure 4.1 : SWCC used for the Analysis (Vasanthan, 2016)	77
Figure 4.2 : Hydraulic Conductivity Function used for the Analysis (Vasanthan, 2016)	78

Figure 4.3 : Slope Geometry with Sub Soil Profile and Boundary Conditions	.79
Figure 4.4 : Daily Rainfall Record form 18th May 2018 to 06th June 2018	.80
Figure 4.5 : Rainfall Pattern used for Model Verification	.80
Figure 4.6 : SEEP/W Model Verification	.81
Figure 4.7 : Critical Rainfall Pattern for the Analyses	.82
Figure 4.8 : Water Levels Comparison between Investigation and Field Monitoring	.83
Figure 4.9 : Initial Ground Water Level for the Analysis without Trench Drains	.84
Figure 4.10 : Initial Ground Water Level for the Analysis with Trench Drains	.84
Figure 4.11 : Construction Stage 1	.85
Figure 4.12 : Construction Stage 2	.86
Figure 4.13 : Construction Stage 3	.86
Figure 4.14 : Ground Water Regime with No Drains	.87
Figure 4.15 : Ground Water Regime with Surface Drains	.88
Figure 4.16 : Ground Water Regime with Surface and Subsurface Drains	.88
Figure 4.17 : Pore-Pressure Distribution at Section A-B with No Drains	.89
Figure 4.18 : Pore-Pressure Distribution at Section C-D with No Drains	.89
Figure 4.19 : Pore-Pressure Distribution at Section A-B with Surface Drains	.89
Figure 4.20 : Pore-Pressure Distribution at Section C-D with Surface Drains	.89
Figure 4.21 : Pore-Pressure Distribution at Section A-B with Surface & Subsurface Drains	.91
Figure 4.22 : Pore-Pressure Distribution at Section C-D with Surface & Subsurface Drains	.91
Figure 4.23 : Analysis without Drains and without Nails – Stage 1	.92
Figure 4.24 : Analysis with only Surface Drains and without Nails – Stage 1	.92
Figure 4.25 : Analysis with Surface & Subsurface Drains and without Nails – Stage 1	.92
Figure 4.26 : Analysis with Surface & Subsurface Drains and with Nails – Stage 1	.92
Figure 4.27 : Minimum FoS Variation at Construction Stage 1	.93
Figure 4.28 : Analysis without Drains and without Nails – Stage 2	.95
Figure 4.29 : Analysis with only Surface Drains and without Nails – Stage 2	.95
Figure 4.30 : Analysis with Surface & Subsurface Drains and without Nails - Stage 2	.95
Figure 4.31 : Analysis with Surface & Subsurface Drains and with Nails – Stage 2	.95
Figure 4.32 : Minimum FoS Variation at Construction Stage 2	.96
Figure 4.33 : Analysis without Drains and without Nails – Stage 3	.98

Figure 4.34 : Analysis with only Surface Drains and without Nails – Stage 3	98
Figure 4.35 : Analysis with Surface & Subsurface Drains and without Nails – Stage 3	98
Figure 4.36 : Analysis with Surface & Subsurface Drains and with Nails – Stage 3	98
Figure 4.37 : Minimum FoS Variation at Construction Stage 3	99
Figure 4.38 : Implemented Soil Nailing Design with No Drainage Improvement	101
Figure 4.39 : Required Soil Nailing to Achieve Sufficient FoS with No Drainage	102
Figure 4.40 : Implemented Soil Nailing Design with Surface Drainage Improvement	103
Figure 4.41 : Required Soil Nailing to Achieve Sufficient FoS with Surface Drainage	103
Figure 4.42 : Minimum values of minimum FoS at each Construction Stage	105

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1: Recommended Factor of Safety (GEO, Hong Kong, 1984)	14
Table 2.2 : Comparison of the Slope Stability Analysis Methods (Duncan & Wright, 198	30) 17
Table 2.3 : Parameters Required for SEEP/W Analysis	24
Table 3.1 : Borehole Locations	58
Table 3.2 : Boreholes Termination Details	59
Table 3.3 : Summary of Index Test Results	59
Table 3.4 : Summary of Ground Condition	60
Table 3.5 : Sol Parameters Used for the Analysis	63
Table 3.6 : FoS of back analysis	66
Table 3.7 : Nail Pullout Resistance	72
Table 4.1 : Comparison of Ginigathhena Soil Index Properties with Vasanthan (2016)	77
Table 4.2 : Summary of the Types of Analysis Carried Out	87
Table 4.3 : Summary of FoS	100
Table 4.4 : Construction Cost Comparison for Different Drainage Measures	104