

**INFLUENCE OF MATRIC SUCTION ON PULLOUT
RESISTANCE OF SOIL NAILS**

Paranthaman Rajeevkaran

178048G

Degree of Master of Science

Department of Civil Engineering

University of Moratuwa

Sri Lanka

November 2018

INFLUENCE OF MATRIC SUCTION ON PULLOUT RESISTANCE OF SOIL NAILS

Paranthaman Rajeevkarar

178048G

Thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Science

Department of Civil Engineering

University of Moratuwa

Sri Lanka

November 2018

DECLARATION

I declare that this is my own work and this thesis/dissertation 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)

Signature:

Date:

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

Name of the Supervisor:

Signature of the Supervisor:

Date:

ABSTRACT

Soil nailing is a widely used slope stabilisation technique using the passive intrusions-soil nails. Soil nail is a reinforcement bar encased within a grouted borehole without any pre-tensioning. When the soil mass attempts to move down, a tensile forces mobilized in the intercepted nails will enhance the shear resistance by increasing the normal stress along the potential failure surface while reducing the shear stress to be mobilized for equilibrium. This enhances the factor of safety.

The tensile force developed on reinforced bar depends on tensile capacity of the bar and pull-out resistance at the soil-grout interface. The contribution of matric suction in pull-out capacity of soil nails is often neglected in conventional design formulae to make it conservative. But most of the soil nails are installed in unsaturated region of soil and significant matric suctions would prevail.

This paper investigates the influence of matric suction on pull-out resistance of soil nails. To ensure uniform conditions the nails were installed in a soil mass compacted under controlled laboratory condition in a test box with dimensions of 1.30 m × 1.08 m × 0.90 m. In this study, four soil nails were installed at an inclination of 5° to the horizontal. The pull-out capacity of soil nails measured under different matric suctions and overburden pressures were compared with the values estimated using the design formulae. The matric suctions varied by controlled wetting were monitored by tensiometers. A good agreement is found between the estimated and measured pull-out capacities and the influence of matric suction on the pull-out resistance was found to be very significant. The numerical analysis performed with Plaxis 2D justified the results obtained.

Keywords: Pull-out resistance, tensiometer, soil nail, matric suction, unsaturated soil, Plaxis 2D

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

To achieve a successful completion of this pullout study, author's supervisor Prof. S.A.S. Kulathilaka took a lot of effort, helped in whatever difficulties faced. Heartiest gratitude extended to him for guiding the author on the correct path throughout this period.

Special thanks is extended to Eng. Mr. Lilanka kankanamge from National Building Research Organisation (NBRO), for his support and guidance in installation and testing of tensiometer in soil mass.

A gratitude is expressed to Manager and employees of ELS Pvt (Ltd.) (Engineering Laboratory Services Pvt Ltd.) for their support in installation and testing of soil nails (pullout resistance).

Thanks is expressed to the non- academic staff of the department of civil engineering, university of Moratuwa Mr.K.R.Pitipanaarachchi, Mr.D.G.S.Vithanage, Mr.M. Ajith Piyasiri and Mrs. S.D.P.K.Peiris who helped, in the experimental study in different ways.

All instruments required for this research study was provided by the department of civil engineering University of Moratuwa.The funding provided by senate research committee for this study is highly acknowledged.

The support provided by Author's father, mother and sister has been very meaningful and invaluable to whom I dedicate this thesis.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Declaration.....	i
Abstract.....	ii
Acknowledgements	iii
Table of content.....	iv
List of Figures	vii
List of Tables.....	x
List of Abbreviations.....	xi
CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 Background.....	1
1.2 Objective.....	2
1.3 Scope of the research.....	2
1.4 Outline of the thesis.....	3
CHAPTER 2 LITERATURE REVIEW.....	5
2.1 Development of Soil Nailing Technique.....	5
2.2 Soil Nailing Construction Procedure.....	6
2.3 Pull-out Behavior of Soil Nails.....	7
2.4 Factors that Affect the Pullout Resistance of Soil Nails.....	7
2.4.1 Effect of dilatancy.....	8
2.4.2 Effects of method of installation.....	9
2.4.3 Effect of soil type.....	9
2.4.4 Influence of overburden pressure.....	10
2.4.5 Effect of grouting pressure.....	12
2.4.6 Effect of matric suction.....	13
2.5 Estimation of Pullout Capacity.....	19
2.6 Numerical Modelling of Soil Nail Pullout Resistance.....	20
CHAPTER 3 EQUIPMENT DESIGN.....	22
3.1 Test box used for soil nail pullout test.....	22
3.2 Drilling and installation of soil nails.....	24
3.3 Instrumentation.....	27
3.3.1 Tensiometers.....	28
3.3.1.1 Preparation of tensiometers.....	30
3.3.2 Force sensitive resistor calibration (FSR).....	30
CHAPTER 4 TESTING PROGRAM AND RESULTS.....	33

4.1	Basic Laboratory tests.....	33
4.1.1	Particle size analysis.....	33
4.1.2	Plastic characteristics of soil.....	34
4.1.3	Compaction test (standard Proctor test).....	34
4.1.4	Specific gravity test.....	35
4.1.5	Summary of the properties of the tested soil.....	35
4.2	Direct shear test.....	36
4.2.1	Direct shear test at different matric suction.....	36
4.2.2	Interface direct shear test at saturated state.....	37
	4.2.2.1 Preparation of test specimen for interface direct shear.....	37
	4.2.2.2 Evaluation of Effective Shear Strength Parameters c' and • ϕ'	38
4.2.3	Interface shear test at as compacted condition of matric suction 40 kPa.....	39
4.2.4	Direct shear tests to estimate the strength reduction factor.....	41
4.3	Compaction of soil mass in test box.....	43
4.4	Grout cube test.....	44
4.5	Performance of pullout test.....	44
4.5.1	Pullout testing near saturated state.....	45
4.5.2	Pullout testing at higher suction (Unsaturated state). ..	46
4.5.3	Estimation of average matric suction value.....	46
4.5.4	Measurement of vertical overburden pressure with FSR during pullout.....	47
4.6	Complete Pullout of soil nails.....	48
CHAPTER 5	STIMULATION OF SOIL NAIL PULLOUT RESISTANCE USING FINITE ELEMENT MODEL.....	49
5.1	Introduction.....	49
5.2	Finite element mesh and boundary conditions.....	50
5.3	Constitutive models, model parameters and modelling Procedures.....	50
5.4	Simulation of soil nail model.....	52
CHAPTER 6	DISCUSSION OF THE TEST RESULTS.....	55

6.1	Introduction.....	55
6.2	Interpretation of the test results.....	55
6.2.1	Interpretation of the measured pullout resistance.....	55
6.2.2	Creep test results.....	57
6.2.3	Effective diameter of the soil nails.....	57
6.2.4	Strength reduction factor determination.....	57
6.2.5	Comparison of pullout with direct shear tests at saturated state.....	58
6.3	Estimation of pullout resistance.....	59
6.3.1	Equation proposed by Schlosser and Guilloux (1981).	60
6.3.2	Equation proposed by Chu and Yin (2005).....	60
6.3.3	Equation proposed by Zhang et al. (2009).....	60
6.3.4	Equation proposed by Gurbarsud et al. (2011).....	61
6.3.5	Conventional formula.....	62
6.3.6	Estimated pull-out capacity using equations available in the literature.....	63
6.3.7	Estimation of pullout resistance with interface shear strength parameters at matric suction of 40 kPa.....	65
CHAPTER 7	CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION.....	67
REFERENCES.....		69

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 2.1	Procedure adopted in the soil nail wall construction in a natural soil slope.....	6
Figure 2.2	Relationship of the average pull-out stress with (a) pull-out displacement and (b) dilation angle (Su et al., 2007).....	9
Figure 2.3	Comparision between the measured and stimulated relationships of average pullout shear stress and pullout displacement under different overburden pressures.....	11
Figure 2.4	The variation of measured pullout capacity with depth.....	11
Figure 2.5	(a) Peak shear stress, shear stress at displacement of 100 mm, and shear stress at displacement of 200 mm plotted against grouting pressure with the same $VP = 80$ kPa and $S_r = 50\%$ and (b) peak shear stress, at displacement of 100 mm, and shear stress at displacement of 200 mm plotted against grouting pressure with the same $VP = 200$ kPa and $S_r = 50\%$	13
Figure 2.6	Interface shear strength corresponding to different grouting pressures under different suctions.....	13
Figure 2.7	Relationships between shear strength with matric suction....	14
Figure 2.8	Relationships between Degree of saturation with matric suction.....	15
Figure 2.9	Typical pore-water pressure profile.....	16
Figure 2.10	Gurpersaud (2010) experimental result on variation of pullout capacity with matric suction.....	17
Figure 3.1	Complete test box arrangement with dimensions.....	22
Figure 3.2	Influence zone on test box following the suggestion of Zhou et al. (2011).....	23
Figure 3.3	Complete experimental arrangement of the test box used in the study.....	24
Figure 3.4	(a) Drilling of hole for soil nail installation (b) Test box after drilling (c) Drilled hole.....	25
Figure 3.5	(a) The apparatus used for pressure grouting (b) The process of grouting.....	26
Figure 3.6	Soil nails with two centralizers.....	26
Figure 3.7	Pullout test arrangement.....	27

Figure 3.8	Instruments Used in the Study.....	27
Figure 3.9	Arrangement before pullout testing.....	28
Figure 3.10	KU tensiometer.....	29
Figure 3.11	Operating principle of HAE ceramic cup (Lu and Likos, 2004).....	29
Figure 3.12	Equipments used for de-airing.....	30
Figure 3.13	Extract from the coding of FSR manual.....	30
Figure 3.14	Experimental arrangement for the Calibration of FSR.....	31
Figure 3.15	Fsr measured force versus time plot.....	32
Figure 3.16	Plot to determine suitable dividing factor for FSR.....	32
Figure 4.1	Combined wet sieve and hydrometer analysis.....	33
Figure 4.2	Variation of moisture content Vs. no of blows.....	34
Figure 4.3	Standard proctor curve.....	35
Figure 4.4	Variation of measured apparent cohesion with matric suction (Dilanthi et al., 2018).....	36
Figure 4.5	(a) The grout cube used in the interface test (b) The applied grout to the cube (c) The grout penetration zone.....	38
Figure 4.6	Shear stress Vs horizontal displacement curves.....	38
Figure 4.7	Shear stress Vs normal stress at failure.....	39
Figure 4.8	Matric suction variation during shearing.....	40
Figure 4.9	Shear stress Vs horizontal displacement curves.....	40
Figure 4.10	Shear stress Vs normal stress at failure.....	41
Figure 4.11	(a) Direct shear at saturated state and normal pressure of 30 kPa (b) Direct shear at saturated state and normal pressure of 60 kPa.....	42
Figure 4.12	(a) Modified hammer (b) Modified core cutter.....	43
Figure 4.13	Pull-out at an overburden pressure of 30 kPa with a matric suction of 7.67 kPa.....	45
Figure 4.14	Pull-out at an overburden pressure of 60 kPa with a matric suction of 2.4 kPa.....	45
Figure 4.15	Pull-out at overburden pressure of 30 kPa with a matric suction of 46kPa.....	46
Figure 4.16	Pull-out at overburden pressure of 60 kPa with a matric suction of 43 kPa.....	46

Figure 4.17	(a) FSR reading at an applied overburden pressure of 30 kPa (b) FSR reading at an applied overburden pressure of 60 kPa.....	47
Figure 4.18	Completely pulled out soil nails.....	48
Figure 5.1	Axisymmetric finite element model.....	50
Figure 5.2	Complete model of soil nail Pullout.....	52
Figure 5.3	The developed axial force in the nail after the simulation at (a) $(U_a-U_w)=2.4$ kPa and $\sigma_v = 60$ kPa (b) $(U_a-U_w) = 7.67$ kPa and $\sigma_v = 30$ kPa (c) $(U_a-U_w)=43$ kPa and $\sigma_v = 60$ kPa (d) $(U_a-U_w)=46$ kPa and $\sigma_v = 30$ kPa.....	53
Figure 5.4	Variation of axial load with displacement from the results of the current study.....	54
Figure 6.1	Measured pullout capacity under different overburden pressures.....	56
Figure 6.2	Measured pullout capacity at different matric suctions.....	56
Figure 6.3	Comparison pullout test with direct shear test at 30 kPa.....	58
Figure 6.4	Comparison pullout test with direct shear test at 60 kPa.....	59
Figure 6.5	Comparison of the estimated and measured results for the soil nails.....	63
Figure 6.6	Comparison of results of Gurbarsud et al. (2011) and finite element analysis output with measured capacity.....	65

List of Tables

Table 2.1	Design assumptions of soil nailing methodologies.....	5
Table 2.2	The proposed formulae to estimate the pull-out capacity of soil nails	19
Table 3.1	Depicting the calculation.....	32
Table 4.1	Summary of the soil characteristics.....	35
Table 4.2	Unsaturated parameters obtained from the direct shear tests for high plastic silt.....	36
Table 4.3	Interface strength parameters at saturated state	39
Table 4.4	Interface shear strength parameters at matric suction of 40 kPa.....	41
Table 4.5	Summary of the failure shear strength.....	42
Table 4.6	Compaction results.....	43
Table 4.7	Percentage increase in diameter of the grouted nails.....	48
Table 5.1	Summary of the shear strength values at different suction.....	51
Table 5.2	Soil parameters used for the simulation.....	51
Table 5.3	Finite element Pullout analysis results.....	54
Table 6.1	Measured pullout resistance under different conditions.....	55
Table 6.2	Nail displacement at 6 and 60 minutes at 0.75 Design load.....	57
Table 6.3	Strength reduction factor at saturated state.....	58
Table 6.4	Summary of the results obtained by using the different equations.....	63
Table 6.5	Estimated value compared to measured pullout in percentage	64
Table 6.6	Estimated results obtained from modified conventional formula.....	66

List of abbreviations

Abbreviations	Description
FSR	Force Sensitive Resistor
FHWA	Federal Highway Administration
CDG	Completely Decomposed Granite
GFRP	Glass Fibre Reinforced Polymer
FEM	Finite Element Model
VP	Vertical Pressure
SWCC	Soil Water Characteristic Curve
MEMs	Micro Electro Mechanical Systems
ASTM	American Society for Testing and Materials
DL	Design Load
GWT	Ground Water Table
USCS	Unified Soil Classification System