

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 General	1
1.2 Research Scope and Objectives	2
1.3 Thesis Outline.....	3
LITERATURE REVIEW	5
2.1 Introduction	5
2.2 Characteristics of Soft Clay	6
2.2.1 Deformation parameter	7
2.2.2 Shear Strength	10
2.2.3 Soil Compressibility	10
2.3 Deep Excavation shoring system	12
2.3.1 Types of In-situ walls	13
2.3.2 Types of Wall Support.....	18
2.4 Stability of Supported Excavation.....	19
2.5 Earth Pressure Calculation.....	22
2.5.1 Rankine's Theory	23
2.5.2 Peck's Diagrams.....	26
2.6 Pervious Works for Predicting Wall and Ground Movement.....	27
NUMERICAL MODELING	37
3.1 Introduction	37
3.2 Methods of Analysis	37
3.3 Finite Element Method	38

3.3.1 Analysis Sequence of finite element method	38
3.3.2 Elements Types	39
3.3.3 Different Methods of Modeling	42
3.4 Material Modeling Basics	43
3.4.1 Stresses	44
3.4.2 Strains	45
3.5 Constitutive Material Models	46
3.5.1 Linear Elastic Constitutive Law	47
3.5.2 Non-linear Elastic Constitutive Laws	47
3.5.3 Elasto-plastic Constitutive Laws	48
3.5.4 Elasto-visco plasticity Constitutive Laws	54
3.6 Applied Constitutive Modeling of Soil Materials	55
3.6.1 Hardening soil model (HSM)	55
3.6.2 Soft soil model (SSM)	65
3.6.3 Linear elastic model	71
3.7 Numerical Model	71
3.7.1 Geometry and boundary conditions of the model	71
3.7.2 Types of Elements	72
3.7.3 Interface Element	74
3.7.4 Generation of Finite Element Mesh	75
3.7.5 Generation of Initial Stresses and Water Pressure	76
3.7.6 Calculation phases	77
FINITE ELEMENT MODEL VERIFICATION	75

4.1 Introduction	75
4.2 Case Study	76
4.2.1 Project Description	76
4.2.2 Soil Conditions	79
4.2.3 Field and Laboratory Test Result	82
4.2.4 Field Measurements	86
4.3 Back Analysis of the Case Study	96
4.3.1 Soil Parameters.....	97
4.3.2 Model Geometry	115
4.4 Comparison between Back Analysis Results and Field Measurements	118
4.4.1 Lateral Deformation of Shoring System.....	119
4.4.2 Settlement of Adjacent Buildings	139
PERFORMANCE OF SHORING SYSTEM.....	143
5.1 Introduction	143
5.2 Assumptions of Typical Section.....	143
5.3 Effect of Foundation Piles.....	144
5.4 Effect of Adjacent Loads	146
5.5 Comparison with Previous Works.....	147
5.5.1 Peck (1969)	147
5.5.2 Clough and O'Rourke (1990)	149
5.5.3 Ou et al (1993)	151
5.5.4 Hsieh and Ou (1998)	153
5.5.5 Phienweij and Gan (2003)	154

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS.....	157
6.1 Summary	157
6.2 Conclusions.....	158
6.3 Suggestions for Future Research	159
REFERENCES	160

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 2.1 – Schematic diagram of stress strain behavior of soils	8
Figure 2.2 – Change of vertical effective stress excess pore pressure.....	11
Figure 2.3 – Compression and unloaded – reloaded indices as a function of plasticity index (After Kulhawy and Mayne 1990)	12
Figure 2.4 – Schematic drawing for berlin walls.....	14
Figure 2.5 – Steel sheet piles	15
Figure 2.6 – Types of pile wall.....	16
Figure 2.7 – Common types of wall support schemes. (After Kempfert and Gebreselassie, 2006)	19
Figure 2.8 – Common types of failures in supported excavations. (After Kempfert and Gebreselassie, 2006)	21
Figure 2.9 – Section through open cut in deposit of soft clay. (After Terzaghi, 1943) ..	21
Figure 2.10 – Development of active and passive earth pressures. (After Ou, 2006)	23
Figure 2.11 – Rankine active and passive earth pressures distributions for long term analysis. (After Ou, 2006)	24
Figure 2.12 – Rankine active and passive earth pressures distributions for short term analysis. (After Ou, 2006)	25
Figure 2.13 – Active and passive zones	26
Figure 2.14 – Apparent Pressure Envelopes: (a) Cuts in Sand; (b) Cuts in Soft to Medium Clay; and (c) Cuts in Stiff Clay (After Peck, 1969).....	27
Figure 2.15 – Summary of surface settlements adjacent to braced excavation in various soils (After Peck 1969).....	28

Figure 2.16 – Observed maximum horizontal deflection of wall for various wall types in stiff clays, residual soils and sands (After Clough and O’Rourke 1990)	29
Figure 2.17 – Observed maximum settlement adjacent to excavations (After Clough and O’Rourke 1990)	30
Figure 2.18 – Dimensionless settlement profiles recommended for estimating the distribution of settlement adjacent to excavations in different soil types (After Clough and O’Rourke 1990)	31
Figure 2.19 – Shape of “Spandrel” settlement profile (After Ou, 1993).	32
Figure 2.20 – Proposed Method for Predicting Concave Settlement Profile (After Hsieh and Ou, 1998).....	33
Figure 3.1 – Geotechnical methods of analysis (After Rao, 2005).....	38
Figure 3.2 – One dimensional element. (After Rao, 2005)	41
Figure 3.3 – Two dimensional elements. (After Rao, 2005)	41
Figure 3.4 – Three dimensional elements. (After Rao, 2005)	41
Figure 3.5 – Axisymmetric Elements. (After Rao, 2005)	41
Figure 3.6 – Finite Elements with Curved Boundaries. (After Rao, 2005).....	42
Figure 3.7 – Examples of axisymmetric problem.	43
Figure 3.8 – Examples of plane strain problem.	43
Figure 3.9 – Geometrical representation of the yield criterion in the principal stress space. (After Hill, 1950)	49
Figure 3.10 – Different yield criteria. (After Chen and Mccarron, 1986; Chen and Mizuno, 1990). (Cited in Kempfert and Gebreselassie, 2006).	50
Figure 3.11 – Associated flow rule. (After Atkinson, 1993)	52

Figure 3.12 – Schematic representation of the yield surface, and the flow rule. (After Kempfert and Gebreselassie, 2006)	52
Figure 3.13 – Perfect plasticity model. (After Brinkgreve, 2002).....	53
Figure 3.14 – Isotropic hardening rule. (After Chakrabarty, 2006).....	54
Figure 3.15 – Kinematic hardening rule. (After Chakrabarty, 2006)	54
Figure 3.16 – Hyperbolic stress-strain relationship in primary loading for a standard drained triaxial test. (After Brinkgreve, 2002)	57
Figure 3.17 – Successive yield loci for various constant values of the hardening parameter (γ_p). (After Brinkgreve, 2002)	59
Figure 3.18 – Yield surfaces of Hardening Soil model in p - q plane. The elastic region can be further reduced by means of a tension cut-off (After Brinkgreve, 2002).....	62
Figure 3.19 – Representation of total yield contour of the Hardening Soil model in principal stress space for cohesionless soil. (After Brinkgreve, 2002)	63
Figure 3.20 – Logarithmic relation between the volumetric strain and the mean effective stress. (After Brinkgreve, 2002).....	68
Figure 3.21 – Yield surface of the soft soil model in the p' - q plane. (After Brinkgreve, 2002).....	70
Figure 3.22 – Representation of total yield contour of the soft soil model in principal stress space. (After Brinkgreve, 2002)	71
Figure 3.23 – Geometry and boundary conditions of the model.	72
Figure 3.24 – Position of nodes and stress points in the 15-node soil element. (After Brinkgreve, 2002)	73
Figure 3.25 – Position of nodes and stress points in the 5-node beam element. (After Brinkgreve, 2002)	73

Figure 3.26 – Position of nodes and stress points in the 5-node geogrid element. (After Brinkgreve, 2002)	74
Figure 3.27 – Distribution of nodes and stress points in interface elements and their connection to soil elements. (After Brinkgreve, 2002)	75
Figure 4.1 – Location of the building.....	76
Figure 4.2 – Shoring wall cross section.	77
Figure 4.3 – Anchors details.	77
Figure 4.4 – Boreholes location.	80
Figure 4.5 – Soil profile of implemented boreholes.	80
Figure 4.6 – Soil profile used in Finite Element Modeling near the south wall.	81
Figure 4.7 – Soil profile used in Finite Element Modeling near the north wall.	81
Figure 4.8 – Plasticity index results.	82
Figure 4.9 – Standard penetration test results.	83
Figure 4.10 – Cone penetration test results.	83
Figure 4.11 – Pocket penetrometer results.	84
Figure 4.12 – Unconfined compression test results.	84
Figure 4.13 – Menard pressuremeter test results.	85
Figure 4.14 – Piezometers and well location.	86
Figure 4.15 – Location of the inclinometers and reference points.	87
Figure 4.16 – Stages of the excavation works.	88
Figure 4.17 – Results of inclinometer (1).....	89

Figure 4.18 – Results of inclinometer (2).....	89
Figure 4.19 – Results of inclinometer (3).....	90
Figure 4.20 – Results of inclinometer (4).....	90
Figure 4.21 – Lateral movements of the north reference points.....	91
Figure 4.22 – Vertical movements of the north reference points.	91
Figure 4.23 – Lateral movements of the south reference points.....	91
Figure 4.24 – Vertical movements of the south reference points.	92
Figure 4.25 – Location of reference points at the building front side.....	93
Figure 4.26 – Vertical displacement of upper reference points at the building front side.	93
Figure 4.27 – Vertical displacement of intermediate reference points at the building front side.	94
Figure 4.28 – Vertical displacement of lower reference points at the building front side.	94
Figure 4.29 – Location of reference points at back side of the building.....	95
Figure 4.30 – Vertical displacement of upper reference points at the building back side.	95
Figure 4.31 – Vertical displacement of lower reference points at the building back side.	96
Figure 4.32 – Corrected SPT results.	99
Figure 4.33 – Undrained cohesion calculated from SPT results.	99
Figure 4.34 – Friction angle calculated from SPT results.	100
Figure 4.35 – Lower boundary of c_u calculated from CPT results.....	101

Figure 4.36 – Upper boundary of c_u calculated from CPT results.	101
Figure 4.37 – Estimated values for friction angle (ϕ) according to CPT results. (Robertson and Campanella, 1983).....	102
Figure 4.38 – Unconfined compressive strength obtained from pocket penetrometer and unconfined compression test results.....	103
Figure 4.39 – Undrained cohesion calculated from pocket penetrometer and unconfined compression test results.	104
Figure 4.40 – Mohr’s circle of stress used to drive relation between undrained shear strength and drained shear parameters.	105
Figure 4.41 – Comparison between measured and computed c_u values.	105
Figure 4.42 – Stiffness modulus calculated from SPT results.	107
Figure 4.43 – Lower boundary of E calculated from CPT results.	108
Figure 4.44 – Upper boundary of E calculated from CPT results.	108
Figure 4.45 – Stiffness modulus calculated from menard pressuremeter results.	110
Figure 4.46 – Relation between E_u and c_u (After Duncan and Buchignani,1976).....	111
Figure 4.47 – Lower and upper boundary of E_u calculated from c_u	111
Figure 4.48 – Determination of coefficient of permeability by pumping from wells. ...	113
Figure 4.49 – Location of analyzed sections.	116
Figure 4.50 – Section (1).	117
Figure 4.51 – Section (2).	117
Figure 4.52 – Section (3).	117
Figure 4.53 – Section (4).	118

Figure 4.54 – Corrected results of inclinometer (1) on 30 th of August 2008.	120
Figure 4.55 – Corrected results of inclinometer (1) on 10 th of October 2008.	120
Figure 4.56 – Comparison between the horizontal deformations calculated using HSM and corrected inclinometer (1) results on 30 th of August 2008.	121
Figure 4.57 – Comparison between the horizontal deformations calculated using HSM and corrected inclinometer (1) results on 10 th of October 2008.	121
Figure 4.58 – Comparison between the horizontal deformations calculated using SSM and corrected inclinometer (1) results on 30 th of August 2008.	122
Figure 4.59 – Comparison between the horizontal deformations calculated using SSM and corrected inclinometer (1) results on 10 th of October 2008.	122
Figure 4.60 – Comparison between the best model from HSM and SSM analysis and corrected inclinometer (1) results on 30 th of August 2008.	123
Figure 4.61 – Comparison between the best model from HSM and SSM analysis and corrected inclinometer (1) results on 10 th of October 2008.	123
Figure 4.62 – Corrected results of inclinometer (2) on 30 th of August 2008.	125
Figure 4.63 – Corrected results of inclinometer (2) on 10 th of October 2008.	125
Figure 4.64 – Comparison between the horizontal deformations calculated using HSM and corrected inclinometer (2) results on 30 th of August 2008.	126
Figure 4.65 – Comparison between the horizontal deformations calculated using HSM and corrected inclinometer (2) results on 10 th of October 2008.	126
Figure 4.66 – Comparison between the horizontal deformations calculated using SSM and corrected inclinometer (2) results on 30 th of August 2008.	127
Figure 4.67 – Comparison between the horizontal deformations calculated using SSM and corrected inclinometer (2) results on 10 th of October 2008.	127

Figure 4.68 – Comparison between the best model from HSM and SSM analysis and corrected inclinometer (2) results on 30 th of August 2008.	128
Figure 4.69 – Comparison between the best model from HSM and SSM analysis and corrected inclinometer (2) results on 10 th of October 2008.	128
Figure 4.70 – Corrected results of inclinometer (3) on 30 th of August 2008.	130
Figure 4.71 – Corrected results of inclinometer (3) on 10 th of October 2008.	130
Figure 4.72 – Comparison between the horizontal deformations calculated using HSM and corrected inclinometer (3) results on 30 th of August 2008.	131
Figure 4.73 – Comparison between the horizontal deformations calculated using HSM and corrected inclinometer (3) results on 10 th of October 2008.	131
Figure 4.74 – Comparison between the horizontal deformations calculated using SSM and corrected inclinometer (3) results on 30 th of August 2008.	132
Figure 4.75 – Comparison between the horizontal deformations calculated using SSM and corrected inclinometer (3) results on 10 th of October 2008.	132
Figure 4.76 – Comparison between the best model from HSM and SSM analysis and corrected inclinometer (3) results on 30 th of August 2008.	133
Figure 4.77 – Comparison between the best model from HSM and SSM analysis and corrected inclinometer (3) results on 10 th of October 2008.	133
Figure 4.78 – Corrected results of inclinometer (4) on 30 th of August 2008.	135
Figure 4.79 – Corrected results of inclinometer (4) on 10 th of October 2008.	135
Figure 4.80 – Comparison between the horizontal deformations calculated using HSM and corrected inclinometer (4) results on 30 th of August 2008.	136
Figure 4.81 – Comparison between the horizontal deformations calculated using HSM and corrected inclinometer (4) results on 10 th of October 2008.	136

Figure 4.82 – Comparison between the horizontal deformations calculated using SSM and corrected inclinometer (4) results on 30 th of August 2008.	137
Figure 4.83 – Comparison between the horizontal deformations calculated using SSM and corrected inclinometer (4) results on 10 th of October 2008.	137
Figure 4.84 – Comparison between the best model from HSM and SSM analysis and corrected inclinometer (4) results on 30 th of August 2008.	138
Figure 4.85 – Comparison between the best model from HSM and SSM analysis and corrected inclinometer (4) results on 10 th of October 2008.	138
Figure 4.86 – Comparison between calculated and measured settlement of the adjacent building and the vertical movement of the supporting piles in section (2).	140
Figure 4.87 – Comparison between calculated and measured settlement of the adjacent building and the vertical movement of the supporting piles in section (3).	141
Figure 5.1 – Effect of foundation piles existence and distribution on lateral deformations of shoring system.	145
Figure 5.2 – Effect of foundation piles existence and distribution on settlement of soil surrounding the shoring system.	145
Figure 5.3 – Effect of adjacent loads on lateral deformations of shoring system.	146
Figure 5.4 – Effect of adjacent loads on settlement of soil surrounding the shoring system.	146
Figure 5.5 – Comparison between calculated surface settlements adjacent to braced excavation and values concluded by Peck (1969).	148
Figure 5.6 – Comparison between calculated wall deflection and values concluded by Clough and O’Rourke (1990).	150
Figure 5.7 – Comparison between calculated ground settlement and values concluded by Clough and O’Rourke (1990).	151

Figure 5.8 – Comparison between calculated ground settlement and values concluded by Ou (1993).	152
Figure 5.9 – Comparison between calculated wall deflection and values concluded by Ou (1993).	152
Figure 5.10 – Comparison between calculated ground settlement and values concluded by Hsieh and Ou (1998).	154
Figure 5.11 – Location of maximum settlement.	154
Figure 5.12 – Comparison between calculated wall deflection and values concluded by Phienwej and Gan (2003).	155

LIST OF TABLES

Table 4.1 – SPT correction factors (Skempton 1986).....	98
Table 4.2 – Estimating unconfined compressive strength from pocket penetrometer values (After Look, 2004)	102
Table 4.3 – Summary of calculated shear parameters	106
Table 4.4 – Menard pressuremeter modulus correlation factor. (Briaud, 1992)	109
Table 4.5 – Summary of calculated stiffness modulus (kPa).	112
Table 4.6 – Ranges of k for various soil types. (After Casagrande and Fadum, 1940).	114
Table 4.7 – Soil parameters implemented in numerical model for sand layers.....	114
Table 4.8 – Soil parameters implemented in numerical model for clay layers.	115