



**Ain Shams University  
Faculty of Engineering  
Department of Structural Engineering**

# **Behavior of Bored Tunnels in Egypt Soft Clays**

A THESIS

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of  
**MASTER OF SCIENCE IN CIVIL ENGINEERING**

Submitted by

**Amr Mohamed Abd Elhai Elshanawany**

Graduate M.Sc. Student, Structural Engineering Department,  
Ain Shams University

Supervised by

**Prof. Dr. Fathalla Mohamed El-Nahhas**  
Professor of Geotechnical Eng. & Foundations,  
Faculty of Engineering  
Ain Shams University

**Dr. Mohamed Farouk Mansour**  
Associate Professor,  
Department of Structural Engineering  
Faculty of Engineering,  
Ain Shams University

December 2018



Ain Shams University  
Faculty of Engineering  
Department of Structural Engineering

### APPROVAL SHEET

Name : **Amr Mohamed Abd Elhai Elshanawany**  
Thesis Title : **Behavior of Bored Tunnels in Egypt Soft Clays**  
Degree : **Master of Science in Civil Engineering (Structural)**

### EXAMINER COMMITTEE

Name and Affiliation	Signature
<b>Prof. Dr. Ahmed Mosalem Samieh Monazaa</b> Professor of Geotechnical Engineering, Civil Engineering Department, Faculty of Engineering, Helwan University, Egypt (External Examiner)	
<b>Prof. Dr. Ali Abd El Fattah Ahmed</b> Professor of Geotechnical Engineering, Structural Engineering Department, Faculty of Engineering, Ain Shams University, Egypt (Internal Examiner)	
<b>Prof. Dr. Fathalla Mohamed El-Nahhas</b> Professor of Geotechnical Engineering, Structural Engineering Department, Faculty of Engineering, Ain Shams University, Egypt (Supervisor)	
<b>Dr. Mohamed Farouk Mansour</b> Associate Professor, Structural Engineering Department, Faculty of Engineering, Ain Shams University, Egypt (Supervisor)	
<b>Date: / /2018</b>	



Ain Shams University  
Faculty of Engineering  
Department of Structural Engineering

Name : **Amr Mohamed Abd Elhai Elshanawany**  
Thesis Title : **Behavior of Bored Tunnels in Egypt Soft Clays**  
Degree : **Master of Science in Civil Engineering (Structural)**

**SUPERVISORS COMMITTEE**

<b>Name and Affiliation</b>	<b>Signature</b>
<b>Prof. Dr. Fathalla Mohamed El-Nahas</b> Professor of Geotechnical Engineering, Structural Engineering Department, Faculty of Engineering, Ain Shams University, Egypt	
<b>Dr. Mohamed Farouk Mansour</b> Associate Professor, Structural Engineering Department, Faculty of Engineering, Ain Shams University, Egypt	
<b>Date: / /2018</b>	

**Postgraduate Studies**

Authorization stamp: The thesis is authorized at / / 2018

College Board approval  
/ / 2018

University Board approval  
/ / 2018

## **CURRICULUM OF VITAE**

**Name:** Amr Mohamed Abd Elhai Elshanawany

**Date of Birth:** 20 January, 1982

**Place of Birth:** Cairo, Egypt

**Nationality:** Egyptian

**University Degree:** B.Sc. in Civil Engineering, Faculty of Engineering,  
Helwan University, 2003.

**Current Job:** Senior Geotechnical Engineer

## **DECLARATION**

This dissertation is submitted to Ain Shams University for the degree of Master of Science in Civil Engineering (Structural Engineering). The work included in this thesis was carried out by the author in the Department of Structural Engineering, Faculty of Engineering, Ain Shams University, Cairo, Egypt. No part of this thesis has been submitted for a degree or qualification at any other university or institution.

**Name:** Amr Mohamed Abd Elhai Elshanawany

**Signature:**

**Date:**

## **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

I wish to express my gratitude to Prof. Dr. Fathalla El-Nahhas, Professor of Geotechnical Engineering and Foundation and Dr. Mohamed Farouk Mansour, Associate Professor in the Structural Engineering Department, Ain Shams University for their kind supervision, sincere assistance and valuable guidance during the preparation of this thesis.

This thesis could not have been completed without the greatest supports and love from my family and my friends throughout the study.



*M.Sc. Thesis submitted by: Amr Mohamed Abd Elhai Elshanawany*

*Supervisors: Prof. Fathalla M. El-Nahhas and Dr. Mohamed F. Mansour*

*Title: Behavior of Bored Tunnels in Egypt Soft Clays*

.....

## **ABSTRACT**

The primary objective of this research study is to investigate the behavior of a typical bored tunnel crossing Suez Canal at the south of Port-Said City, referred to as Port-Said Tunnel (PST). The tunnel is constructed in a deep very soft to firm clay deposit lying in El-Tina Plain and is known as Port-Said Clay. The Port-Said Clay characterization is based on the results of recent research studies. The available information on the bored tunnel was limited to the method of tunneling which is TBM with slurry support and compensation grouting through the tail, geometric configuration and boring diameter. No field measurements were available for use in this research study.

The interaction between PST and Port-Said Clay is investigated by numerical analysis. The finite difference-based program FLAC 7.0 is utilized in the analyses. The constitutive behavior of Port-Said Clay is described using the modified cam clay (MCC) model. Due to the absence of field measurements for the typical bored tunnel under investigation, verification of the numerical model results is carried out by simulating the behavior of a bored tunnel in similar ground conditions in eastern Canada (Thunder Bay Tunnel) using the same numerical method and the same constitutive model. The numerical analysis results are compared with the available field measurements.

The parametric study on the behavior of PST in Port-Said Clay involved investigating the effects of different face and grouting pressures on the short and long-term behaviors. A hybrid tunneling modeling approach is adopted. The Gap approach is utilized to simulate the volume loss due to shield advance, and the grout pressure method is used to simulate the application of annular grouting. The tunneling behavior is investigated during three phases simulating the shield advance, application of grouting, and long-term behavior.

The results of the analysis are presented in terms of the stress fields, pore pressure response, strain fields, displacement fields, ground displacement and lining straining actions.

The results of the analysis showed a significant effect of the variation of the face and grouting pressures on the tunnel's short and long-term behaviors. The grouting pressure is the primary factor that governs the long-term behavior. The results are compared to some published field measurements and show a reasonable match.

**Keywords:** *Bored tunneling, soft clay, Port-Said Clay, numerical analysis, Gap approach, long-term behavior*



# **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<b>ACKNOWLEDGMENTS .....</b>	<b>I</b>
<b>ABSTRACT.....</b>	<b>II</b>
<b>TABLE OF CONTENTS.....</b>	<b>IV</b>
<b>LIST OF FIGURES .....</b>	<b>VI</b>
<b>LIST OF TABLES .....</b>	<b>XII</b>
<b>LIST OF SYMBOLS .....</b>	<b>XIII</b>
<b>LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS .....</b>	<b>XVII</b>
<b>CHAPTER(1) INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 General.....	1
1.2 Statement of the Problem.....	2
1.3 Research Objectives.....	3
1.4 Research Plan.....	3
1.5 Thesis Outline .....	4
<b>CHAPTER(2) BORED TUNNELING IN SOFT CLAY .....</b>	<b>6</b>
2.1 Historical Evolution of Tunneling Techniques .....	6
2.2 Sources of Ground Subsidence (Settlement) Due to Bored Tunneling .....	9
2.3 Tunnel Face Stability and Face Pressure .....	12
2.4 Prediction of Settlement Due to Tunneling.....	18
2.5 The Ground Reaction Curve for Loads on Linings.....	24
2.6 Modeling Approaches for Shielded Tunnels in Two-Dimensional Analysis.....	28
2.7 Stress and Strain Fields around Tunnels .....	35
2.8 Case Histories for Tunneling in Clay.....	42
<b>CHAPTER(3) VERIFICATION MODEL FOR A BORED TUNNEL IN SOFT CLAY (CASE OF THUNDER BAY TUNNEL) 46</b>	
3.1 Introduction.....	46
3.2 Geological History .....	47
3.3 Finite Difference in Brief.....	47
3.4 Thunder Bay Tunnel (TBT) .....	49
3.5 Subsurface Conditions and Soil Properties .....	56
3.6 Verification Models .....	60
3.7 Setup of The Numerical Model.....	66
3.8 Analysis Results.....	70
3.9 Applicability of Using Modified Cam Clay Constitutive Model .....	96
3.10 Summary and Conclusions .....	103

<b>CHAPTER(4)</b>	<b>PREDICTION OF TUNNEL BEHAVIOR FOR TUNNELS UNDER SUEZ CANAL AT PORT-SAID</b>	<b>105</b>
4.1	Introduction.....	105
4.2	Geology of El-Tina Plain.....	106
4.3	Port-Said Tunnels (PST) under Suez Canal.....	107
4.4	Subsurface Conditions .....	109
4.5	Critical State Model Parameters (Modified Cam Clay Model).....	111
4.6	Construction of the Ground Reaction Curve (GRC).....	112
4.7	Estimation of Volume Loss during Shield Advance .....	114
4.8	Numerical Analysis of Port-Said Tunnels (PST) .....	119
4.9	Analysis Results.....	128
4.10	Comparison with measurements and literature .....	170
4.11	Lack in 2D modelling of tunnels and its effect on the results .....	174
4.12	Summary and Conclusions .....	176
<b>CHAPTER(5)</b>	<b>SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE STUDIES.....</b>	<b>180</b>
5.1	Summary .....	180
5.2	Conclusions.....	182
5.3	Recommendations for Future Studies .....	185
<b>REFERENCES.....</b>		<b>186</b>
<b>ملخص.....</b>		<b>198</b>

## **LIST OF FIGURES**

<b>Figure 2.1</b> Illustration of box shield used by Brunel in 1806.....	6
<b>Figure 2.2</b> Illustration of screw shield used by Brunel in 1818 .....	7
<b>Figure 2.3</b> Methods of supporting the ground and groundwater pressure at the face, Mechanised shield tunneling 2 <sup>nd</sup> edition (2009) .....	8
<b>Figure 2.4</b> Components of shield tunneling settlement, after ITA/AITES Report (2006).....	10
<b>Figure 2.5</b> Circular and spherical failure mechanism, after Krause (1987) .....	14
<b>Figure 2.6</b> The tunnel face stability model of the method of Anagnostou and Kovari (1993 and 1994) .....	15
<b>Figure 2.7</b> Nomograms for the dimensionless coefficients $F_0$ to $F_3$ , after Anagnostou and Kovari (1996) .....	16
<b>Figure 2.8</b> Two-dimensional blow out model including shear stress along soil column boundaries, (Broere, 2001).....	17
<b>Figure 2.9</b> Wedge model for safety against blow out (Balthaus, 1989).....	18
<b>Figure 2.10</b> Relation between the width of settlement trough, $i/R$ , and the normalized depth to tunnel centerline, $z/2R$ (Peck, 1969) .....	19
<b>Figure 2.11</b> Ground response curves for (a) deep tunnels, and (b) shallow tunnels in different grounds, modified after Pacher (1964).....	25
<b>Figure 2.12</b> Ground response curves for time-dependent interaction between ground and lining, after Pacher (1964).....	27
<b>Figure 2.13</b> Illustration of the Gap method, modified after Rowe et al. (1983) .....	30
<b>Figure 2.14</b> Stress reduction method with ground loss control adopting Ground Reaction Curve, modified after Addenbrooke et al. (1997).....	32
<b>Figure 2.15</b> Illustration of the calculation phases of the contraction method, modified after Vermeer and Brinkgreve (1993).....	33
<b>Figure 2.16</b> Illustration of the grout pressure method, Möller and Vermeer (2008).....	35
<b>Figure 2.17</b> Stress path from typical elements in soil due to tunneling, Ng and Lo (1985) .....	36
<b>Figure 2.18</b> Contour maps of strains: a) volumetric strain; and b) maximum shear strain, after Eisenstein et al. (1981).....	38
<b>Figure 2.19</b> Pattern of plastic zones around the experimental tunnel in Edmonton, Canada, after El-Nahhas (1980).....	39
<b>Figure 2.20</b> Contours of strain around tunnel: a) vertical strain, $\epsilon_v$ ; b) horizontal strain, $\epsilon_h$ , and c) shear strain, $\gamma_{vh}$ , after Lee and Rowe (1989) .....	41
<b>Figure 3.1</b> Two-dimensional finite difference grid .....	48
<b>Figure 3.2</b> Details of TBT lining, after Morton et al., (1977) .....	50
<b>Figure 3.3</b> Tunnel location, after Palmer and Belshaw (1980) .....	51
<b>Figure 3.4</b> TBT Instrumentation Plan, after Palmer and Belshaw (1980).....	54

<b>Figure 3.5</b> Composite section of soil deformation instrumentation, after Palmer and Belshaw (1980) .....	55
<b>Figure 3.6</b> Composite section showing piezometers and piezometric head after 1 Year, after Palmer and Belshaw (1980).....	56
<b>Figure 3.7</b> Soil profile and summary of test results at array 2, after Palmer and Belshaw (1980) .....	58
<b>Figure 3.8</b> General soil properties for Array 2, after Ng (1984) .....	59
<b>Figure 3.9</b> Soil profile and parameters along Array 2, Modified after Ng (1984) .....	63
<b>Figure 3.10</b> Typical hydraulic parameters for soils and rock, (Delleur, 1999) .....	64
<b>Figure 3.11</b> Model configuration and boundary conditions .....	67
<b>Figure 3.12</b> Model mesh.....	67
<b>Figure 3.13</b> Total Vertical stress field (short term) .....	71
<b>Figure 3.14</b> Total Vertical stress field (long-term - permeable lining) .....	71
<b>Figure 3.15</b> Total Vertical stress field (long-term - impermeable lining) .....	72
<b>Figure 3.16</b> Total Horizontal stress field (short term).....	72
<b>Figure 3.17</b> Total Horizontal stress field (long-term - permeable lining) .....	73
<b>Figure 3.18</b> Total Horizontal stress field (long-term - impermeable lining).....	73
<b>Figure 3.19</b> Total Vertical stress profile through the vertical axis of the tunnel.....	74
<b>Figure 3.20</b> Total Horizontal stress profile through tunnel horizontal axis .....	75
<b>Figure 3.21</b> Total Vertical stress profile through tunnel horizontal axis .....	75
<b>Figure 3.22</b> Total Horizontal stress profile through the vertical axis of the tunnel .....	76
<b>Figure 3.23</b> Pore water pressure field (short term).....	80
<b>Figure 3.24</b> Pore water pressure field (long-term - permeable lining).....	80
<b>Figure 3.25</b> Pore water pressure field (long-term - impermeable lining).....	81
<b>Figure 3.26</b> Pore water pressure profile along the vertical axis of the tunnel.....	82
<b>Figure 3.27</b> Pore water pressure profile along the tunnel horizontal axis.....	83
<b>Figure 3.28</b> Shear strain field (short term) .....	85
<b>Figure 3.29</b> Shear strain field (long-term - permeable lining) .....	85
<b>Figure 3.30</b> Shear strain field (long-term - impermeable lining) .....	86
<b>Figure 3.31</b> Vertical displacement field (short-term).....	87
<b>Figure 3.32</b> Vertical displacement field (long-term - permeable lining) .....	87
<b>Figure 3.33</b> Vertical displacement field (long-term - impermeable lining) .....	88
<b>Figure 3.34</b> Horizontal displacement field (short term).....	88
<b>Figure 3.35</b> Horizontal displacement field (long-term - permeable lining) .....	89
<b>Figure 3.36</b> Horizontal displacement field (long-term - impermeable lining).....	89
<b>Figure 3.37</b> Vertical displacement profile along the vertical axis of the tunnel .....	90

<b>Figure 3.38</b> Horizontal displacement profile along the vertical locus of the spring line .....	91
<b>Figure 3.39</b> Surface settlement trough .....	93
<b>Figure 3.40</b> Variation of pore water pressure with time for an impermeable lining.....	95
<b>Figure 3.41</b> Variation of vertical crown displacement and maximum surface displacement with time for an impermeable lining.....	96
<b>Figure 3.42</b> Illustration of the Modified Cam Clay model concept in the $p'$ - $q$ space (after Roscoe and Burland, 1968). .....	98
<b>Figure 3.43</b> Illustration of the Modified Cam Clay model concept in the $v$ - $\ln p'$ space (after Roscoe and Burland, 1968). .....	98
<b>Figure 3.44</b> Correlation of the swelling index $C_s$ , with the natural moisture content ( $w$ ) and liquid limit (LL) for lacustrine soft clay soils in southern Germany (data are partially obtained from Scherzinger 1991).....	101
<b>Figure 3.45</b> Ground surface trough for Modified Cam Clay model and observed settlement .....	102
<b>Figure 4.1</b> General location of the proposed tunnels on Egypt's map, after Rizos' et al. (2018) .....	106
<b>Figure 4.2</b> Port-Said roadway tunnels alignment.....	108
<b>Figure 4.3</b> Port-Said roadway tunnels profile .....	108
<b>Figure 4.4</b> Port-Said roadway tunnels cross section .....	108
<b>Figure 4.5</b> Crown displacement versus the tunnel stress as a percent from the initial stress.....	113
<b>Figure 4.6</b> Shear strain around the tunnel at 90% of the initial stresses .....	114
<b>Figure 4.7</b> Shear strain around the tunnel at 85% of the initial stresses .....	114
<b>Figure 4.8</b> Shear strain around the tunnel at 82% of the initial stresses .....	114
<b>Figure 4.9</b> Demonstration of volume loss around the shield due to slurry and grout flow, after Bezuijen and Bakker's (2007).....	118
<b>Figure 4.10</b> Variation of total volume loss with face pressure.....	121
<b>Figure 4.11</b> Idealized soil profile and parameters used in the numerical analysis.....	123
<b>Figure 4.12</b> Variation of boundary displacement with the model half-width .....	124
<b>Figure 4.13</b> Model configuration and boundary conditions.....	125
<b>Figure 4.14</b> Grouting pressure simulation (Möller and Vermeer, 2008) .....	127
<b>Figure 4.15</b> Total Vertical stress profile for pressure 200kPa.....	129
<b>Figure 4.16</b> Total Vertical stress profile for pressure 225kPa.....	129
<b>Figure 4.17</b> Total Vertical stress profile for pressure 250kPa.....	130
<b>Figure 4.18</b> Total Vertical stress profile for pressure 275kPa.....	130
<b>Figure 4.19</b> Total Vertical stress profile for pressure 300kPa.....	131
<b>Figure 4.20</b> Total Vertical stress for different pressures near the crown .....	132
<b>Figure 4.21</b> Total Vertical stress for different pressures near the invert.....	133

<b>Figure 4.22</b> Total horizontal stress profile for pressure 200 kPa .....	134
<b>Figure 4.23</b> Total horizontal stress profile for pressure 225 kPa .....	135
<b>Figure 4.24</b> Total horizontal stress profile for pressure 250 kPa .....	135
<b>Figure 4.25</b> Total horizontal stress profile for pressure 275 kPa .....	136
<b>Figure 4.26</b> Total horizontal stress profile for pressure 300 kPa .....	136
<b>Figure 4.27</b> Total horizontal stress at different pressures near the spring line.....	137
<b>Figure 4.28</b> variation of pore water pressure above tunnel vertical axis for different phases at pressure 200 kPa.....	139
<b>Figure 4.29</b> variation of pore water pressure above tunnel vertical axis for different phases at pressure 225 kPa.....	139
<b>Figure 4.30</b> variation of pore water pressure above tunnel vertical axis for different phases at pressure 250 kPa.....	140
<b>Figure 4.31</b> variation of pore water pressure above tunnel vertical axis for different phases at pressure 275 kPa.....	140
<b>Figure 4.32</b> Variation of pore water pressure with depth below ground surface in different phases for face/grouting pressure of 300 kPa.....	141
<b>Figure 4.33</b> variation of pore water pressure along the tunnel horizontal axis for different phases at pressure 200 kPa .....	143
<b>Figure 4.34</b> variation of pore water pressure along the tunnel horizontal axis for different phases at pressure 225 kPa .....	143
<b>Figure 4.35</b> variation of pore water pressure along the tunnel horizontal axis for different phases at pressure 250 kPa .....	144
<b>Figure 4.36</b> variation of pore water pressure along the tunnel horizontal axis for different phases at pressure 275 kPa .....	144
<b>Figure 4.37</b> variation of pore water pressure along the tunnel horizontal axis for different phases at pressure 300 kPa .....	145
<b>Figure 4.38</b> Scale for shear strain contours from FLAC output.....	147
<b>Figure 4.39</b> Shear strain contours around the tunnel for face/grouting pressure of 200 kPa a) Phase 1, b) Phase 2, c) Phase 3 .....	147
<b>Figure 4.40</b> Shear strain contours around the tunnel for face/grouting pressure of 225 kPa a) Phase 1, b) Phase 2, c) Phase 3 .....	147
<b>Figure 4.41</b> Shear strain contours around the tunnel for face/grouting pressure of 250 kPa a) Phase 1, b) Phase 2, c) Phase 3 .....	148
<b>Figure 4.42</b> Shear strain contours around the tunnel for face/grouting pressure of 275 kPa a) Phase 1, b) Phase 2, c) Phase 3 .....	148
<b>Figure 4.43</b> Shear strain contours around the tunnel for face/grouting pressure of 300 kPa a) Phase 1, b) Phase 2, c) Phase 3 .....	148
<b>Figure 4.44</b> Vertical displacement for different phases at a pressure of 200 kPa.....	151
<b>Figure 4.45</b> Vertical displacement for different phases at a pressure of 225 kPa.....	152
<b>Figure 4.46</b> Vertical displacement for different phases at a pressure of 250 kPa.....	153

<b>Figure 4.47</b> Vertical displacement for different phases at a pressure of 275 kPa.....	154
<b>Figure 4.48</b> Vertical displacement for different phases at a pressure of 300 kPa.....	155
<b>Figure 4.49</b> Variation of vertical displacement with pressure for phase 1.....	156
<b>Figure 4.50</b> Variation of vertical displacement with pressure for phase 2.....	156
<b>Figure 4.51</b> Variation of vertical displacement with pressure for phase 3.....	157
<b>Figure 4.52</b> Net vertical displacement above the tunnel for different pressures at phase (1) .....	158
<b>Figure 4.53</b> Net vertical displacement above the tunnel for different pressures at phase (2) .....	158
<b>Figure 4.54</b> Net vertical displacement above the tunnel for different pressures at phase (3) .....	159
<b>Figure 4.55</b> observed consolidation settlement in Tokyo, Japan, after Akagi, H. (2014).....	160
<b>Figure 4.56</b> Cumulative vertical displacement above the tunnel for different pressures.....	161
<b>Figure 4.57</b> Settlement trough at the ground surface for face/grouting pressure of 200kPa.....	163
<b>Figure 4.58</b> Settlement trough at the ground surface for face/grouting pressure of 225kPa.....	163
<b>Figure 4.59</b> Settlement trough at the ground surface for face/grouting pressure of 250kPa.....	164
<b>Figure 4.60</b> Settlement trough at the ground surface for face/grouting pressure of 275kPa.....	164
<b>Figure 4.61</b> Settlement trough at the ground surface for face/grouting pressure of 300 kPa.....	165
<b>Figure 4.62</b> Net surface displacement due to the application of grouting for different grouting pressures .....	165
<b>Figure 4.63</b> Bending Moment diagram on lining for the pressure of 200 kPa a) Phase 1, b) Phase 2, c) Phase 3.....	167
<b>Figure 4.64</b> Bending Moment diagram on lining for the pressure of 225 kPa a) Phase 1, b) Phase 2, c) Phase 3.....	168
<b>Figure 4.65</b> Bending Moment diagram on lining for the pressure of 250 kPa a) Phase 1, b) Phase 2, c) Phase 3.....	168
<b>Figure 4.66</b> Bending Moment diagram on lining for the pressure of 275 kPa a) Phase 1, b) Phase 2, c) Phase 3.....	169
<b>Figure 4.67</b> Bending Moment diagram on lining for the pressure of 300 kPa a) Phase 1, b) Phase 2, c) Phase 3.....	169
<b>Figure 4.68</b> The variation of maximum bending Moment on lining with different pressures for different phases.....	170
<b>Figure 4.69</b> Variation of normalized consolidation settlement with distance normalized to tunnel depth from this study and other measurements reported by Shirlaw (1994) .....	171