



MODELING AND EVALUATION OF STRIP FOOTINGS ON ANCHORED GEOSYNTHETIC REINFORCED SOIL OVERLAYING LOOSE SAND

By

Mohamed Kamal Hussein Mohamed

A Thesis Submitted to the
Faculty of Engineering at Cairo University
in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
in
CIVIL ENGINEERING – PUBLIC WORKS

FACULTY OF ENGINEERING, CAIRO UNIVERSITY
GIZA, EGYPT
2019

**MODELING AND EVALUATION OF STRIP FOOTINGS
ON ANCHORED GEOSYNTHETIC REINFORCED SOIL
OVERLAYING LOOSE SAND**

By

Mohamed Kamal Hussein Mohamed

A Thesis Submitted to the
Faculty of Engineering at Cairo University
in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
in
CIVIL ENGINEERING – PUBLIC WORKS

Under the Supervision of

Prof. Dr. Mohamed Ibrahim Amer

Prof. Dr. Rami Mahmoud El-Sherbiny

.....
Professor of Geotechnical Engineering
Faculty of Engineering
Cairo University

.....
Professor of Geotechnical Engineering
Faculty of Engineering
Cairo University

FACULTY OF ENGINEERING, CAIRO UNIVERSITY
GIZA, EGYPT
2019

MODELING AND EVALUATION OF STRIP FOOTINGS ON ANCHORED GEOSYNTHETIC REINFORCED SOIL OVERLAYING LOOSE SAND

By

Mohamed Kamal Hussein Mohamed

A Thesis Submitted to the
Faculty of Engineering at Cairo University
in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
in
CIVIL ENGINEERING – PUPLIC WORKS

Approved by the
Examining Committee

Prof. Dr. Mohamed Ibrahim Amer

Thesis Main Advisor

Prof. Dr. Rami Mahmoud El-Sherbiny

Advisor

Prof. Dr. Hussein Hamed El-Mamlouk

Internal Examiner

Prof. Dr. Fathallah El-Nahhas

External Examiner

Professor at Faculty of Engineering,
Ain Shams University

FACULTY OF ENGINEERING, CAIRO UNIVERSITY
GIZA, EGYPT
2019

Engineer's Name: Mohamed Kamal Hussein Mohamed
Date of Birth: 31/1/1988
Nationality: Egyptian
E-mail: Mohamed.kamal88@hotmail.com
Phone: 0115-5476683
Address: 4, El lebeny St., Harm, Giza.
Registration Date: 01 /10/2013
Awarding Date:/....../2019
Degree: Doctor of Philosophy



Department: Civil Engineering - Public Works
Supervisors: Prof. Dr. Mohamed Ibrahim Amer
Prof. Dr. Rami Mahmoud El-sherbiny

Examiners:

Prof. Dr. Mohamed Ibrahim Amer	(Thesis Main Advisor)
Prof. Dr. Rami Mahmoud El-Sherbiny	(Advisor)
Prof. Dr. Hussein Hamed El-Mamlouk	(Internal Examiner)
Prof. Dr. Fathallah El-Nahhas	(External Examiner)
(Professor at Faculty of Engineering, Ain Shams University)	

Title of Thesis:

MODELING AND EVALUATION OF STRIP FOOTINGS ON ANCHORED
GEOSYNTHETIC REINFORCED SOIL OVERLAYING LOOSE SAND

Key Words:

Shallow Foundations, Anchored Geosynthetic Reinforcement, Pullout Resistance, Passive Resistance, Reinforced Soil.

Summary:

This thesis presents the results of laboratory and numerical models to study the behavior of shallow footings resting on anchored geosynthetic reinforced dense soil overlying loose. Laboratory model tests are performed to study the effect of reinforcement length, reinforcement depth, number of layers, and anchorage condition on the performance of a strip footing on geosynthetic reinforced soil. Finite element verification is performed using Plaxis 2D and an additional parametric study is performed to numerically investigate the effect of reinforcement length, deadman height, deadman width, and geosynthetic stiffness for different anchored geogrid configurations. An analytical method is developed to calculate the tensile forces in the reinforcement and ultimate bearing capacity. The pullout resistance of the geogrid significantly increases when anchoring the edges due to the development of passive resistance on the deadman resulting in an increase in bearing capacity. Uniform strains are generated along anchored reinforcement compared to the bell-shaped strain curve for conventional reinforcement. The optimum reinforcement length is six times the footing width for conventional reinforcement, on the other hand, the optimum reinforcement length is equal to footing width plus reinforcement depth for anchored reinforcement.

Disclaimer

I hereby declare that this thesis is my original work and that no part of it has been submitted for a degree qualification at any other university or institute.

I further declare that I have appropriately acknowledged all sources used and have cited them in the references section.

Name :

Date :

Signature :

Dedication

To the most loving and caring parents,

Kamal Hussein Mohamed and Nawal Hassan Ahmed

To my beloved wife,

Mai Samir Abo El Soud

To my beloved son and daughter,

Zeyad and Menna Allah

Thank you for giving me the tools to be successful in life
and the motivation to use them.

Acknowledgments

The author is deeply indebted to Prof. Mohamed I. Amer, Professor of Soil Mechanics and Foundation Engineering at the Faculty of Engineering, Cairo University, for his continuous supervision of the research and for his help and generous suggestions throughout the work.

Grateful acknowledgment and sincerest thanks and gratitude are due to Prof. Rami M. El-Sherbiny, Professor at the Faculty of Engineering, Cairo University, for his sincere support, valuable guidance, motivation, continuous hard work, fruitful positive discussions, and comments throughout the course of this study. The author would like to thank his distinguished supervisors for giving him this opportunity; it was a most rewarding experience, both professionally and personally.

The author also wishes to express his gratitude and appreciation to professors, colleagues, staff and technicians of the Soil Mechanics and Foundations Research Laboratory, Faculty of Engineering, Cairo University, for their support and encouragement.

Finally, another special appreciation is directed to my parents and my wife for their efforts, support, and help to create this thesis. This appreciation is also extended to include some of my family members, especially Hussein Kamal, Salma Kamal, Hassan Kamal, and Mona Mohamed. In addition, I cannot forget the support of some of my best friends and colleagues, especially Ahmed Saad, Mahmoud Ali, Islam Mamdouh, Ahmed Gomaa, Mohamed Abu Bakr, and Saad Medhat.

Table of Contents

DISCLAIMER	I
DEDICATION	II
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	III
LIST OF TABLES	VII
LIST OF FIGURES	VIII
NOMENCLATURE	XIII
ABSTRACT	XVI
CHAPTER 1 : INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 BACKGROUND	1
1.2 PROBLEM STATEMENT	1
1.3 SCOPE AND OBJECTIVES OF THIS STUDY	2
1.4 THESIS ORGANIZATION	3
CHAPTER 2 : LITERATURE REVIEW	4
2.1 INTRODUCTION.....	4
2.2 EXPERIMENTAL STUDIES	4
2.2.1 Reinforced Sand Soil Foundations.....	4
2.2.2 Reinforced Clay Soil Foundations	10
2.2.3 Experimental Studies on Non-Conventional Reinforced Soil Foundation	13
2.3 ANALYTICAL STUDIES	16
2.3.1 Binquet and Lee’s Method (1975)	18
2.3.2 Huang and Tatsuoka’s Method (1990)	19
2.3.3 Wayne et al.’s Method (1998).....	21
2.3.4 Michalowski’s Method (2004).....	22
2.3.5 Sharma’s Method (2009)	24
2.3.6 Chen and Abu-Farsakh’s Method (2015)	27
2.3.7 Saha Roy and Deb’s Method (2017)	29
2.4 NUMERICAL ANALYSIS	29
CHAPTER 3 : EXPERIMENTAL SETUP.....	32
3.1 INTRODUCTION.....	32
3.2 TEST DEVICE AND SETUP	32
3.2.1 Tank Model.....	32
3.2.2 Footing Model	33
3.2.3 Loading Frame.....	33
3.2.4 Load Cell.....	35

3.2.5 Strain Gauge Installation.....	37
3.2.6 Linear Voltage Displacement Transducer (LVDT)	38
3.2.7 Data Acquisition System.....	38
3.3 CHARACTERIZATION OF TESTED SAND.....	38
3.3.1 Grain Size Distribution	38
3.3.2 Maximum and Minimum Void Ratios	39
3.3.3 Specific Gravity	39
3.3.4 Modified Proctor Compaction Test	39
3.3.5 Shear Strength Testing	40
3.4 CHARACTERIZATION OF TESTED GEOGRID	42
3.5 TEST PROCEDURE	45
3.5.1 Conventional Geogrid Installation	45
3.5.2 Wraparound Geogrid Installation	46
3.5.3 Anchored Geogrid Installation.....	46
3.6 TESTING PROGRAM.....	49
CHAPTER 4 : TEST RESULTS AND ANALYSES.....	53
4.1 TYPICAL TEST RESULTS	53
4.2 RESULTS OF CONVENTIONAL GEOGRID CONFIGURATION	53
4.2.1 Effect of Thickness of Dense Sand Without Reinforcement	54
4.2.2 Effect of The Number of Reinforcement Layers	54
4.2.3 Effect of Reinforcement Length	55
4.2.4 Effect of Thickness of Reinforced Dense Sand	60
4.2.5 Strain Distribution along Reinforcement	62
4.3 RESULTS OF ANCHORED GEOGRID CONFIGURATION.....	70
4.3.1 Effect of Reinforcement Length.....	70
4.3.2 Effect of Deadman Height	75
4.3.3 Effect of Reinforcement Depth	76
4.3.4 Strain Distribution along Reinforcement	80
4.4 WRAPAROUND CONFIGURATION	86
4.5 COMPARISON BETWEEN ANCHORED AND CONVENTIONAL CONFIGURATIONS	87
CHAPTER 5 : FINITE ELEMENT ANALYSIS.....	89
5.1 INTRODUCTION.....	89
5.2 CONSTITUTIVE MODELS	89

5.3	FINITE ELEMENT MESH	90
5.4	FINITE ELEMENT MODEL VERIFICATION	92
5.4.1	Load Transfer Mechanism (Observed Deformation)	93
5.4.2	Load Displacement Behavior	96
5.4.3	Tensile Force along Reinforcement.....	101
5.5	PARAMETRIC STUDY	105
5.5.1	Effect of Reinforcement Length	106
5.5.2	Effect of Deadman Height	110
5.5.3	Effect of Deadman Width	114
5.5.4	Effect of Geogrid Stiffness	116
CHAPTER 6 :	ANALYTICAL SOLUTION	118
6.1	ANALYSIS OF EQUILIBRIUM CONDITIONS	118
6.2	MOBILIZATION OF EARTH PRESSURE ON DEADMAN.....	120
6.3	FORMULATION OF ANALYTICAL APPROACH.....	122
6.4	COMPARISONS BETWEEN TEST RESULTS AND ANALYTICAL SOLUTIONS	124
CHAPTER 7 :	FINITE ELEMENT FOR SOFT CLAY	127
7.1	INTRODUCTION.....	127
7.2	CONSTITUTIVE MODELS	127
7.3	FINITE ELEMENT RESULTS	128
7.4	APPLICABILITY OF ANALYTICAL APPROACH ON SOFT CLAY	132
CHAPTER 8 :	CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	134
8.1	CONVENTIONAL GEOGRID CONFIGURATIONS	134
8.2	ANCHORED GEOGRID CONFIGURATIONS	134
8.3	RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH	136
REFERENCES	137
APPENDIX :	STRAIN GAUGE READINGS	142

List of Tables

Table 2.1: Coefficients of bearing capacity for reinforced soil (Michalowski, 2004) ...	24
Table 3.1: Gradation index properties of tested sand	39
Table 3.2: Values of maximum and minimum void ratio of tested sand	40
Table 3.3: Shear Strength Parameters of Tested Sand.	41
Table 3.4: Properties of geogrid material.	43
Table 3.5: Testing Program	51
Table 3.6: Purpose of Testing Program.....	52
Table 5.1: HSM parameters for dense and loose sand	90
Table 5.2: Verification models configurations	93
Table 5.3: Experimental results versus numerical results for anchored geogrid configurations.	100
Table 5.4: Experimental and numerical tensile forces for anchored geogrid configurations	104
Table 5.5: Parametric study	107
Table 7.1: Mohr - Coulomb parameters for soft clay	128

List of Figures

Figure 2.1: Variation of bearing capacity ratio BCRs versus reinforcement depth ratio (d/B) at different foundation depth ratios (Shin et al., 2002)	9
Figure 2.2: The ratio of BCRs to BCR_u versus foundation depth ratio (D_f/B) at the critical value of reinforcement depth (d/B) _{cr} (Shin et al., 2002).....	9
Figure 2.3: Stress distribution at a depth of 254 mm (1.67B) below the footing (B/L : 1.0, D_f/B : 0.0 Applied stresses $q=750$ kPa).....	11
Figure 2.4: Schematic model and photos of the square foundation on grid-anchor reinforced soil (Mosallanezhad et al., 2008).....	14
Figure 2.5: Test setup for prestressed geosynthetic reinforced granular beds (Shivashankar and Jayaraj, 2014).	14
Figure 2.6: Distribution of settlement at the interface between reinforced granular bed and weak soil (Shivashankar and Jayaraj, 2014).	15
Figure 2.7: Footing resting on the geosynthetic-reinforced sand bed with wraparound ends (Kazi et al., 2015)	15
Figure 2.8: q_{Rs}/q_{Uu} versus settlement ratio (s/B) for reinforced soil for $D/B = 0.3$ (Kazi et al., 2015).....	16
Figure 2.9: Reinforcement Mechanisms.....	17
Figure 2.10: Modes of failure (after Binquet and Lee, 1975)	18
Figure 2.11: Stress distributions underneath strip footing and failure surface (Binquet and Lee, 1975)	20
Figure 2.12: Friction resistance against reinforcement pullout and variation of normal stresses (Binquet and Lee, 1975).....	20
Figure 2.13: Modes of failure of reinforced sand (Huang and Tatsuoka, 1990).	21
Figure 2.14: Modes of failure for reinforced soil foundation (Wayne et al., 1998).....	23
Figure 2.15: Soil collapse mechanism (Michalowski, 2004)	24
Figure 2.16: Failure mechanism of reinforced soil foundation (Sharma et al., 2009)	26
Figure 2.17: Simplified distribution of vertical settlement for sandy soil (Sharma et al., 2009)	27
Figure 2.18: Partial punching shear failure followed by general shear failure (Chen and Abu-Farsakh. 2015)	28
Figure 2.19: Diagrams of general shear failure zone (Chen and Abu-Farsakh. 2015).	28
Figure 2.20: Comparison between observed bearing capacity ratios for reinforced granular bed with single layer geogrid and geotextile reinforcement overlying weak soil (Shivashankar and Jayaraj, 2014).....	31
Figure 3.1: Tank model	32
Figure 3.2: Footing model	33
Figure 3.3: Schematic drawing of the test device.....	34
Figure 3.4: Arrangement of the test device	35
Figure 3.5: Hinge connection between horizontal beam and loading rod.....	35
Figure 3.6: Load Cell.....	36
Figure 3.7: Installation steps of strain gauge.....	37
Figure 3.8: Data Acquisition (GRAPHTIC GL 7000)	38
Figure 3.9: Grain size distribution of used sand.....	39
Figure 3.10: Results for Modified Proctor Test.....	40

Figure 3.11: Consolidated-drained triaxial tests results for dense sand	41
Figure 3.12: Consolidated-drained triaxial tests results for loose sand.....	42
Figure 3.13: Standard Test Method for Determining Tensile Properties of Hate ® 23.142 GR reinforcement using Testometric Machine (ASTM D4595-86).	43
Figure 3.14: Tensile force versus strain for tested geogrid	44
Figure 3.15: Global strain versus local strain for tested geogrid.....	44
Figure 3.16: Global strain versus local strain for tested geogrid tested at different strain rates	45
Figure 3.17: Conventional Geogrid Configuration	47
Figure 3.18: Wraparound Configuration	47
Figure 3.19: Anchored Geogrid Configuration	48
Figure 3.20: Deadman installation.	48
Figure 3.21: Modular block configuration	49
Figure 4.1: Average stresses versus settlement curves for different thickness of dense sand	54
Figure 4.2: Average stresses versus settlement curves for the different number of layers.	56
Figure 4.3: Failure modes of reinforced soil for conventional configuration with $d = 1.2B$	57
Figure 4.4: Bearing capacity ratio versus the number of layers for conventional configuration with $d = 1.2B$	58
Figure 4.5: Average stresses versus settlement curves for a different reinforcement length.	59
Figure 4.6: Effect of geogrid length for conventional configuration with $d = 1.2B$ on the bearing capacity ratio	60
Figure 4.7: Average stresses versus settlement curves for reinforced sand and unreinforced sand with different thickness dense sand.....	61
Figure 4.8: Effect of reinforced soil thickness on the bearing capacity ratio at different settlement ratios for $L/B=6$ and $N=3$	61
Figure 4.9: Axial strains at the center versus settlement curves for a different reinforcement length and $N=1$	62
Figure 4.10: Axial strains at the center versus settlement curves for $N=2$, $L=6B$ (C-2-6.0B-0.3-0.0)	63
Figure 4.11: Axial strains at the center versus settlement curves for $N=3$ and $L=6B$ (C-3-6.0B-0.3-0.0).....	63
Figure 4.12: Axial strains versus settlement curves for different locations (C-3-6B-0.3-0.0).	64
Figure 4.13: Axial strains versus settlement curves for different locations (C-2-6B-0.3-0.0).	65
Figure 4.14: Axial strains versus settlement curves for different locations (C-1-6B-0.3-0.0).	66
Figure 4.15: Strain distribution along reinforcement for conventional reinforcement with various lengths and $N = 1$	67
Figure 4.16: Strain distribution along reinforcement for conventional reinforcement with various lengths and $N = 2$	68
Figure 4.17: Strain distribution along reinforcement for conventional reinforcement with various lengths and $N = 3$	69
Figure 4.18: Average stresses versus settlement curves for anchored geogrid with different reinforcement lengths for $u=0.3B$, and $h_d = 2u$	71

Figure 4.19: Average stresses versus settlement curves for anchored geogrid with different reinforcement lengths for $u=0.6B$, and $h_d = u$	72
Figure 4.20: Effect of reinforcement length for anchored geogrid configuration on the bearing capacity ratio for single layer for $u=0.3B$, and $h_d = 2u$	72
Figure 4.21: Deformation of anchored geogrid configuration	73
Figure 4.22: Load transfer mechanism for anchored geogrid configuration	74
Figure 4.23: Effect of reinforcement length for anchored geogrid configuration on the bearing capacity ratio for single layer of $u = 0.6B$, and $h_d = u$	75
Figure 4.24: Average stresses versus settlement curves for anchored geogrid with a different deadman height for $L = 1.5B$ and $u = 0.6B$	76
Figure 4.25: Effect of deadman height on the bearing capacity ratio for a single layer with $u/B = 0.6$ and $L = 1.5B$	77
Figure 4.26: Average stresses versus settlement curves for anchored geogrid with a different first layer depth for $L = 1.0B$ and constant deadman height	78
Figure 4.27: Average stresses versus settlement curves for anchored geogrid with a different first layer depth, $L = 1.5B$ and constant deadman height.	78
Figure 4.28: Effect of reinforcement layer depth on the bearing capacity ratio for a single layer for $L=1.0B$ and constant deadman height	79
Figure 4.29: Effect of reinforcement layer depth on the bearing capacity ratio for a single layer for $L = 1.5B$ and constant deadman height	80
Figure 4.30: Axial strains at center versus settlement curves for anchored geogrid with a different reinforcement length, $u = 0.3B$, and $h_d = 2u$	81
Figure 4.31: Axial strains at center versus settlement curves for anchored geogrid with a different reinforcement length, $u = 0.6B$, and $h_d = u$	81
Figure 4.32: Axial strains at center versus settlement curves for anchored geogrid with a different deadman height, $L = 1.5B$ and $u = 0.6B$	82
Figure 4.33: Axial strains at center versus settlement curves for anchored geogrid with a different first layer depth, $L=1.0B$, and constant deadman height	82
Figure 4.34: Axial strains at center versus settlement curves for anchored geogrid with a different first layer depth, $L = 1.5B$, and constant deadman height	83
Figure 4.35: Strain distribution along reinforcement for anchored geogrid with a different reinforcement length, $u = 0.3B$, and $h_d = 2u$	84
Figure 4.36: Strain distribution along reinforcement for anchored geogrid with a different reinforcement length, $u = 0.6B$, and $h_d = u$	85
Figure 4.37: Strain distribution along reinforcement for anchored geogrid with a different deadman height, $L = 1.5B$, and $u = 0.6B$	85
Figure 4.38: Strain distribution along reinforcement for anchored geogrid with a different first layer depth, $L = 1.0B$ and constant deadman height	86
Figure 4.39: Strain distribution along reinforcement for anchored geogrid with a different first layer depth, $L=1.5B$ and constant deadman height	87
Figure 4.40: Average stresses versus settlement curves for wraparound geogrid with a different geogrid length of $d=1.2B$ and $u=0.6B$	88
Figure 4.41: Ultimate bearing capacity ratio for different configurations	88
Figure 5.1: Model Geometry	91
Figure 5.2: Typical Finite Element Mesh	91
Figure 5.3: Average stresses versus settlement for different mesh densities	92

Figure 5.4: Effective vertical stresses.....	94
Figure 5.5: Effective horizontal stresses	94
Figure 5.6: Effective normal stresses on internal deadman side	95
Figure 5.7: Geogrid vertical displacements.....	95
Figure 5.8: Geogrid axial forces.....	95
Figure 5.9: Deformed Mesh	96
Figure 5.10: Vertical Displacements	96
Figure 5.11: Model verification for anchored geogrid with a different reinforcement length for $u = 0.3B$, and $h_d = 2u$	97
Figure 5.12: Model verification for anchored geogrid with a different reinforcement length for $u = 0.6B$, and $h_d = u$	98
Figure 5.13: Model verification for anchored geogrid with a different deadman height for $L=1.5B$, and $u=0.6B$	99
Figure 5.14: Model verification for anchored geogrid with a different reinforcement length for $u = 0.9B$, and $h_d = 0.67u$	100
Figure 5.15: Experimental results versus numerical results for anchored geogrid configurations	101
Figure 5.16: Model verification for strain distribution along reinforcement for anchored geogrid with a different reinforcement length, $u = 0.6B$, and $h_d = 1.0u$	102
Figure 5.17: Model verification for strain distribution along reinforcement for anchored geogrid with a different deadman height, $L=1.5B$, and u $=0.6B$	103
Figure 5.18: Model verification for strain distribution along reinforcement for anchored geogrid with a different reinforcement length, $u = 0.9B$, and $h_d = 0.67u$	104
Figure 5.19: Experimental and numerical tensile forces for anchored geogrid configurations	105
Figure 5.20: Average stresses versus settlement curves for anchored geogrid with a different reinforcement length for $B = 0.3m$, $d = 0.2m$, $u = 0.2B$, and $h_d = u$	108
Figure 5.21: Average stresses versus settlement curves for anchored geogrid with a different reinforcement length for $B = 0.3m$, $d = 0.2m$, $u = 0.3B$, and $h_d = u$	108
Figure 5.22: Average stresses versus settlement curves for anchored geogrid with a different reinforcement length for $B = 0.3m$, $d = 0.2m$, $u = 0.4B$, and $h_d = u$	109
Figure 5.23: Average stresses versus settlement curves for anchored geogrid with a different reinforcement length for $B = 1.0$, $d = 0.7m$, $u = 0.3B$, and $h_d = u$	109
Figure 5.24: Effect of reinforcement length for anchored geogrid with a different reinforcement depth on the bearing capacity ratio for $d/B=0.7$ and $h_d=u$	110
Figure 5.25: Average stresses versus settlement curves for anchored geogrid with a different deadman height for $B=0.3m$, $d=0.2m$, $u=0.2B$, and $L=B+u$	111
Figure 5.26: Average stresses versus settlement curves for anchored geogrid with a different deadman height for $B=0.3m$, $d=0.2m$, $u=0.3B$, and $L=B+u$	112