

# Settlement Behavior of Strip Foundation on Geogrid-Reinforced Clay under Cyclic Loading

Geogrid로 보강된 점토지반에 축조된 대상기초의 반복하중하에서의 침하거동

Shin, Eun-Chul\*<sup>1</sup>

신 은 철

Das, Braja M.\*<sup>2</sup>

다스 브라지 엠

---

## 요 지

직오그리드로 보강된 포화점토상에 축조된 줄기초가 낮은 빈도의 반복하중을 받았을시 발생하는 영구침하량을 산정하기위한 실내모형 실험을 실시하였다. 실험을 실시하는 과정에서 초기 단계에는 기초에 허용정적 하중을 가하였고 연속적으로 반복하중을 가하였다. 정적하중과 반복하중강도에 따른 기초의 최대영구침하량에 관하여 기술하였다.

## Abstract

Laboratory model tests to determine the permanent settlement of a surface strip foundation supported by geogrid-reinforced saturated clay and subjected to a low-frequency cyclic load were performed. In conducting the test, the foundation was initially subjected to an allowable static load. The cyclic load was then super-imposed over the static load. The variation of the maximum permanent settlement with the intensity of the static load and the intensity of the amplitude of the cyclic load are also presented.

---

## 1. Introduction

The study of the behavior of soils and foundations under various types of dynamic load applications was initiated during the 1960s and 1970s. During that period, a limited number of studies were conducted to determine the dynamic bearing capacity of shallow foundations and the resulting settlement(e.g. Triandafilidis, 1965; Vesic et al., 1965;

---

\*<sup>1</sup> 정희원, 인천대학교 공과대학 토목공학과 전임강사

\*<sup>2</sup> Dean, School of Engineering and Computer Science, California State University, Sacramento, CA 95819, USA

Prakash and Chummar, 1967). Experimental observations to determine the load-settlement relationships of surface square foundations supported by sand & clay and subjected to transient loading were reported by Cunny and Sloan(1961), Shenkman and Mckee(1961), and Jackson and Hadala(1964). The results of most of these studies were summarized by Das(1992). Raymond and Komos(1987) presented experimental results for the settlement of a strip foundation on granular soil under the effects of controlled cyclic vertical stress.

Recently, several attempts have been made to improve the ultimate and allowable bearing capacities of shallow foundations. Shin et al.(1993) conducted laboratory model tests on a surface strip foundation supported by geogrid-reinforced saturated clay(Fig.1) to obtain the critical parameters required to derive the maximum ultimate bearing capacity for a given clay-geogrid combination. In Figure 1, B is the width of strip foundation, N is the number of geogrid layers each having a width b, u is the distance between the bottom of the foundation and the first geogrid layer, and h is the vertical distance between two consecutive geogrid layers. The total depth of geogrid reinforcement, d, can be expressed as

$$d = u + (N - 1)h \quad (1)$$

The improvement in the ultimate bearing capacity of a foundation due to soil reinforcement is generally expressed in a nondimensional form called bearing capacity ratio (BCR) which is defined as

$$BCR = q_{u(R)} / q_u \quad (2)$$

where  $q_{u(R)}$  is the ultimate bearing capacity with soil reinforcement, and  $q_u$  is ultimate bearing capacity without reinforcement.

For a given soil and type of geogrid, and for a given value of  $b/B$ ,  $u/B$ , and  $h/B$ , the bearing capacity ratio will increase with the increase of the number (and thus  $d/B$ ) of geogrid layers up to a maximum value at  $d/B=(d/B)_{cr}$  and will remain practically constant thereafter. In a similar manner, other parameters remaining constant, there are critical values of  $u/B=(u/B)_{cr}$ , and  $b/B=(b/B)_{cr}$  at which the bearing capacity ratio reaches a maximum. The critical parameters of geogrid-reinforced foundation on clay derived from the study of Shin et al.(1993) were as follows :

$$(u/B)_{cr} \approx 0.4$$

$$(b/B)_{cr} \approx 4.5 \text{ to } 5.0$$

$$(d/B)_{cr} \approx 1.75 \text{ to } 1.8$$

In many instances, shallow foundations support vibrating machinery which may transmit cyclic load to the foundation. Laboratory model tests were conducted to evaluate the nature of settlement of a surface strip foundation supported by a geogrid-reinforced satu-

rated clay while being subjected to combination of static and cyclic loading of low frequency. To the knowledge of the author, results of such studies have not yet been reported in the literature.




Fig. 1 Strip foundation on geogrid-reinforced saturated clay

## 2. Laboratory Model Tests

Laboratory model tests were conducted with a clayey soil, the grain-size distribution of which is shown in Figure 2. About 98% of the soil could pass through a No.200 US sieve (0.075-mm opening). The liquid and plastic limits of the soil were 44% and 24%, respectively. Tensar BX1100 geogrid was used as the reinforcing material. The physical properties of the geogrid are as follows :

- (a) Structure : punctured sheet drawn
- (b) Polymer : polypropylene/high-density polyethylene copolymer
- (c) Junction method : unitized
- (d) Aperture size :
  - Machine direction : 25mm
  - Cross-machine direction : 33mm
- (e) Rib thickness : 0.76mm
- (f) Junction thickness : 2.29mm

Laboratory model tests were conducted in a box measuring 915mm(length) $\times$ 229mm(width) $\times$ 607mm(height). Three sides of the box were made of wooden planks and the remaining length side was made of Plexiglas. The model test box was braced with angle irons to avoid yielding during soil placement and actual testing. The inside of the model test box was made as smooth as possible by means of varnish to reduce friction with the edges of

the model foundation during the application of load.

The model foundation was made of hard wood with dimensions of 76mm(width)×229mm(length)×38mm(thickness). To ensure rigidity, an aluminum plate with the same width as the model foundation was mounted on its top. The base of model foundation was made rough by cementing a thin layer of sand to it with epoxy glue. On the top of the foundation, a hole was made to ensure that the applied centric load during model tests remained vertical.

The clayey soil obtained from the field was pulverized in the laboratory and mixed with predetermined amount of water. For uniform moisture distribution, the moist soil was put in several plastic bags which were then sealed and kept in a moist curing room for about a week before use. Table 1 shows the average physical properties of the compacted moist clay during the tests.




Fig. 2 Grain-size distribution of the clayey soil

Table 1. Average Properties of Clay During Tests

Parameter	Quantity
Moisture content	34%
Moist unit weight	18 kN/m <sup>3</sup>
Degree of saturation	96%
Undrained shear strength	12 kN/m <sup>2</sup>

For actual model tests, the moist soil was placed in the test box and compacted in 25mm thick layers by a flat-bottomed hammer. The geogrid layers were placed at desired values of  $u/B$  and  $h/B$ . The model foundation was placed on the surface of the compacted clay. Two types of test were conducted: (1) static loading tests to determine the ultimate bearing capacity, and (2) cyclic loading tests to determine the permanent settlement.

For the static loading tests, the load to the foundation was applied by a hydraulic jack. The load and corresponding settlement were measured by a proving ring and a dial gauge, respectively. The static tests were conducted on reinforced and unreinforced clay.

The cyclic loading tests were conducted by first applying a static load per unit area,  $q_s$ , of the type shown in Figure 3(b) was applied to the foundation. The frequency of the cyclic load was 1 cps. A Universal Testing Machine was used for the application of the static and cyclic loads on the foundation. Permanent settlement of the foundation due to the cyclic

load only ( $s_d$ ) was measured along with the number of load cycles. The load and corresponding settlement were measured by a loadcell and a LVDT. The number of load cycles and the corresponding foundation settlement were recorded by a data acquisition system.

Table 2 gives the details of the various test parameters. It is important to point out that Tests 2 through 11 were conducted with the geogrid reinforcement in place. For all of these tests the critical values of  $u/B$ ,  $b/B$ , and  $d/B$  determined by Shin et al.(1993) were used. Also,  $h/B$  for all tests was kept at  $1/3$  as suggested by Omar et al.(1993).




Fig. 3 Cyclic load test

### 3. Model Tests Results

Figure 4 shows the experimental variation of the load per unit area versus  $s/B$  ( $s$ =foundation settlement) obtained from the bearing capacity Test 1 and 2. The magnitude of  $s/B$  at ultimate load for reinforced and unreinforced cases was approximately identical to each other. The magnitude of  $q_u$  and  $q_{u(R)}$  obtained from Tests 1 and 2 was, respectively,  $61 \text{ kN/m}^2$  and  $86 \text{ kN/m}^2$ , thus giving a bearing capacity ratio,  $\text{BCR} = q_{u(R)} / q_u = 1.41$ .

Figure 5, 6, 7 and 8 show plots for the foundation settlement results from the application of cyclic load only ( $s_d$ ) conducted in Series II, III, IV and V, respectively. For a given  $q_s / q_{u(R)}$  and  $q_{d(max)} / q_{u(R)}$  or  $q_s / q_u$  and  $q_{d(max)} / q_u$  combination, the general nature of the variation of  $s_e / B$  with logarithm of the number of load cycle applications ( $\log n$ ) is as shown in Figure 9.




Fig. 4 Plot of load per unit area versus settlement: Tests 1 and 2

Table 2. Details of Test Parameters

Test Series	Test no.	$q_s / q_{u(R)} (\%)$	$q_{d(max)} / q_{u(R)} (\%)$	Comments
I	1	—	—	Static test for $q_u$ without reinforcement
	2	—	—	Static test for $q_{u(R)}$ without reinforcement
II	3	31.7	3.4	Cyclic test with reinforcement $u/B=0.4, h/B=1/3, b/B=5, d/B=1.73$ (see Fig.1 for $u, b, h$ and $d$ )
	4	31.7	7.4	
	5	31.7	14.6	
III	6	23.4	3.4	
	7	23.4	7.4	
	8	23.4	14.6	
IV	9	14.6	3.4	
	10	14.6	3.4	
	11	14.6	14.6	
V		$q_s / q_u (\%)$	$q_{d(max)} / q_u (\%)$	Cyclic test without reinforcement
	12	23.4	3.4	
	13	23.4	7.4	
	14	23.4	14.6	

Note :  $q_u$  = ultimate static bearing capacity without geogrid reinforcement  
 $q_{u(R)}$  = ultimate static bearing capacity with geogrid reinforcement.

The plot of  $s_d/B$  versus  $\log n$  be divided into three zones. Zone I a rapid settlement zone ( $n \leq n_r$ ) where which a major portion of the ultimate permanent settlement takes place. The permanent settlement due to cyclic load application at  $n = n_{cr}$  is equal to  $s_{d(r)}$ . The magnitude of  $n_r$  is about 10. Following the rapid settlement zone, there is a zone (Zone II) of slowly retarding rate of settlement between  $n = n_r$  and  $n = n_{cr}$ . Zone III is a zone in which practically no additional permanent settlement takes place due to cyclic load application.

Hence, for practical purposes, the ultimate permanent settlement due to cyclic load appli-

cation may be taken as  $s_{d(u)}$ , which corresponds to  $n = n_{cr}$ .

Using the concept described above, the variations of  $s_{d(u)}/B$  for different combinations of  $q_{d(max)}/q_{u(R)}$  and  $q_s/q_{u(R)}$  or  $q_s/q_u$  and  $q_{d(max)}/q_u$  were determined and are plotted in Figure 10. Based on the plots, the following general conclusions can be drawn :

- (1) For a given value of  $q_{d(max)}$ , the magnitude of the permanent settlement increases with the increase in  $q_s$ .
- (2) For a given value of  $q_s$ , the magnitude of the permanent settlement increases with the increase of  $q_{d(max)}$ .

For the present tests, with minor deviations, the permanent settlement due to cyclic loading can be expressed as (for  $4\% \leq q_{u(max)}/q_{u(R)} \leq 15\%$ ,  $14.6\% \leq q_s/q_{u(R)} \leq 31.7\%$ )

$$\frac{s_{d(u)}}{B} (\%) = 0.16 \left[ \frac{q_{d(max)}}{q_{u(R)}} (\%) \right] + 8.33 \log \left[ \frac{q_s}{q_{u(R)}} (\%) \right] - 8.6 \quad (3)$$




Fig. 5 Variation of  $s_d/B$  with  $n$ ,  $q_s/q_{u(R)}=31.4\%$




Fig. 6 Variation of  $s_d/B$  with  $n$ ,  $q_s/q_{u(R)}=23.4\%$




Fig. 7 Variation of  $s_d/B$  with  $n$ ,  $q_s/q_{u(R)}=14.6\%$




Fig. 8 Variation of  $s_d/B$  with  $n$ ,  $q_s/q_{u(R)}=23.4\%$




Fig. 9 General nature of variation of  $s_d/B$  with  $n$




Fig. 10 Plot of  $s_d/B$  versus  $q_{d(max)}/q_{u(R)}$  for values of  $q_s/q_{u(R)}$

It can also be seen from Figures 5, 6, and 7 that the magnitude of  $n_{tr}$  for series II, III and IV was  $2 \times 10^4 - 2.5 \times 10^4$ ,  $1.8 \times 10^4 - 2.3 \times 10^4$ , and  $1.5 \times 10^4 - 1.7 \times 10^4$ , respectively. Hence it appears that the magnitude of  $n_{tr}$  increases with the increases in  $q_s$  and  $q_{d(max)}$ . A comparison of the permanent settlements shows that full depth geogrid reinforcement can decrease the permanent settlement of the foundation by 20% to 30% due to cyclic loading.

#### 4. Conclusions

Laboratory model tests to estimate the permanent settlement of a surface strip foundation supported by geogrid-reinforced saturated clay and subjected to low-frequency cyclic loading have been presented. Based on the model test results, the following conclusions can be drawn :

- (1) For a given amplitude of the cyclic load intensity, the maximum permanent settlement increases with the increase in the intensity of the static load.
- (2) For a given intensity of static loading, the maximum permanent settlement increases with the increase in the amplitude of the cyclic load intensity.
- (3) From the test results (Fig. 10) of Test Series III and V, full depth geogrid reinforcement may reduce the permanent settlement of a foundation by about 20% to 30% compared to one without reinforcement.

#### References

1. Cunny, R.W. & Sloan, R.C.(1961). "Dynamic loading machine and results of preliminary small footing tests", *Special technical publication 305*, ASTM, pp.65~77.
2. Das, B.M.(1992). "*Principles of Soil Dynamics*", PWS Publishing, Boston, MA.
3. Jackson, J.G., Jr. & Hadala, P.E.(1964). "Dynamic bearing capacity of soils", In Report 3: *The ap*



- plication of Similitude to Small Scale Footing Tests*, US Army Corps of Engineers, Waterways Experiment Station, Vicksburg, MS.
4. Prakash, S. & Chummar, A.V.(1967). "Response of footings to lateral loads", In *Proceedings, International Symposium on Wave Propagation and Dynamic Properties of Earth Materials*, University of New Mexico Press, NM, pp.679~691.
  5. Omar, M.T., Das B.M., Yen, S.C., Puri, V.K. and Cook, E.E.,(1993). "Ultimate bearing capacity of rectangular foundations on geogrid-reinforced sand", *Geotechnical Testing Journal*, ASTM, 16(2), pp.246~252.
  6. Raymond, G.P. & Komos, F.E.(1978). "Repeated load testing of a model plane strain footing", *Canadian Geotechnical Journal* 15(2), pp.190~201.
  7. Shenkman, S. & McKeel, K.E.(1961). "Bearing capacity of dynamically loaded footings", *Special Technical Publication 305*, ASTM, pp.78~90.
  8. Shin, E.C., Das, B.B., Puri, V.K., Yen, S.C. & Cook, E.E.(1993). "Bearing capacity of strip foundation on geogrid reinforced clay", *Geotechnical Testing Journal*, ASTM, 16(4), pp.534~541.
  9. Triandafilidis, G.E.(1965). "The dynamic response of continuous footing supported on cohesive soil" In *Proceedings of VI International Conference on Soil Mechanics and Foundation Engineering*, Vol. 2, A.A. Balkema, Rotterdam, pp.205~208.
  10. Vesic, A.S., Banks, D.C. & Woodward, J.M.(1965). "An experimental study of dynamic bearing capacity of footings on sand", In *Proceedings of VI International Conference on Soil Mechanics and Foundation Engineering*, Vol 2, A.A. Balkema, Rotterdam, pp.209~203.

(접수일자 1994. 12. 15)