

Assessment of Soil Arching in a Pile-supported Railway Embankment under the Moving Train Load and Earthquake

by Naveen Kumar Meena

Thesis submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

under the supervision of Dr. Sanjay Nimbalkar and A/Prof. Behzad Fatahi

University of Technology Sydney
Faculty of Engineering and Information Technology
(FEIT)

January 2022

CERTIFICATE OF ORIGINAL AUTHORSHIP

I, *Naveen Kumar Meena* declare that this thesis, is submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the award of *Doctor of Philosophy*, in the *School of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Faculty of Engineering and Information Technology* at the University of Technology Sydney.

This thesis is wholly my own work unless otherwise referenced or acknowledged. In addition, I certify that all information sources and literature used are indicated in the thesis.

This document has not been submitted for qualifications at any other academic institution.

This research is supported by the Government of India under National Overseas Scholarship, No. 11016/16/2016 Education.

Signature: Production Note:
 Signature removed
 prior to publication.

(NAVEEN KUMAR MEENA)

Date: 03/January/2022

DEDICATED

To my family and friends

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

PhD become the most memorable period in my life where I challenged and improved myself over these four years of journey. Successful completion of my PhD would not have been possible without the motivation of many people. Therefore, I am conveying my sincere thanks to all of them.

First and foremost, I would like to express my deep gratitude to my principal supervisor, Dr. Sanjay Nimbalkar, for his continuous support and guidance throughout this journey. Apart from academic expertise, his encouraging nature has been the key to success. His proficiency in understanding students' learning nature and guiding them is remarkable. I am profoundly indebted and blessed to have him as my principal supervisor. I would also like to thank my co-supervisor, Associate Professor Behzad Fatahi, for his supervision and willingness to help whenever possible. I am also very appreciative to my candidature committee for their support during my candidature assessments.

My sincere thank go to the Ministry of Tribal Affairs, Government of India, for providing me the financial support as National Overseas Scholarship, No. 11016/16/2016 Education. I am also very thankful to the Consulate General of India Sydney for lookout all matters regarding my scholarship during my full candidature.

Finally, I would like to thank all my family and friends for their encouragement and unconditional love when I needed it most.

LIST OF PUBLICATIONS

RELATED TO THE THESIS:

Journal articles

1. **Meena, N. K.** Nimbalkar, S. Fatahi, B. and Yang, G. (2020). “Effects of soil arching on behavior of pile-supported railway embankment: 2D FEM approach”, *Computers and Geotechnics*, vol. 123, pp. 103601.
2. **Meena, N. K.** and Nimbalkar, S. “Two-Dimensional Analytical Solution of Soil Arching in a Pile-supported Geosynthetic-reinforced Railway Embankment”, *Geosynthetics International*, (***Under review***)
3. **Meena, N. K.** Nimbalkar, S. and Fatahi, B. “Investigation of soil arching in a geosynthetic-reinforced pile-supported embankment under the earthquake”. (***draft under preparation***)

Book chapter

1. Nimbalkar, S. and **Meena, N. K.** (2022). “Static and Seismic Assessment of Soil Arching in Piled Embankments” In: Kolathayar S., Pal I., Chian S.C., Mondal A. (eds) *Civil Engineering for Disaster Risk Reduction*. Springer Tracts in Civil Engineering. Springer, Singapore.

Peer-reviewed conference papers

1. **Meena, N. K.** Nimbalkar, S. and Fatahi, B. (2019). “Finite element modeling of soil arching in pile supported embankment: 2D approach”, In *International Congress and Exhibition “Sustainable Civil Infrastructures”* (pp. 40-50). Springer, Cham.

2. **Meena, N. K.**, and Nimbalkar, S. (2019). “Seismic assessment of soil arching in piled embankment using finite element approach”, In *4th Australasian Conference on Computational Mechanics*, Hobart, Australia, p. 24.
3. **Meena, N. K.**, Nimbalkar, S., and Fatahi, B. (2021). “Finite Element Analysis of Soil Arching in Piled Embankment”, In *International Conference of the International Association for Computer Methods and Advances in Geomechanics* (pp. 817-824). Springer, Cham.
4. **Meena, N. K.**, Nimbalkar, S. (2021). “Soil Arching in Geosynthetic-Reinforced Pile-supported Railway Embankments under the Seismic Condition”, *Australian Earthquake Engineering Society (AEES) conference*.
5. **Meena, N. K.**, Nimbalkar, S., and Fatahi, B. (2022). “Finite element simulation of the soil arching in a pile-supported railway embankment considering train loading”, In *Proceedings of the 20th International Conference on Soil Mechanics and Geotechnical Engineering*, Sydney 2022.

OTHERS:

1. **Meena, N. K.**, and Nimbalkar, S. (2019). “Effect of water drawdown and dynamic loads on piled raft: two-dimensional finite element approach”, *Infrastructures*, 4(4), 75.
2. Rajeev, A., **Meena, N. K.**, and Pallav, K. (2019). “Comparative Study of Seismic Design and Performance of OMRF Building Using Indian, British, and European Codes”, *Infrastructures*, 4(4), 71.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Certificate of Original Authorship	i
Acknowledgement	iii
List of Publications	iv
Table of Contents	vi
List of Figures	xiii
List of Tables	xxiv
List of Symbols	xxvi
ABSTRACT	xxxii
1. INTRODUCTION	1
<i>1.1 Background</i>	<i>1</i>
<i>1.2 Problem statement and research objectives</i>	<i>3</i>
<i>1.3 Limitations of this thesis</i>	<i>6</i>
<i>1.4 Thesis outline</i>	<i>6</i>
2. LITERATURE REVIEW	10
<i>2.1 Pile-supported embankments</i>	<i>10</i>
<i>2.2 Soil arching</i>	<i>11</i>
<i>2.2.1 Soil arcing terminologies</i>	<i>13</i>
<i> 2.2.1.1 Stress concentration ratio (SCR)</i>	<i>14</i>
<i> 2.2.1.2 Soil arching ratio (SAR)</i>	<i>14</i>
<i> 2.2.1.3 Stress efficacy on the pile top (E_{str})</i>	<i>15</i>
<i>2.2.2 Theoretical evaluation of soil arching in GRPS embankments</i>	<i>16</i>

2.2.3	<i>Ground reaction curve (GRC)</i>	18
2.2.4	<i>Soil arching investigation in GRPS embankments</i>	19
2.2.4.1	<i>Experimental investigations</i>	19
2.2.4.2	<i>Numerical investigations</i>	25
2.2.4.3	<i>Theoretical investigations</i>	34
2.2.5	<i>GRPS embankment characteristics affecting soil arching</i>	35
2.2.5.1	<i>GRPS embankment geometry and material parameters</i>	35
2.2.5.2	<i>Nature of the imposed surcharge</i>	37
2.3	<i>Effect of seismic activities on soil arching</i>	38
2.4	<i>Summary and research gaps</i>	39
3. SOIL ARCHING IN A PILE-SUPPORTED RAILWAY EMBANKMENT:		
	2D FEM APPROACH	41
3.1	<i>Introduction</i>	41
3.1.1	<i>Two-dimensional (2D) idealisation</i>	42
3.2	<i>Numerical modelling</i>	43
3.2.1	<i>Geometric description</i>	43
3.2.2	<i>Material properties</i>	45
3.2.3	<i>Interface</i>	46
3.2.4	<i>Model validation</i>	47
3.2.5	<i>Stress determination on the pile-supported embankment</i>	48
3.2.6	<i>Effect of pile arrangement on soil arching</i>	52
3.3	<i>Results and discussion</i>	53
3.3.1	<i>Vertical stress</i>	53
3.3.2	<i>Comparison with Hewlett and Randolph (1988) predictive method</i>	57

3.3.3 Settlement	59
3.3.3.1 Total settlement	61
3.3.3.2 Differential settlement	62
3.3.4 Lateral stress coefficient (K)	64
3.3.5 Tension in geosynthetic layer (T)	69
3.4 Parametric study	70
3.4.1 Total settlement	70
3.4.2 Differential settlement	72
3.4.3 Soil arching ratio (SAR)	73
3.4.4 Stress concentration ratio (SCR)	75
3.4.5 Stress efficacy (E_{str})	78
3.4.6 Tension in geosynthetic layer (T)	80
3.4.7 Effect on arching height (h_{arch})	83
3.4.8 Effect of equivalent dynamic load induced by different train speed	86
3.4.9 Shape of soil arching	88
3.4.10 Review of available design approaches	91
3.5 Practical implications and limitations	95
3.6 Three-dimensional (3D) unit cell numerical modelling	98
3.7 Summary	100
4. 2D ANALYTICAL SCHEME OF SOIL ARCHING IN A PILE- SUPPORTED RAILWAY EMBANKMENT	104
4.1 Introduction	105
4.2 Theoretical analysis of soil arching in 2D	106

4.2.1 Theoretical analysis of soil arching in an unreinforced pile-supported railway embankment	108
4.2.2 Theoretical analysis of soil arching in an unreinforced pile-supported railway embankment	112
4.2.2.1 Vertical stress distribution on the geosynthetic layer in a reinforced pile-supported railway embankment	114
4.2.2.2 Tension in the geosynthetic layer	116
4.2.2.3 Soil-geosynthetic layer interface	116
4.3 Validation of the present analytical method	119
4.3.1 Field study (Cao et al. 2016)	119
4.3.2 Field study (Chen et al. 2016)	121
4.4 Parametric study	123
4.4.1 Effect of embankment height	124
4.4.2 Effect of the one-dimensional modulus of subsoil	130
4.4.3 Effect of the tensile stiffness of the geosynthetic layer	135
4.4.4 Effect of equivalent dynamic load induced by different train speed	139
4.5 Theoretical analysis of soil arching in a pile-supported embankment considering an earthquake	142
4.5.1 In unreinforced pile-supported railway embankment	145
4.5.2 In reinforced pile-supported railway embankment	146
4.6 Summary	148
5. A 3D ANALYTICAL ASSESSMENT OF SOIL ARCHING IN A PILE-SUPPORTED RAILWAY EMBANKMENT	153

5.1 Introduction	153
5.2 3D analytical method for GRPS railway embankments	154
5.2.1 <i>Theoretical analysis of soil arching in an unreinforced pile-supported railway embankment</i>	155
5.2.1.1 <i>Soil arching in the three-dimensional (3D) condition when the arching crown is critical</i>	156
5.2.1.2 <i>Soil arching in the three-dimensional (3D) condition when the pile head is critical</i>	158
5.2.2 <i>Theoretical analysis of soil arching in a GRPS railway embankment</i>	159
5.2.3 <i>Soil arching indices</i>	162
5.3 Validation of the proposed analytical method	163
5.4 Parametric study	164
5.4.1 <i>Effect of embankment height</i>	165
5.4.2 <i>Effect of the one-dimensional modulus of subsoil</i>	171
5.4.3 <i>Effect of tensile stiffness of the geosynthetic layer</i>	176
5.4.4 <i>Effect of equivalent dynamic load induced by different train speed</i>	180
5.5 Summary	185
6. INVESTIGATION OF SOIL ARCHING IN A PILE-SUPPORTED EMBANKMENT UNDER THE EARTHQUAKE	187
6.1 Introduction	187
6.2 Numerical modelling	189
6.2.1 <i>Geometric profile of FE model</i>	189
6.2.2 <i>Boundary condition, element type and interface</i>	190

6.2.3 Constitutive model, material parameters and damping	190
6.2.4 Seismic input	194
6.2.5 FE simulation procedure	195
6.3 FE model validation	196
6.4 Results and discussion	196
6.4.1 Vertical stress	196
6.4.2 Settlement	200
6.4.3 Soil arching indices	203
6.4.3.1 Stress concentration ratio (SCR)	203
6.4.3.2 Soil arching ratio (SAR)	204
6.5 Parametric study	205
6.5.1 Effect of embankment height and pile spacing	206
6.5.2 Effect of the embankment modulus and friction angle	210
6.5.3 Effect of tensile stiffness of the geosynthetic layer	218
6.5.4 Effect of the amplitude of input seismic excitation	222
6.6 Summary	230
7. INVESTIGATION OF SOIL ARCHING IN A PILE-SUPPORTED RAILWAY EMBANKMENT UNDER THE MOVING TRAIN LOAD	233
7.1 Introduction	233
7.2 Finite element method (FEM) simulation	234
7.2.1 Brief description	234
7.2.2 Moving train load	236
7.2.3 Numerical analysis procedure	237

7.3 Validation of FE modelling	237
7.4 Results and discussion	239
7.4.1 Vertical stress	239
7.4.2 Settlement	240
7.5 Parametric study	241
7.5.1 Effect of pile spacing (<i>s</i>) and embankment height (<i>h</i>)	242
7.5.2 Effect of the embankment modulus and friction angle	246
7.5.3 Effect of the train speed	251
7.6 Summary	256
8. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	259
8.1 Conclusions	259
8.1.1 Soil arching in a pile-supported railway embankment	259
8.1.2 2D analytical scheme of soil arching in a pile-supported railways embankment	260
8.1.3 3D analytical assessment of soil arching in a pile-supported railway embankment	261
8.1.4 Investigation of soil arching in a pile-supported embankment under the earthquake	261
8.1.5 Investigation of soil arching in a pile-supported embankment under the moving train load	262
8.2 Recommendations for further research	262
References	265
Appendix A	278

LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE	Page
Figure 1.1: Schematic diagram of geosynthetic-reinforced pile-supported railway embankment and soil arching mechanism	2
Figure 1.2: A flow chart of the research objectives and the outcome	5
Figure 2.1: Vertical stress-settlement curve (modified from Terzaghi 1936)	12
Figure 2.2: A typical schematic diagram of (a) positive soil arching, and (b) negative soil arching (modified from Han et al. 2017)	13
Figure 2.3: A typical schematic diagram of soil arching theoretical model families: (a) Frictional models; (b) Limit equilibrium models; (c) Rigid arch models (modified from Rui et al. 2018)	16
Figure 2.4: Soil arching evolution (modified from Iglesia et al. 1999)	18
Figure 2.5: General concept of the ground reaction curve	19
Figure 2.6: Illustration of the principle of the EA method (modified from Zhang et al. 2014)	34
Figure 3.1: Typical pile-supported railway embankment with modelled unit cell	43
Figure 3.2: Model validation with experimental data reported by King et al. (2019)	47
Figure 3.3: Comparison of two different pile arrangements	53
Figure 3.4: Normalised vertical stress contour for varied; (a) embankment height, and (b) pile spacing	56
Figure 3.5: Effect of geosynthetic layer on vertical stress in embankment fill	57

Figure 3.6: Comparison of FE results with Hewlett and Randolph (1988) method: normalised stress on point A ($\sigma_s/\gamma s$) vs. normalised embankment height (h/s)	58
Figure 3.7: Normalised settlement contour for varied (a) embankment height, and (b) pile spacing	61
Figure 3.8: Effect of embankment height on total settlement	62
Figure 3.9: Settlement ratio at (a) the embankment top, (b) point A	63
Figure 3.10: Lateral stress coefficient (K) for varied embankment height at (a) point A, (b) point B	66
Figure 3.11: Lateral stress coefficient (K) for varied pile spacing at (a) point A, (b) point B	68
Figure 3.12: Tension distribution in a geosynthetic layer	69
Figure 3.13: Influence on total settlement due to (a) pile modulus and embankment modulus (b) friction angle, and dilation angle	71
Figure 3.14: Influence on settlement ratio (δ_{em}/δ_p) due to (a) pile modulus and embankment modulus (b) friction angle, and dilation angle	73
Figure 3.15: Influence on soil arching ratio (SAR) due to (a) pile modulus and embankment modulus (b) friction angle, and dilation angle	75
Figure 3.16: Effect of embankment height (h) and pile spacing (s) on stress concentration ratio (SCR)	76
Figure 3.17: Influence on stress concentration ratio (SCR) due to (a) pile modulus and embankment modulus (b) friction angle, and dilation angle	77
Figure 3.18: Effect of reinforcement on stress concentration ratio (SCR)	78

Figure 3.19: Influence on stress efficacy (E_{str}) due to (a) pile modulus and embankment modulus (b) friction angle, and dilation angle	80
Figure 3.20: Influence on tension in geosynthetic layer (T) of (a) pile modulus, (b) embankment modulus, (c) friction angle, and (d) dilation angle	82
Figure 3.21: Influence of tension in geosynthetic layer (T) on stress concentration ratio (SCR)	83
Figure 3.22: Influence on soil arching height (h_{arch}) due to (a) embankment height, (b) clear pile spacing ($s-d$), and (c) friction angle	86
Figure 3.23: Influence of train speed on (a) settlement ratio, (b) soil arching ratio (SAR)	87
Figure 3.24: Influence on arching shape due to (a) pile modulus, (b) embankment modulus, (c) friction angle, and (d) dilation angle	91
Figure 3.25: Review of available design approaches with present study, (a) soil arching ratio (SAR), and (b) efficacy (E_{str})	95
Figure 3.26: FE unit cell model in (a) 2D and (b) 3D	99
Figure 3.27: Comparison of vertical stress on subsoil in 2D and 3D FE model ..	100
Figure 4.1: (a) Cross-sectional view of the pile-supported railway embankment; (b) Longitudinal view of the considered unit length with the sleeper	108
Figure 4.2: Vertical stress (σ_{RT}) at depth h' below the embankment top due to the self-weight of rail track and the moving train	111
Figure 4.3: Deflection in the geosynthetic layer overlying the pile head and subsoil	113
Figure 4.4: Vertical stress distribution on the geosynthetic layer and tension	115
Figure 4.5: Shear stress developed at the soil-geosynthetic layer interface	117

Figure 4.6: Relative error of different methods in predicting stress efficacy based on Cao et al. (2016)	121
Figure 4.7: Relative error of different methods in predicting stress efficacy based on Chen et al. (2016)	123
Figure 4.8: Effect of embankment height on the stress concentration ratio in (a) the unreinforced case; and (b) the reinforced case	126
Figure 4.9: Effect of embankment height on efficacy in (a) the unreinforced case (b) the reinforced case	127
Figure 4.10: Effect of embankment height on (a) tension, and (b) axial strain in the geosynthetic layer	129
Figure 4.11: Effect of embankment height on deflection in the geosynthetic layer	130
Figure 4.12: Effect of the one-dimensional modulus of the subsoil on the stress concentration ratio in (a) the unreinforced case; and (b) the reinforced case	132
Figure 4.13: Effect of the one-dimensional modulus of subsoil on stress efficacy in (a) the unreinforced case; and (b) the reinforced case	133
Figure 4.14: Effect of the one-dimensional modulus of subsoil on the tension in the geosynthetic layer	134
Figure 4.15: Effect of the one-dimensional modulus of subsoil on deflection in the geosynthetic layer	135
Figure 4.16: Effect of tensile stiffness of the geosynthetic layer on (a) the stress concentration ratio; and (b) the stress efficacy	136

Figure 4.17: Effect of tensile stiffness of the geosynthetic layer on deflection in the geosynthetic layer	137
Figure 4.18: Effect of tensile stiffness of the geosynthetic layer on (a) tension; and (b) axial strain in the geosynthetic layer	138
Figure 4.19: Effect of equivalent dynamic load induced by different train speed on the stress concentration ratio in (a) the unreinforced case, and (b) the reinforced case	140
Figure 4.20: Effect of equivalent dynamic load induced by different train speed on stress efficacy in (a) unreinforced, and (b) reinforced case	141
Figure 4.21: Effect of equivalent dynamic load induced by different train speed on deflection in the geosynthetic layer	142
Figure 4.22: Schematic diagram of an embankment under the seismic excitation	144
Figure 4.23: Effect of vertical acceleration on the stress concentration ratio in the unreinforced condition	146
Figure 4.24: Effect of vertical acceleration on the stress concentration ratio in the reinforced condition	147
Figure 4.25: Effect of vertical acceleration on the tension in a geosynthetic layer	148
Figure 5.1: Stress distribution on a three-dimensional (3D) element of soil arching (modified from Hewlett and Randolph 1988)	155
Figure 5.2: Vertical stress formation in a reinforced case of pile-supported embankment	160

Figure 5.3: Effect of embankment height on the stress concentration ratio in (a) the unreinforced case, and (b) the reinforced case	166
Figure 5.4: Effect of embankment height on stress efficacy in (a) the unreinforced case, and (b) the reinforced case	168
Figure 5.5: Effect of embankment height on the soil arching ratio in (a) the unreinforced case, and (b) the reinforced case	170
Figure 5.6: Effect of embankment height on tension in the geosynthetic layer	171
Figure 5.7: Effect of one-dimensional modulus of subsoil on stress concentration ratio in (a) the unreinforced case, and (b) the reinforced case	172
Figure 5.8: Effect of one-dimensional modulus of subsoil on stress efficacy in (a) the unreinforced case, and (b) the reinforced case	174
Figure 5.9: Effect of one-dimensional modulus of subsoil on the soil arching ratio in (a) the unreinforced case, and (b) the reinforced case	175
Figure 5.10: Effect of one-dimensional modulus of subsoil on tension in the geosynthetic layer	176
Figure 5.11: Effect of tensile stiffness of the geosynthetic layer on the stress concentration ratio in the reinforced case	177
Figure 5.12: Effect of tensile stiffness of the geosynthetic layer on the stress efficacy in the reinforced case	178
Figure 5.13: Effect of tensile stiffness of the geosynthetic layer on the soil arching ratio in the reinforced case	179
Figure 5.14: Effect of tensile stiffness of the geosynthetic layer on tension in the geosynthetic layer	180

Figure 5.15: Effect of train speed on the stress concentration ratio in (a) the unreinforced case, and (b) the reinforced case	181
Figure 5.16: Effect of train speed on stress efficacy in (a) the unreinforced case, and (b) the reinforced case	183
Figure 5.17: Effect of train speed on the soil arching ratio in (a) the unreinforced case, and (b) the reinforced case	184
Figure 5.18: Effect of train speed on tension in the geosynthetic layer	185
Figure 6.1: Locations of the key seismic events in Australia (map modified from Geoscience Australia)	188
Figure 6.2: (a) Horizontal acceleration time history of the Christchurch 2011 earthquake, and (b) Fast Fourier transform amplitude of the Christchurch 2011 earthquake	195
Figure 6.3: Mesh profile of the FE model	196
Figure 6.4: Vertical stress contour for different time instances	197
Figure 6.5: Vertical stress contour at earthquake time (t) = 30 s for (a) the unreinforced case, and (b) the reinforced case	198
Figure 6.6: Normalised vertical stress on the subsoil and pile during the earthquake	200
Figure 6.7: Settlement contour for different time instances	201
Figure 6.8: Settlement contour at earthquake time (t) = 30 s for (a) the unreinforced case, and (b) the reinforced case	202
Figure 6.9: Normalised settlement on the subsoil and pile top during the earthquake	203
Figure 6.10: Stress concentration ratio time history during the earthquake	204

Figure 6.11: Soil arching ratio time history	205
Figure 6.12: Effect of embankment height and pile spacing on normalised vertical stress on the subsoil at the end of the earthquake	206
Figure 6.13: Effect of embankment height and pile spacing on the normalised settlement of the subsoil top at the end of earthquake	207
Figure 6.14: Effect of embankment height and pile spacing on maximum tension in the geosynthetic layer at the end of the earthquake	208
Figure 6.15: Effect of embankment height and pile spacing on the stress concentration ratio at the end of the earthquake	209
Figure 6.16: Effect of embankment height and pile spacing on the soil arching ratio at the end of the earthquake	209
Figure 6.17: Effect on normalised vertical stress due to (a) embankment modulus, and (b) friction angle	211
Figure 6.18: Effect on normalised settlement due to (a) embankment modulus, and (b) friction angle	213
Figure 6.19: Effect on maximum tension in the geosynthetic layer due to (a) embankment modulus, (b) friction angle	214
Figure 6.20: Effect on stress concentration ratio due to (a) embankment modulus, (b) friction angle	216
Figure 6.21: Effect on soil arching ratio due to (a) embankment modulus, (b) friction angle	217
Figure 6.22: Effect of geosynthetic tensile stiffness normalised vertical stress acting on the subsoil	218

Figure 6.23: Effect of geosynthetic tensile stiffness on normalised settlement of subsoil	219
Figure 6.24: Effect of geosynthetic tensile stiffness on maximum tension in the geosynthetic layer	220
Figure 6.25: Effect of geosynthetic tensile stiffness on the stress concentration ratio	221
Figure 6.26: Effect of geosynthetic tensile stiffness on the soil arching ratio	221
Figure 6.27: Vertical stress contour for different peak ground acceleration	223
Figure 6.28: Effect of peak ground acceleration on the normalised vertical stress acting on the subsoil	224
Figure 6.29: Normalised settlement contours for different peak ground acceleration	225
Figure 6.30: Normalised settlement of subsoil for different peak ground acceleration	226
Figure 6.31: Effect of peak ground acceleration on maximum tension in the geosynthetic layer	227
Figure 6.32: Effect of peak ground acceleration on tension in a geosynthetic layer	228
Figure 6.33: Effect of peak ground acceleration on the stress concentration ratio	229
Figure 6.34: Effect of peak ground acceleration on the soil arching ratio	229
Figure 7.1: A typical cross section of pile-supported embankment including FE simulated model	234

Figure 7.2: (a) Description of considered train configuration for moving train load calculation (b) Loading pattern induced by a train moving at 40 km/h train speed	236
Figure 7.3: Comparison of vertical displacement of a beam with the data reported by Yang and Yau (1997)	238
Figure 7.4: Comparison of vertical displacement of rail with the data reported by Paixão et al. (2014)	239
Figure 7.5: Normalised vertical stress distribution under the embankment construction and moving train loading	240
Figure 7.6: Normalised settlement under the embankment construction and moving train loading	241
Figure 7.7: Effect of embankment height and pile spacing on normalised vertical stress at the subsoil top	243
Figure 7.8: Effect of embankment height and pile spacing on normalised settlement of subsoil	244
Figure 7.9: Effect of embankment height and pile spacing on stress efficacy	245
Figure 7.10: Effect of embankment height and pile spacing on maximum tension in geosynthetic layer	246
Figure 7.11: Effect of pile and embankment modulus spacing on stress efficacy	247
Figure 7.12: Effect of friction and dilation angle on stress efficacy	248
Figure 7.13: Effect of (a) embankment modulus and (b) friction angle on the settlement at the base of embankment	249

Figure 7.14: Effect of (a) embankment modulus and (b) friction angle on the tension in geosynthetic layer	251
Figure 7.15: Effect of train speed on the Lateral stress coefficient (K) (a) at subsoil, (b) at pile top	253
Figure 7.16: Effect of train speed on the embankment settlement on the subsoil	254
Figure 7.17: Effect of train speed on stress efficacy	255
Figure 7.18: Effect of train speed on tension in geosynthetic layer	256
Figure A.1: Soil element at the (a) soil arching crown (b) pile head	278
Figure A.2: Failure theory for (a) 2D plane strain and (b) 3D condition (modified from Hewlett and Randolph 1988)	282

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	Page
Table 2.1: Elementary model of soil arching	17
Table 2.2: Summery of the experimental studies of soil arching in the past years	20
Table 2.3: Summery of the past studies based on numerical simulation	26
Table 3.1: Material parameters for pile-supported embankment	45
Table 3.2: Dynamic Amplification Factor (DAF) calculation with different methods	49
Table 3.3: Induced vertical stress on embankment top obtained by Trapezoidal method	52
Table 3.4: Soil arching height verified by various studies	54
TABLE 3.5: Equations for calculating soil arching ratio (<i>SAR</i>) and stress efficacy (E_{str}) by different design methods	93
Table 4.1: Calculation of the surcharge on the embankment top	109
Table 4.2: Calculation of the moving train surcharge (σ_{train}) due to 25 t axle load	110
Table 4.3: A brief of parameters used for validation of present analytical method	119
Table 4.4: Comparison of present method with Cao et al. (2016) measurement and other methods	120
Table 4.5: Comparison of present method with Chen et al. (2016) measurement and other methods	122
Table 5.1: Calculation of the track surcharge on the embankment top	157

Table 5.2: A brief of the parameters used to validate the proposed 3D analytical method	163
Table 5.3: Comparison of present method with Xu et al. (2015) measurement and other methods	164
Table 6.1: Seismic events in Australia and territories (Meena and Nimbalkar 2019)	189
Table 6.2: Material properties used for the seismic analysis	191
Table 6.3: Parameter values to determine the shear wave velocity, stiffness and damping coefficient	193
Table 6.4: Dynamic parameters used for the seismic analysis	193
Table 7.1: Material properties of rail track	235
Table 7.2: Dynamic parameters of ballast and subballast used in numerical simulation for moving train*	235

LIST OF SYMBOLS

The following symbols and abbreviations are used in this thesis:

Notations

A	Effective surface area of a pile
A_{Emtop}	Area of embankment top
A_{ef}	Effective surface area of a single pile
A_{h}	Horizontal acceleration
A_{p}	Cross-sectional area of a pile
A_{s}	Area of clear pile spacing
A_{sb}	Area of subballast
A_{v}	Vertical acceleration
A_{wall}	Area of the pile wall
$A_{\sigma_{\text{track}}}$	Area of applied stress due to the track
$A_{\sigma_{\text{train}}}$	Area of applied stress due to the train loading
$A_{\sigma_{\text{RT}}}$	Area of applied stress on the soil arching crown
b'	Plate width
C_{c}	Soil arching coefficient
c'	Effective cohesion
D	Pile diameter
D_{act}	Active depth of subsoil
d	Width of the pile wall
E	Elastics modulus
E_{em}	Elastics modulus of embankment
E_{eq}	Equivalent elastic modulus of a pile

E_{geo}	Elastic modulus of geosynthetic layer
E_{p}	Elastic modulus of a pile
E_{sub}	Elastic modulus of subsoil
E_{set}	Settlement efficacy
E_{str}	Stress efficacy
E_{o}	One-dimensional modulus of the subsoil
g	Gravity load
F	Uniform force acting on the embankment lateral boundary
F_{d}	Design wheel load
F_{s}	Static wheel load
f_{eq}	Dominant frequency
h	Embankment height
h_{arch}	Soil arching height
h_{opt}	Optimum embankment height
h'	Embankment depth up to soil arching crown
I_{pile}	Second moment of the area of a pile
I_{sub}	Second moment of the area of subsoil
I_{wall}	Second moment of the area of a pile wall
J	Stiffness of geosynthetic layer
K	Lateral stress coefficient
K_{o}	Lateral stress coefficient at rest
K_{a}	Lateral stress coefficient at active stage
K_{p}	Lateral stress coefficient at passive stage
k_{h}	Coefficient of horizontal acceleration

k_s	Modulus of the subgrade reaction
k_{soil}	Soil stiffness parameter
k_v	Coefficient of vertical acceleration
N_{em}	Normalised embankment height
N_{vs}	Normalised vertical stress
l	Length of sleeper
l_d	diagonal spacing between pile
M_L	Earthquake magnitude
m	Mass of the embankment
P	Total force acting on the pile head
P_c	Vertical stress on the pile head
Q	Total force carried by the pile
q	Surcharge on the embankment top
r	Radial distance of soil arching
s	Pile spacing
s_x	Pile spacing in x-axis
s_y	Pile spacing in y-axis
T	Tension in geosynthetic layer
T_{max}	Maximum tension in a geosynthetic layer
t_{EQ}	Earthquake excitation time
t_{geo}	Thickness of geosynthetic layer
V	Train speed
W_{track}	Total weight of track
y	Maximum deflection of geosynthetic layer

$a, b, \text{ and } c$	Elastic modulus coefficients relating to <i>SAR</i>
$\alpha \text{ and } \beta$	Damping coefficients
$\alpha' \text{ and } \beta'$	Mean value of impact factor
γ	Unit weight
γ'	Standard deviation of the impact factor
ε_{geo}	Axial strain in geosynthetic layer
Φ	Dynamic impact factor
λ	Interface factor
Δ_{lateral}	Lateral displacement
μ	Interface frictional coefficient
δ	Soil settlement without piles
δ_{int}	Interface friction angle between pile and the surrounding subsoil
δ_{em}	Settlement of embankment
δ_{es}	Total settlement of subsoil
δ_{p}	Soil settlement with piles
δ_{sp}	Settlement of a plate
$\delta/(s-d)$	Normalised settlement of embankment
ν	Poisson's ratio
ρ	Material density
σ_{geo}	Vertical stress on the geosynthetic layer
σ_{h}	Horizontal stress
σ_{i}	Vertical stress, just below the inner boundary of the soil arching
σ_{max}	Maximum vertical stress

σ_n	Normal stress in the interface
σ_p	Vertical stress on the pile
σ_r	Radial stress in soil arching
σ_s	Vertical stress on the subsoil
σ_t	Train-induced vertical stress
σ_{track}	Self-weight of the rail track
σ_{train}	Self-weight of the moving train
σ_{RT}	Total vertical stress on the soil arching crown
σ_{up}	Upward vertical reaction stress on the bottom of the geosynthetic layer
σ_v	Vertical stress
σ_{VEQ}	Additional vertical stress due to a seismic excitation
σ_o	Radial stress at soil arching crown
σ_{θ}	Tangential stress in soil arching
τ	Shear stress along with the geosynthetic layer interface
τ_{bottom}	Shear stress along with the geosynthetic layer and subsoil
τ_{top}	Shear stress along with the geosynthetic layer and embankment
ϕ'	Effective friction angle of soil
ψ	Dilation angle of soil
ξ_o	Damping ratio

Abbreviations

2D	Two-dimensional
3D	Three-dimensional

ARE	American Railways Engineering Association
ARR	Area replacement ratio
CA	Concentric arch
CINPE4	Four-node plane strain linear infinite element
CPE4R	Four-node plane strain element with reduced integration
CPE8R	Eight-node, reduced-integration, two-dimensional, quadratic solid element
DAF	Dynamic amplification factor
DEM	Discrete element method
EA	Equivalent area
EEM	Equivalent elastic modulus
EFS	Equivalent flexural stiffness
FEM	Finite element method
FFT	Fast Fourier transform
FLAC	Fast lagrangian analysis of continua
GRC	Ground reaction curve
GRPS	Geosynthetic-reinforced pile-supported
MC	Mohr-Coulomb
MCC	Modified Cam Clay
ORE	Office of Research and Experiments
PFC	Particle flow code
PGA	Peak ground acceleration
SAR	Soil arching ratio
SCR	Stress concentration ratio

ABSTRACT

The pile-supported embankments provide feasible solutions for railway infrastructure projects on the soft soil and allow rapid construction with less differential settlement. In the pile-supported embankments, the embankment load including surcharge is transferred to the pile heads through a load transfer mechanism known as soil arching. The pile-supported railway embankments often encounter dynamic loading due to the moving trains and earthquake. The dynamic loading may influence the soil arching phenomenon. Over the past decade, soil arching has been significantly studied under static conditions, and several analytical methods have been proposed to evaluate soil arching. However, the dynamic behaviour of soil arching under moving train-induced load and earthquake is yet to be investigated. Furthermore, the vertical stress on soil arching crown in the existing analytical methods is considered only due to self-weight of embankment and the stress distribution due to additional surcharge is neglected, resulting in inaccurate predictions.

In this thesis, finite element method (FEM)-based numerical analyses are performed to investigate the dynamic behaviour of soil arching. The physical visualisation of the soil arching phenomenon in the pile-supported embankments is very complex and usually requires a large setup. Therefore, numerical analysis is the unsurpassed approach to investigate soil arching. The two-dimensional (2D) unit cell model is analysed. A 2D idealisation method (i.e. equivalent area method) is used to convert a hypothetical three-dimensional (3D) problem into 2D to reduce the complexity and computational time.

This work begins with investigating the soil arching in a railway embankment under static condition. The equivalent dynamic load induced by a moving train is

chosen for train loading. The results confirm that the analysed numerical model can predict the soil arching phenomenon in a pile-supported railway embankment with reasonable accuracy. The key parameters of pile-supported embankments and their optimum value are identified. The inclusion of a geosynthetic layer is also investigated. The comparison of different analytical methods has also been reported to identify the variation in different methods. Subsequently, the accuracy of the existing analytical methods is improved by incorporating a realistic approximation of vertical stress on the soil arching crown. Results show that the failure of soil arching at the pile top is critical in the 3D condition, whereas the soil arching failure at the crown is more critical in the 2D condition.

Subsequently, the influence of earthquake-induced loading on soil arching phenomenon is investigated. The results show that soil arching is significantly affected under the seismic excitation. The parametric investigation reveals that friction angle of embankment fill should be higher for better performance of pile-supported embankment during an earthquake. The geosynthetic layer at the base of the embankment encourages stress transfer to the pile head through the membrane effect. Also, the amplitude of the earthquake significantly affects the mobilisation of soil arching.

Finally, the mobilisation of soil arching under moving train-induced dynamic loading is investigated. The results revealed that the dynamic loading significantly affects the soil arching phenomenon and should be considered during the design of a pile-supported railway embankment. The application of a geosynthetic layer enhances the load transfer from the subsoil to the pile head through the membrane effect.

Therefore, the findings of this thesis enhance the current knowledge of the dynamic behaviour of soil arching under the moving train load and earthquake. The

presented analytical methods can be used for accurate evaluation of vertical stress on the soil arching crown.