



Enhancement of Reinforced Soil Wall Performance under Dynamic Loading

Binod Shrestha

A thesis submitted in fulfilment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

Faculty of Engineering and Information technology
University of Technology, Sydney

January 2013

Certificate of Authorship/Originality

I certify that the work in this thesis has not previously been submitted for a degree nor has it been submitted as part of requirements for a degree except as fully acknowledged within the text.

I also certify that the thesis has been written by me. Any help that I have received in my research work and the preparation of the thesis itself has been acknowledged. In addition, I certify that all information sources and literature used are indicated in the thesis.

Binod Shrestha

January 2013

Acknowledgements

First, I would like to sincerely thank my supervisor, Associate Professor Hadi Khabbaz for his guidance, support and friendship during my Ph.D. study. He advised me in various ways and inspired my future career development with suggestions for work-family balanced life. His encouragement and motivation have always inspired me.

I also owe special thanks to my co-supervisor, Dr. Behzad Fatahi, for his valuable guidance and contribution during this study.

I would also like to express my gratitude to Professor Bijan Samali and Associate Professor Jinachun Li for serving in my doctoral assessment and providing valuable suggestions on how to use the shake table facilities.

Staff members of the shake table facility, Peter Brown and Rami Haddad, as well as the soil laboratory technicians at UTS provided great support and assistance with the experimental part of this research. Their help is greatly appreciated. Administrative support from the staff of the School of Civil and Environmental Engineering and the University Graduate School at UTS is also deeply appreciated.

I am also grateful to my long term friend Rudra Pun, for his assistance during the research, particularly with constructing the model and conducting the shake table tests. I would also like to thank my close friends Behnam Fatahi and Ali Parsapajouh, for their help and support, and for making life more fun and easy.

I am grateful to the Australian Government, and the Department of Industry, Innovation, Science, Research and Tertiary Education (DIISRTE) for funding the

Australian Postgraduate Awards (APA), and am thankful to UTS for awarding me this reputable scholarship.

I am forever indebted to my parents for their understanding, and endless patience and support. I can imagine how happy and proud they are at this accomplishment. This work is a small dedication to them for their love, encouragement, and support. I would also like to thank my brothers, and relatives and friends for their moral support. Special thank goes to Muna, my wife and best friend, for her great love, kind patience and priceless company during every single step of our life. I am eternally indebted and grateful to her.

Finally, thanks are due to my son Binam and daughter Manvi, for their forbearance and affection during four years of my study at UTS.

Dedicated to my ancestors

Abstract

Reinforced soils have been widely used in a variety of applications because of their satisfactory performance and cost effectiveness. A number of investigations to determine the seismic deformation modes of reinforced soil walls with conventional horizontal inclusions have already been conducted, but only limited investigations with the partial inclusion of vertical elements have been conducted, and then they did not consider the performance of reinforced soil walls under dynamic loading.

This research presents a new concept of soil reinforcement using vertical fortification designed to connect layers of conventional horizontal reinforcement together. For this proposed system, as with conventional reinforced soil, the selected granular material is compacted over the horizontal reinforcement up to a given height, and then subsequent layers of horizontal reinforcement are laid down. Afterwards, reinforcements are inserted vertically or at an inclined angle, as per the design requirements. Each layer is then tied to another so that it acts as one integrated system, reducing the total force at the back of the facing panels.

This concept is modelled numerically using PLAXIS 2D version 9.0 using the Kobe earthquake loading. The convincing results from this numerical analysis encouraged me to conduct an experimental program that included shake table tests. The selections of materials were then tested to determine which materials were readily available on the market. Four reduced scale physical models, with and without vertical reinforcement, with angled reinforcement towards the facing and against the facing were tested on a shake table under stepped-up sinusoidal acceleration input. The results of the four models tested were then compared to evaluate the performance enhancement of a soil

wall with vertical reinforcement. The results showed that the wall with vertical reinforcement improved its performance under dynamic loading remarkably.

Finite element models based on the same parameters used in the shake table experiments and with a PLAXIS 2D program were developed, from which the numerical outcomes generated similar patterns of better performance when vertical fortification was included. Those results are matched against the experimental outcomes, and the results show a reasonable agreement between the measured and calculated displacements, backfill surface settlements and accelerations, albeit there were some discrepancies. These slight dissimilarities could be the result of implementing, to some extent, different physical properties in the numerical model and their variability within the measured data. An array of parametric studies with varying design parameters was also carried out, with the results indicating that the magnitude of dynamic response increases with a decreasing angle of friction and the extent of dynamic response decrease with an increasing Young's modulus. It is also found that the vertical reinforcement with very close spacing (less than three times the spacing of horizontal reinforcement), adds no extra benefit for the wall system.

According to the findings of this study, the proposed inclusion of vertical components to reinforced soil walls enhances the stability of the walls compare to the conventional reinforced soil systems under earthquake loading. The vertical components increase the integrity of the reinforced wall and create blocking actions, which reduce deformations at both facing wall and backfill surface. These outcomes point out the potential benefits of inserting vertical elements into a conventional soil reinforcement system under dynamic loads.

Contents

Acknowledgements	iii
Abstract	vi
List of Figures	xiv
List of Tables	xxv
List of Symbols	xxvii
1. Introduction	1
1.1 <i>General</i>	1
1.2 <i>Scope and Objectives of the Study</i>	3
1.3 <i>Research Methodology</i>	5
1.4 <i>Organisation of this Dissertation</i>	6
2. Performance of Reinforced Soil: A Literature Review	8
2.1 <i>Introduction</i>	8
2.2 <i>Performance of Reinforced Soil in Past Earthquakes: Case Histories</i>	8
2.2.1 1994 Northridge earthquake	9
2.2.2 1995 Hyogoken-Nanbu (Kobe) earthquake	11
2.2.3 1999 Chi-Chi earthquake	12
2.2.4 2001 El Salvador earthquake	14
2.2.5 2004 Niigataken-Chuetsu earthquake.....	15
2.2.6 2007 Niigataken-Chuetsu-Oki earthquake	16
2.2.7 2008 Iwate-Miyagi-Nairiku earthquake.....	17
2.3 <i>Physical Model Tests</i>	19

2.3.1 GRS walls with full-height rigid facing	23
2.3.2 GRS walls with segmented facing	28
2.3.3 Other new applications	33
2.4 Numerical Modelling.....	36
2.5 Key Elements in Enhancing Seismic Performance of Retaining Walls.....	51
2.5.1 Facing rigidity.....	53
2.5.2 Arrangement of reinforcements.....	53
2.5.3 Properties of reinforcement.....	55
2.5.4 Backfill and subsoil conditions.....	56
2.6 Overview of Failure Modes	57
2.7 Three Dimensional Soil Reinforcement	61
2.7.1 Introduction.....	61
2.7.2 Cellular reinforcement.....	62
2.7.3 Multi-layer horizontal–vertical orthogonal elements	66
2.8 Summary.....	71
3. Theoretical Consideration of Vertical Reinforcement.....	75
3.1 Introduction	75
3.2 Current Analytical Approaches for Seismic Analysis and Design.....	76
3.2.1 Mononobe-Okabe approach	77
3.2.2 Parameters of the dynamic behaviour of reinforced soil walls.....	80
3.2.3 Internal stability calculations.....	82
3.2.4 Two-part wedge failure mechanism.....	85
3.2.5 Log spiral failure mechanism	88
3.2.6 Circular slip failure mechanism	90
3.3 Peak Ground Acceleration Coefficients	93
3.4 Conceptual Design of Vertical Reinforcement.....	95

3.5 Improving the Behaviour of Reinforced Soil.....	96
3.6 Enhancement on Current Analytical Methods	99
3.7 Improvement against Modes of Failure	100
3.7.1 Bearing capacity of the foundation	100
3.7.2 Tensile failure of reinforcement	101
3.7.3 Pull out failure	102
3.7.4 Overturning mode under dynamic loading	103
3.7.5 Bulging mode under dynamic loading	103
3.7.6 Expected failure mode after the inclusion of vertical reinforcement	104
3.8 Field Construction Techniques	104
3.8.1 Push-pull method	105
3.8.2 Sewing method	106
3.8 Summary	107
4. Verifying the Concept Using Numerical Modelling	108
4.1 Introduction	108
4.2 Finite Element Model	109
4.3 Model Parameters	112
4.4 Analysis of Results.....	118
4.4.1 Horizontal deformation	118
4.4.2 Vertical deformation	121
4.4.3 Stresses on the foundation of the wall.....	123
4.5 Summary	125
5. Experimental Program	127
5.1 Introduction	127
5.2 Shake Table	127

5.2.1 Previous shake table tests	127
5.2.2 UTS shake table facility	132
5.3 <i>Similitude Rules</i>	132
5.4 <i>Design and Assembly of Model Container</i>	134
5.4.1 Model geometry	134
5.4.2 Container assembly	136
5.4.3 Facing elements	138
5.4.4 Back boundary	139
5.4.5 Foundation and toe boundaries	140
5.4.6 Materials required to prepare the shake table model	141
5.5 <i>Physical Properties of Sand</i>	141
5.5.1 Sieve analysis	141
5.5.2 Minimum and maximum density tests	142
5.5.3 Direct shear tests	145
5.5.4 Summary of test results	147
5.6 <i>Material Testing of Reinforcements and Damping System</i>	147
5.6.1 Tensile tests for geonets	148
5.6.2 Tensile tests for binding wires	151
5.6.3 Damping test	154
5.6.4 Summary of test results	156
5.7 <i>Model Preparation and Instrumentation</i>	156
5.8 <i>Fundamental Frequency and Input Motion</i>	162
6.0 Results and Discussion of Experimental Investigations	166
6.1 <i>Introduction</i>	166
6.2 <i>Test Model 1: without Vertical Reinforcement</i>	166
6.3 <i>Test Model 2: with Vertical Reinforcement</i>	170

6.4 Test Model 3: with Reinforcement Inclined away from the Facing	174
6.5 Test Model 4: with Reinforcement Inclined towards the Facing	175
6.6 Discussion of the Results	178
6.6.1 Horizontal deformation	178
6.6.2 Vertical deformation	182
6.6.3 Response of the accelerometers	184
6.7 Summary	187
7. Numerical Verification and Parametric Studies	189
7.1 Introduction	189
7.2 Finite Element Model	189
7.3 Numerical Modelling	191
7.3.1 Model 1: Reinforced wall without vertical reinforcement	195
7.3.2 Model 2: Reinforced wall with vertical reinforcement	198
7.3.3 Model 3: Reinforced wall with reinforcement inclined towards the facing	200
7.3.4 Model 4: Reinforced wall with reinforcement inclined against the facing	203
7.3.5 Comparing the results of different models	205
7.4 Experimental versus Numerical Analysis	208
7.4.1 Horizontal displacement	209
7.4.2 Settlement of the backfill surface	219
7.4.3 Acceleration	223
7.5 Parametric Studies	226
7.5.1 Introduction	226
7.5.2 Parameter value ranges and the baseline case	227
7.5.3 Results of parametric studies	228
7.6 Summary	231
8. Conclusions and Recommendations	233

<i>8.1 Introduction</i>	233
<i>8.2 Conclusions</i>	234
<i>8.3 Recommendations for Further Research</i>	239
References	241

List of Figures

Figure 1.1 A schematic cross section of a GRS wall	2
Figure 2.1 Valencia wall, USA (Bathurst & Cai 1995)	10
Figure 2.2 Tanata GRS wall after 1995 Kobe earthquake (Tatsuoka, Tateyama & Koseki 1996)	11
Figure 2.3 An example of a failed segmented GRS wall after the 1999 Chi-Chi earthquake (Koseki & Hayano 2000).....	13
Figure 2.4 Wall failures in El Salvador due to 1.7 m high unreinforced section at top of wall added by the owner after original construction (Koseki et al. 2006)	14
Figure 2.5 Failure of highway and adjacent railway embankment resulting from 2004 Chuetsu earthquake (JSCE 2006).....	15
Figure 2.6 Repair of highway embankment as a result of 2004 Chuetsu earthquake (JSCE 2006)	16
Figure 2.7 Failure of RW for municipal road at Agewa caused by 2007 Niigataken-Chuetsu-Oki earthquake (Koseki 2012).....	17
Figure 2.8 RSW with at Agewa with segmental facing panels made of metal mesh (Koseki 2012).....	17
Figure 2.9 Failure of anchor tendons for cut-slope at construction site of Isawa dam caused by 2008 Iwate-Miyagi-Nairiku earthquake (Koseki 2012)	18
Figure 2.10 RSW with segmented facing panels made of metal mesh at construction site of Isawa dam (Koseki 2012).....	18

Figure 2.11 Permanent displacements at top of wall versus peak horizontal ground acceleration coefficient (Watanabe et al. 2003).....	23
Figure 2.12 Reinforcement loads during base shake of GRS wall structures (Watanabe et al. 2003).....	24
Figure 2.13 Development of a global instability mechanism during shaking of a GRS model wall (Kato et al. 2002).....	25
Figure 2.14 Sum of tensile loads in reinforcement layers for GRS walls with a sloped foundation toe (S) and level ground (L) (Kato et al. 2002)	26
Figure 2.15 Reduced scale models of rigid panel walls with a hinged toe (El-Emam & Bathurst 2005).....	27
Figure 2.16 Shake table test arrangement for 1 m high GRS model wall (Bathurst, Hatami & Alfaro 2002)	29
Figure 2.17 Wall displacements versus peak base acceleration for model walls with different facing types (Bathurst, Hatami & Alfaro 2002)	29
Figure 2.18 Full scale shake table test of segmented retaining wall (Ling et al. 2005).	30
Figure 2.19 Laminar box mounted on a shake table (Krishna & Latha 2007).....	31
Figure 2.20 A schematic diagram of a typical rigid-faced wall configuration and instrumentation (Krishna & Latha 2007)	31
Figure 2.21 Reinforced earth retaining wall models (Model-1) inside the rigid sandbox, installed on the NTUA shake table (Anastasopoulos et al. 2010).	32
Figure 2.22 Influence of soil nails on the sum of tensile loads in layers of reinforcement (Kato et al. 2002).....	33

Figure 2.23 Example of methods used to improve the seismic stability of bridge abutments in Japan (Aoki et al. 2003).....	34
Figure 2.24 An example of a highway embankment project with combined cement-treated backfill and geosynthetic reinforcement (Ito et al. 2006)	35
Figure 2.25 Shake table tests demonstrating reduction in seismic forces against rigid walls using geofoam EPS seismic buffers (Zarnani, Bathurst & Gaskin 2005)	36
Figure 2.26 Numerical modelling of a centrifuge test of a segmental GRS wall (Fujii et al. 2006).....	38
Figure 2.27 Comparison of physical test results and computed acceleration responses of centrifuge tests of segmental GRS walls (Fujii et al. 2006).....	40
Figure 2.28 Comparison between physical test and computed lateral displacement response of centrifuge tests of segmental GRS walls (Fujii et al. 2006)	41
Figure 2.29 Predicted and observed failure surfaces from hinged toe model wall (5 layers of reinforcement and $L/H = 1.0$) at different input base acceleration amplitudes (El-Emam & Bathurst 2004)	43
Figure 2.30 Cross section of wall (Public Works Research Institute (PWRI) 1997).....	44
Figure 2.31 Comparison of observed and calculated lateral facing deformation (Rowe & Skinner 2001).....	45
Figure 2.32 Dimensions and instrumentation of Walls 1, 2, and 3 (Ling et al. 2005)....	47
Figure 2.33 Wall face peak horizontal displacement comparison between the calculated and the measured data (Ling et al. 2005)	48
Figure 2.34 Comparison of backfill surface settlement (Ling et al. 2005)	50

Figure 2.35 GRS wall models on level ground (Watanabe et al. 2003)(note: all dimensions are in cm)	54
Figure 2.36 Geosynthetic reinforcement models (Nakajima et al. 2007)	56
Figure 2.37 Modes of failure for reinforced soil walls (CFEM 2006).....	58
Figure 2.38 Details of the overturning mode and the failure mechanism (Sabermahani, Ghalandarzadeh & Fakher 2009)	59
Figure 2.39 Details of the bulging mode and the failure mechanism (Sabermahani, Ghalandarzadeh & Fakher 2009)	60
Figure 2.40 Cellular reinforcement (Khedkar & Mandal 2009)	63
Figure 2.41 Pullout load versus displacement curve comparison for various reinforcement heights (Khedkar & Mandal 2009).....	65
Figure 2.42 Typical horizontal–vertical orthogonal reinforcing elements (Zhang et al. 2008)	67
Figure 2.43 Deviator stress–axial strain curves for sand reinforced with vertical and H–V reinforcing elements with different reinforcement ratios and confining pressures (Note: S-single-sided and D-double-sided) (Zhang et al. 2008).....	70
Figure 3.1 Typical 3D reinforced soil structures (after Zhang, Javadi & Min 2006)	76
Figure 3.2 Mononobe-Okabe approach (Note: W = weight of the wedge, S and N = shear and normal forces, F = resultant of S and N).....	78
Figure 3.3 Shear stress-strain characteristics of soil (Das & Ramana 2009).....	80
Figure 3.4 Nature of variation of shear modulus with strain (after Hardin & Drnevich 1972)	81

Figure 3.5 Calculation of tensile load, T_i , in a reinforcement layer due to dynamic earth pressure and wall inertia for segmental retaining walls (after Bathurst & Cai 1995).....	83
Figure 3.6 Calculation of tensile load, T_i , in a reinforcement layer for reinforced soil walls with extensible reinforcement (FHWA 1996)	84
Figure 3.7 Two-part wedge analysis (after Bonaparte, Schmertmann & Williams 1986)	86
Figure 3.8 Log spiral analysis (after Leshchinsky, Ling & Hanks 1995)	89
Figure 3.9 Circular slip analysis (Fredlund & Krahn 1976)	92
Figure 3.10 Relationship between A and k_h	94
Figure 3.11 A typical reinforced soil wall using vertical reinforcement	95
Figure 3.12 Cross-section of typical vertical reinforcement	96
Figure 3.13 Effect of reinforcement on equilibrium	97
Figure 3.14 Inclined-Horizontal Reinforcement Model.....	98
Figure 3.15 Failure mode within reinforced zone of soil foundation	101
Figure 3.16 Construction steps for push-pull method.....	105
Figure 3.17 Sewing mechanism	106
Figure 4.1 Triangular elements with 15 nodes.....	110
Figure 4.2 General model of the reinforced soil wall used in the numerical analysis ..	111
Figure 4.3 Plane strain finite element mesh	115
Figure 4.4 General models of the reinforced soil wall.....	117
Figure 4.5 Accelerogram of Kobe earthquake	118

Figure 4.6 Horizontal displacements without vertical reinforcement.....	119
Figure 4.7 Horizontal displacements with vertical reinforcement.....	119
Figure 4.8 Horizontal deformation of the wall.....	120
Figure 4.9 Vertical displacement without vertical reinforcement.....	121
Figure 4.10 Vertical displacements with vertical reinforcement.....	122
Figure 4.11 Vertical deformation of wall.....	123
Figure 4.12 Comparison of vertical stresses on the RSF with and without inclusion of vertical reinforcement.....	124
Figure 4.13 Comparison of equivalent vertical force between horizontal layers.....	125
Figure 5.1 Model general configurations.....	134
Figure 5.2 Required materials for container (all dimensions are in mm).....	135
Figure 5.3 Details of the model box elements (all dimensions are in mm).....	136
Figure 5.4 Front view of container.....	137
Figure 5.5 Rear view of container.....	137
Figure 5.6 Fabrication of facing with reinforcement.....	138
Figure 5.7 Foam damper at the back of model box.....	139
Figure 5.8 Foundation layer after compaction (all dimensions are in mm).....	140
Figure 5.9 Grain size distribution of sand used in all shake table tests.....	142
Figure 5.10 Sand placing by pouring funnel to find out minimum dry density.....	143
Figure 5.11 Mould assembly and the vibratory table.....	144
Figure 5.12 Shear stress versus shear displacement.....	145

Figure 5.13 Shear stress versus normal stress	146
Figure 5.14 The Universal Testing Machine and the associated data acquisition system used for conducting tensile tests	148
Figure 5.15 Test specimens for tensile tests.....	149
Figure 5.16 A clamped specimen during a tensile test.....	149
Figure 5.17 Load verses elongation graph of the adopted geonet polymer (PN-05)	150
Figure 5.18 Tensile test on wires used as vertical reinforcement	152
Figure 5.19 A clamped specimen during a tensile test of the wire	153
Figure 5.20 Stress verses strain curve of Tensile Test 2 of the wire.....	153
Figure 5.21 Free vibration test to measure the damping ratio.....	154
Figure 5.22 Effect of damping the vibration	155
Figure 5.23 Determination of falling height for sand backfilling	157
Figure 5.24 Sand backfilling in the model	158
Figure 5.25 Installation of vertical reinforcements	158
Figure 5.26 Wall with temporary support in facing	160
Figure 5.27 Installation of the accelerometer.....	161
Figure 5.28 Installation of LVDTs prior to the test	161
Figure 5.29 Schematic diagram for instrumentation details	162
Figure 5.30 Impact pulse test for fundamental frequency.....	163
Figure 5.31 Input base acceleration characteristics.....	165
Figure 6.1 Horizontal deformation of the wall (no vertical reinforcement)	168

Figure 6.2 Vertical deformations of the backfill	168
Figure 6.3 Recorded shaking accelerations.....	169
Figure 6.4 Prior to the test: Model 1 and its instrumentation.....	169
Figure 6.5 Impact of shaking: Model 1 topping failure and its undulated surface	170
Figure 6.6 Horizontal deformation of wall (with vertical reinforcement)	171
Figure 6.7 Vertical deformations of backfills	172
Figure 6.8 Recorded shaking accelerations.....	172
Figure 6.9 Prior to the test: Model 2 and its instrumentation.....	173
Figure 6.10 Impact of shaking: Model 2 topping failure and its deformed top surface	173
Figure 6.11 Horizontal deformation of wall (with an angled reinforcement towards the back of the wall).....	175
Figure 6.12 Vertical deformations of the backfill	176
Figure 6.13 Recorded shaking accelerations.....	176
Figure 6.14 Prior to the test: Model 4 and its instrumentation	177
Figure 6.15 Impact of shaking: Model 4 topping failure and its deformed top surface	178
Figure 6.16 Comparison of horizontal deformations of different models	181
Figure 6.17 Comparison of vertical deformations of three models	183
Figure 6.18 Comparison of accelerations (A1) responses at the level of 200 mm	185
Figure 6.19 Comparison of accelerations (A2) responses at the level of 410 mm	186
Figure 6.20 Comparison of accelerations (A3) responses at the level of 610 mm	186
Figure 7.1 Details of finite element models	195

Figure 7.2 Conventional horizontal reinforcement model	196
Figure 7.3 Horizontal deformation of the reinforced wall (no vertical reinforcement)	197
Figure 7.4 Vertical deformations of the reinforced wall (no vertical reinforcement)...	197
Figure 7.5 Analysed accelerations in Model 1	198
Figure 7.6 Vertical – horizontal reinforcement model.....	198
Figure 7.7 Horizontal deformation of the reinforced wall (with vertical reinforcement)	199
Figure 7.8 Vertical deformations of the reinforced wall (with vertical reinforcement)	199
Figure 7.9 Acceleration responses in Model 2.....	200
Figure 7.10 Model details with reinforcement inclined towards the wall facing.....	201
Figure 7.11 Horizontal deformation of the reinforced wall (with reinforcement inclined towards the facing).....	201
Figure 7.12 Vertical deformation of the reinforced wall (with reinforcement inclined towards the facing).....	202
Figure 7.13 Response of Acceleration in Model 3.....	202
Figure 7.14 Model details with reinforcement inclined away from the facing.....	203
Figure 7.15 Horizontal deformation of the reinforced wall (with reinforcement inclined away from the facing)	203
Figure 7.16 Vertical deformation of the reinforced wall (with reinforcement inclined against the facing)	204
Figure 7.17 Response to acceleration in Model 4	204

Figure 7.18 Comparison of horizontal deformation at the top layer from numerical analysis.....	206
Figure 7.19 Comparison of settlements at V1.....	206
Figure 7.20 Comparison of settlements at V2.....	207
Figure 7.21 Response of different models at the top layer to acceleration	207
Figure 7.22 Comparison between displacement at the top and middle layers of the wall facing, without vertical reinforcement	212
Figure 7.23 Comparison of displacement in the top and middle layers of the wall facing, with vertical reinforcement	215
Figure 7.24 Comparison of displacement in the top and middle layers of wall facing, with reinforcement inclined towards the facing.....	218
Figure 7.25 Comparison of settlement without any vertical reinforcement.....	220
Figure 7.26 Comparison of settlement with vertical reinforcement	221
Figure 7.27 Comparison of settlements with reinforcement inclined towards the facing	222
Figure 7.28 Comparison of PHA of the reinforced wall (with horizontal reinforcement only)	223
Figure 7.29 Comparison of PHA with vertical reinforcement.....	224
Figure 7.30 Comparison of PHA with reinforcement inclined towards the facing	224
Figure 7.31 Effect of the soil friction angle on maximum horizontal displacement.....	228
Figure 7.32 Effect of the spacing of vertical reinforcement on the maximum horizontal displacement.....	229

Figure 7.33 Effect of Young's modulus on the maximum horizontal displacement230

List of Tables

Table 2.1 Summary of shake table model tests.....	20
Table 2.2 Summary of numerical simulation on seismic performance of GRS structures	52
Table 2.3 Properties of model reinforcements (after Nakajima et al. 2007).....	55
Table 4.1 Sand and interface properties	113
Table 4.2: Properties of the vertical reinforcement and geogrids	114
Table 5.1 Summary of different shake table tests of ≤ 1 m wall height from previous studies.....	131
Table 5.2 UTS shake table specifications	132
Table 5.3 Scaling factors for shake table tests	133
Table 5.4 Proposed shake table configuration	134
Table 5.5 List of materials	141
Table 5.6 Backfill soil properties	142
Table 5.7 Deviation of shear stress with normal stress in sand	146
Table 5.8 Results and analyses of tensile tests.....	150
Table 5.9 Results of tensile test of wires.....	152
Table 5.10 Properties of reinforcements	156
Table 6.1 Location of instruments for all tests.....	167
Table 7.1 Sand and interface properties	192
Table 7.2: Properties of the vertical reinforcement and geogrids	193

Table 7.3 Variation of key parameters and typical results.....227

List of Symbols

1. Latin Notations

A	Area of the shear surface
A_{vr}	Area of the shear surface of vertical reinforcement
c	Cohesion
c_{inter}	Cohesion of the interface
c_{soil}	Cohesion of the surrounding soil
C	Damping matrix
D	Damping ratio
D_{max}	Maximum damping ratio
E	Young's modulus
F	Load vector
g	Gravity acceleration (9.8 m/s^2)
G	Shear modulus
G_{max}	Maximum shear modulus
h	Height of the specimen
H	Height of the wall
H_i	Height of vertical reinforcements at each layer
K	Stiffness matrix
K_{AE}	Total earth pressure coefficient
k_h	Horizontal seismic coefficient
k_v	Vertical seismic coefficient
L_a	Length of the anchorage
L_{vr}	Length of vertical reinforcement in anchorage zone
m	Shear distortion ratio
M	Mass matrix

M_D	Driving moment
M_R	Moment resistance due to the shear strength of the soil
N	Number of reinforcement layers
P_1	Horizontal force
P_{AE}	Total active earth force
P_{AE-HOR}	Horizontal component of total active thrust
$q_{u(R)}$	Total bearing capacity after the reinforcement
$q_{u(UR)}$	Bearing capacity of the unreinforced soil foundation
r	Radius of specimen
R_{inter}	Interface reduction factor
R_T	Tensile strength of the reinforcing materials per unit length
S	Shear force
S_Z	Spacing of reinforcements
T_i	Tensile force in the i^{th} layer of reinforcement
T_r	Tensile force
T_{vr}	Tensile strength of the vertical reinforcement
u	Depth of reinforcement location
\mathbf{u}	Displacement vector
$\dot{\mathbf{u}}$	Velocity
$\ddot{\mathbf{u}}$	Acceleration
V_1	Vertical force
V_p	Compression wave velocity
W	Weight of the wedge
W_A	Weight of the static internal failure wedge

2. Greek Notations

β	Angle of the back slope
γ	Unit weight of the retained soil

γ_r	Reference strain
δ	Mobilised interface friction angle between the back of the facing wall and the backfill soil
ΔM_R	Increase in moment resistance due to the reinforcement
ΔP_{dyn}	Dynamic earth force
ΔT_{dyn}	Dynamic tensile reinforcement load increment
$\Delta T_{\text{dyn } i}$	Dynamic tensile reinforcement increment
ΔT_{vi}	Increased tensile force due to the vertical reinforcement
θ	Angle of inclination of the inside face of the wall to the vertical
λ	Inter-wedge shear mobilisation ratio
μ_v	Vertical reinforcing ratio
ν	Poisson's ratio
σ_1	Vertical stress
τ	Shear stress
τ_{max}	Maximum shear stress
ϕ	Friction angle of the retained soil
ϕ_f	Factored soil friction angle
ϕ_{inter}	Friction angle of the interface
ϕ_{soil}	Friction angle of the surrounding soil
ψ	Angle of seismic inertia
Ψ	Dilatancy angle