A REVIEW STUDY ON LOAD CARRYING CAPACITY OF STONE COLUMN EMBEDDED IN SOFT SOIL

Shiv Saroop[1], Er. Ankaj Minhas [2], Er. Nasir Ali Lone[3]

[1]M.tech Student in Galaxy Global group of Institutions, Dinarpur, Ambala.

[2, 3]Assistant Professor, Civil Engineering, Galaxy Global group of Institutions, Dinarpur, Ambala.

Abstract: Soil improvement can be achieved using Stone Columns with a gain of bearing capacity, reduction and acceleration of settlements and mitigating the potential of liquefaction, making possible to replace the deep foundations with shallow ones, thus facilitating design and reducing costs. The effectiveness of this technique may be compromised when the layer of soft soil grows too thick and amounts of organic materials get too high, leading to a situation where the excessive compressibility and low strength of the natural soil results in too little lateral support for the columns and extremely large vertical deflections of columns resulting a local bulging failure of the structure. In this review study, various literatures studies of stone column are discussed.

Keywords: Soil bearing capacity, Stone column, Deflection, Settlement, Liquefaction.

1.1 INTRODUCTION

The soft soil is extensively located in many areas which usually have a low bearing capacity, low permeability, and high compressibility, and insufficient strength. The cohesive soil has a flocculated structure which is unstable, and under the influence of increasing overburden and pressure, it will be compressed (1). Cohesive soils can be improved by using methods such as compaction piles, displacement and replacement; vacuum pre-consolidation, pre-consolidation using prefabricated vertical drains, and soil reinforcing. The solutions for ground improvement primarily depends on the type of the soil present on the site ground, ground conditions, design loads, size of the treatment area and site location. In many sites with weak ground conditions, the most economical approach is to improve the bearing capacity rather than attempt to preterm it the weaker soils with piled foundations (4). Ground improvement techniques are cost effective and can be applied by 50% of the costs of a piling scheme. Stone columns are one of the most cost effective and environmentally friendly techniques that are installed into the soft soils to improve the soil problems. This technique can decrease the excessive and differential settlement and the shear strength and also can accelerate the consolidation progress. In this method, the partial of unsuitable subsurface soils, are replaced with a compacted stone column that often completely permeates with the weak layers. Various literature studies declares that due to high permeability and the material components used in the stone column, not only the load carrying capacity of the soil raise, but also it reduces the soil settlement considerably and minimizes the post construction settlements. In fact, the stone columns also act as vertical drains thus induce rapid consolidation process. Moreover, compaction of granular materials during the installation processes and replacing the soft soils with stronger materials significantly increase the unit weight of the soil (11).

1.2 LITERATURE STUDY ON STONE COLUMNS

S.F. Kwa et al studied on the Ground improvement using stone column construction encased with geogrid. Test thinks about in the present work are completed to explore the conduct of the stone segment encased with Geogrid; Tests are completed on a solitary introduced stone segment (common and encased) so as to assess the adequacy of the single section on bearing limit and settlement. It was discovered that encasing the stone segment with geogrid brings about an expansion in burden conveying limit and decrease in a settlement in examination with the case without geogrid. By utilizing geogrid, a definitive bearing limit expanded by 60% contrasted with that without geogrid and load-bearing limit expanded by 20% for 10 mm settlement. Numerical examination will be completed by utilizing PLAXIS 3D to approve the test and to make correlation between them. (1)

A. Vahedian et al studied on the stone column reinforced soil. This paper plans to present a short best in class on the stone segment ground improvement strategy dependent on existing writing and benchmarks. Because of high penetrability of the material segment utilized in the stone segments, not just the heap conveying limit of the dirt is raised, yet in addition the dirt settlement is decreased impressively and the post development settlement is limited. To accomplish this objective, a few huge attributes of stone segment as far as structure parameters are considered. One case of the conduct evaluation of strengthened soil utilizing stone segment is incorporated. Another one-dimensional investigation has been contemplated notwithstanding an improved nonlinear limited component technique. The outcomes show that the new technique is dependable. It is likewise shown that the settlement of the dirt without stone segments is fundamentally higher than the comparable soil fortified with stone segment. (2)

D.P. Mahoney et al studied on the concept of ground improvement by using stone column. This development technique was seen to create lower clamor levels than customary ground improvement strategies, yet basically produced practically no vibrations. Because of vulnerabilities related with another development procedure and given the site explicit sub soil changeability both along the side and with profundity, a enormous scale field preliminary has been finished preceding beginning the principle development arrangement. The preliminary affirmed that; the system could accomplish the required degree of ground improvement; affirmed that the new establishment system would reliably work in the exceptionally factor silty sandy subsoil conditions; and, it was utilized to improve the stone segment spacing's and profundities. This paper traces the field preliminary format, pre and post trial evidence testing system, and examines the preliminary outcomes and the impact of it on the last development plan. At the season of this paper being composed the principle development grouping is well in progress. (3)

Samuel Thanaraj et al studied on the soil stabilization by using different types of stone column. Burden conveying limit of a stone section is ascribed to frictional properties of the stone mass, attachment and frictional properties of soils encompassing the segment, adaptability or inflexibility qualities of the establishment transmitting worries to the improved ground and the greatness of horizontal weight created in the encompassing soil mass and following up on the sides of the stone segment because of connection between different components in the framework. The stone section gets its hub limit from the uninvolved earth weight created because of the swelling impact of the segment and expanded protection from horizontal twisting under superimposed extra charge load. The hypothesis of burden move, estimation of extreme bearing limit and forecast of settlement of stone sections was first proposed by a few scientists. (4)

Tendal Y.K, et al gave the audit on Reinforced granular section for profound soil adjustment intending to distinguish key contemplations for the general utilization of encased stone segments, To give bits of knowledge to plan and development, To accumulate the most recent research improvements. Case accounts of field applications and watched field execution. Geosynthetic encased stone section decreases settlement practically a large portion of that of untreated ground a definitive bearing limit of fortified stone segment and stone segment treated beds are around multiple times and multiple times that of the untreated bed. While hypothetical investigations and model testing results demonstrate that geosynthetic encased stone segment strategies can be productive for delicate soil improvement, well-reported case narratives of fruitful usage are fairly restricted. There stays an extraordinary requirement for well-reported informational collections of field execution situations. The paper recognizes territories where more research is required and incorporates suggestions for future innovative work. (5)

Ahmet Demir et al made a trial study on conduct of geosynthetic fortified stone segments on unreinforced and strengthened delicate earth. Initially, unreinforced tests was done and after that fortified with just stone section and geogrid encasement stone segment were examined. A few properties, for example, width of stone segment and encasement impact on progress of delicate earth were likewise watched. They have finished up with the accompanying discoveries: Stone segment improves bearing limit of mud bed and diminishes settlement. Littler measurement stone segment has lower bearing limit than bigger distance across stone section. Geogrid encasement builds bearing limit of stone section in light of the fact that protruding conduct of stone segment decline. Sand bank expands bearing limit of stone section marginally yet it's anything but a huge improvement. (6)

Guetif et al announced dependent on progress of a delicate soil by stone segments is because of three elements. The first is incorporation of a stiffer segment material, (for example, squashed stones, rock, and others) in the delicate soil. The subsequent factor is the densification of the encompassing delicate soil during the establishment of stone segment. The third factor is the going about as vertical channels. In this way, the inclusion of stone segments into feeble soils isn't only a substitution activity and stone section can changes in both the material properties and the condition of worries in the treated soil mass. (7)

K. V. Sudheer et al made an experiment on the behaviour of compaction sand pile and stone column in fine sand with clay. Laboratory tests were carried out on compaction sand piles as well as stone columns of size 25mm diameter installed in the reconstituted saturated soil. The mini plate load tests were conducted and the load settlement behaviors were observed. It is found that when the clay content is increased up to 20% the percentage of improvement is increased. From the results it can be concluded that even with small percentage of clay present in the loose fine sand sample, ground improvement by stone column is highly preferable than compaction sand pile. (8)

B. Galy et al did an examination on the Influence of the Vibro-stone section support on the seismic bearing limit of a surface shallow balance. Another way to deal with assessing the bearing limit of fortified soils under seismic conditions is proposed. It depends on utmost balance hypothesis, pseudo-static and pseudo-unique ideas and a particular strategy for evaluating strengthened soil properties. The parametric examination displayed demonstrates that a 1.5B treatment width on each side of the balance is adequate to expand the first bearing limit by 25 to half (contingent upon the Area proportion) on account of a "halfway improvement" situation is introduced here. (9)

Pradip Das et al directed an investigation of the conduct of stone segment in nearby delicate and free layered soil. They had an examination on the usage of stone section to improve the heap limit of sandy residue soil with mud in normally combined state. Load tests likewise led through the pressure testing machine are performed on single un-encased stone segment in sandy sediment soil with clay. The stone segment treated soil can convey more burden than untreated soil. The heap conveying limit of treated soil increment with the expansion in measurement of stone column. When section region is stacked, disappointment of protruding happens inside the whole segment territory. The encased stone segment in layered soil additionally diminishes with the expanding distance across of stone section. The heap conveying limit of treated layered soil diminishes with the expanding of breadth of stone segment. (10)

Kumar Rakeshand Jain P.K. made an examination on Prospect of utilizing granular heaps for development of far reaching soil. The heap settlement conduct of the dirt was resolved for various size of the granular heap. Geo-matrix encased granular heaps were additionally introduced in the dirt. The bearing limit of the stone segment increments by presenting circumferential geo-framework fortification. Also, as the profundity of circumferential fortification expands settlement diminishes and the bearing limit increments. Further decrease in settlements is seen with the expanding profundity of geo network encasement. On full profundity encasing, decrease in complete settlements of up to 79.13% is taken note. The tests likewise uncover that the bigger distances across. (11)

Behzad Kalantari et al made an audit on Soft soil adjustment utilizing stone sections. The establishment techniques, structure and disappointment methods of stone sections were taken and finished up with the accompanying: The utilization of stone segment in delicate muds has been found to give moderate increment in burden conveying limit joined by critical decrease in settlement. Being granular and openly depleted material, union settlement is quickened and post development settlement is limited. Stone sections may have specific application in delicate soils, for example, N.C dirt, residue and peat, they are for the most part embedded on volume uprooting premise exhuming an opening with determined measurement and wanted profundity. (12)

Ali et al considered on Behavior of fortified stone sections in delicate soils. Lab model tests have been done on drifting and completely entering single heaps with and without geotextile to discover the impact of encasement, l/d proportion and distance across of segment on bearing limit. Since stone sections having lengths in excess of multiple times their width don't contribute a lot to bearing limit accordingly, gliding segments ought to be favored in circumstances where hard strata is at a profundity more than this length. Quite far, segments of littler width ought to be given in light of the fact that these are more grounded than enormous distance across segments. The segments ought to be folded over with some geosynthetic material, by doing as such the bearing limit of improved ground is expanded by manifolds. Since protruding of stone sections happens just in upper segment because of absence of parallel weight, thus giving geosynthetic in that bit may likewise be similarly advantageous. (13)

Sudip Basack et al did the audit to break down the reaction of stone segment strengthened delicate soil under dike stacking, embracing the free strain approach and thinking about angling, obstructing and smear impacts. A plan system related with a progression of diagrams and bends for different stopping up and smear zone parameters has been recommended by the authors. Utilizing them, a common structure model for stone segment fortification in a delicate mud store has been displayed. Considering the qualities of stone section fortified delicate earth, a numerical arrangement dependent on unit cell hypothesis was created by the creators for processing the pace of combination, stress conveyance, settlement and level of post-union ground improvement accomplished. The free strain speculation is received for investigation which gives off an impression of being progressively reasonable for bank stacking when the curving impact and stopping up are considered. The correlation of the numerical outcomes with the accessible arrangements and field information demonstrates adequate understanding which legitimizes the legitimacy of the model. (14)

A.P. Ambily et al have done an examination on Experimental and Theoretical Evaluation of Stone Column in Soft Clay. This ground improvement system has been effectively connected for the establishments of structures like oil stockpiling tanks, earthen banks, pontoon establishments and so on where enormous settlement is conceivable. Test studies were done to assess the conduct of stone segment by changing separating, shear quality of delicate mud, dampness content and so forth the perceptions given beneath: When section territory alone is stacked, the disappointment by swelling of segment with most extreme protruding at 0.5 to multiple times the segment distance across underneath the top. The heap settlement conduct when whole region is stacked is practically direct and it is conceivable to touch base at the firmness of the improved ground. The firmness got from model test contrasts well and that acquired from the limited component examination contrasted with the heap settlement for s/d of 2 and 3, s/d of 4 isn't having any noteworthy improvement. (15)

Hamed Niroumand et al considered in their examination on Soil improvement by strengthened stone sections dependent on exploratory work made an audit on ground improvement for utilizing fortified stone segments in geotechnical building ventures. There was a unique spotlight on the most proficient method to execution and assess ground improvement utilizing strengthened stone section for specific purposes. The past outcomes showed the strengthened stone segments altogether increment the bearing limit and pressure of the dirt. In light of past outcomes, basic qualities were talked about and suggested. The consideration of level cross sections expanded the heap conveying limit of granular segments. The presentation expanded with expanding cross section numbers. It was likewise discovered that flexible materials in the plate structures were the best fortification plan for the granular segments. The geosynthetic encasement counteracts the defilement of stone segment and in this manner won't diminish the rubbing between the stone totals and dirt bed. (16)

H.A Mahamed Ismail et al has done research on Consolidation of sand and total as stone section material. A unit cell is utilized to think about the union under appropriation load for total and sand segment. An ax symmetric union model utilizing PLAXIS programming reenactment is utilized to look at the expanding pace of combination for the two materials. The closed with: Stone segment establishment in delicate muds may improve the dirt trademark. The combination procedure can be assisted when introducing the stone segment. Sand segment is the appropriate material to be utilized as stone segment in quickening the union rate. (17)

CONCLUSION

1. The initial stress is maximum at higher area ratio and for a particular area ratio, the initial stress increases linearly with the increase of length ratio. Also, the maximum failure stress depends on the maximum area ratio and length ratio. After reaching the maximum failure stress, the failure zone rises to the upper surface of pond ash bed.

2. In the footing load test the failure stress increases linearly with the area ratio. With the decrease in the length ratio, the failure strain is observed to be increasing. This is due to the fact that, for the case of higher length ratio the stone column- having a higher angle of friction and higher density- leads to a lower strain.

3. For the case of low length ratio, the particles of the stone column and the pond ash settle on application of the load. However, since pond ash forms a major portion of the specimen, the strain caused is higher than for the larger length ratios.

4. The price of pond ash is much more0than different standard materials0for the Soil0Stabilization though it may be utilized in0locations owning very0poor soil0as a result of the Shear Strength of its improving property

5. Unstabilized soil sample has a high Atterberg's limits and swelling percentage.

REFERNCES

1. S.F. Kwa, "Ground improvement using stone column construction encased with geogrid", Construction of Unique buildings and structures.
2. A. Vahedian, "A Short State-of-the-Art Review on Construction and Settlement of Soft Clay Soil Reinforced with Stone Column", International Journal of Engineering and Technology, Vol. 6, No. 5, October 2014.
3. B. Indraratna, S. Basack, and C. Rujikiatkamjorn, ―Numerical Solution of Stone Column–Improved Soft Soil Considering Arching, Clogging, and Smear Effects, Geotechnical and Geoenvironmental engineering, vol. 139, no.3, pp. 377-394, 2012.
4. D. Sayar and M. Khalilpasha, ―Soil Improvement Using Vibro Replacement Technique, International Journal of Advances in Environmental Biology, vol. 6, no.2, 658-661, 2012.
5. U. Kumar, Y. Tandel, and C. Solanki, ―Effect of geosynthetic encasement on sand column in soft soil, Structural and Civil Engineering Research, vol. 2, no. 3, August 2013.
6. L. Keykhosropur, A. Soroush, and R. Imam, ―3D numerical analyses of geosynthetic encased stone columns, Geotextiles and Geomembranes, vol. 35, pp. 61-68, 2012.
7. H. F. Schweiger and G. N. Pande, ―Numerical analysis of stone column supported foundations, Computers and Geotechnics, vol.2, no. 6, pp. 347-372, 1986.
8. M. D. Babu, S. Nayak, and R. Shivashankar, ―A Critical Review of Construction, Analysis and Behaviour of Stone Columns,‖ Geotechnical and Geological Engineering, vol. 31, no. 1, pp. 1-22, 2013.
9. H. J. Priebe, ―The design of Vibro replacement, Ground Engineering, vol. 28, no. 10, p. 31, 1995.
10. R. D. Barksdale and R. C. Bachus, ―Design and construction of stone columns, National Technical Information Service, vol. 1, 1983.

11. J. Shahu, M. Madhav, and S. Hayashi, ―Analysis of soft ground-granular pile-granular mat system,‖ Computers and Geotechnics, vol. 27, no. 1, pp. 45-62, 2000.
12. Hughes, J.M.O. and Withers, N.J. (1974),"Reinforcing of Soft Cohesive Soils with Stone Columns", Ground Engineering Journal, Vol. 7, No. 3, pp. 42-49.
13. Kempfert H., Gebreselassi B. (2006), "Excavations and Foundations in Soft Soils", Springer, Germany
14. Fattah, M. Y., Majeed, Q. G., (2012), “A Study on the Behaviour of Geogrid Encased Capped Stone Columns by the Finite Element Method”, Int. J. of GEOMATE, Sept., 2012, Vol. 3, No. 1 (Sl. No. 5), pp. 343-350, Geotech., Const. Mat. & Env., ISSN:2186-2982(P), 2186-2990(O), Japan.
15. Annual Book of ASTM Standard, Vol.4, No.8, (2000). American Society of Testing and Materials International, 100 Barr Harbor Drive, West Conshohocken, PA 19428-2959, United States
16. Fathi, E., Mohtasham, R., (2016), “Numerical Analysis of the Reinforced Stone Column by Geosynthetic on Stability of Embankment", Proceedings of the World Congress on Civil, Structural, and Environmental Engineering (CSEE’16), Prague, Czech Republic – March 30 – 31, 2016, ICGRE, Paper No. ICGRE 112.
17. Ambily, A. P. and Gandhi, S. R., (2007), “Behavior of stone columns based on experimental and FEM analysis,” Journal of Geotechnical and Geoenvironmental Engineering, ASCE, vol. 133, pp. 405-415.
18. IS 2720(Part 4):1985 Methods of test for soils: Part 4 “Grain size analysis” May 2010 (second revision)
19. IS 2720(Part 2):1973 Methods of test for soils: Part 2 “Determination of water content” May 2010 (second revision)
20. IS 2720(Part 29):1975 Methods of test for soils: Part 29 Determination of dry density" May 2010 of soils in place, by the core-cutter method (first revision)
21. IS 2720(Part 7):1980 Methods of test for soils: Part 7 “Determination of water content-“ Dec. 2011 dry density relation using light compaction (second revision)
22. IS 2720(Part 13):1986 Methods of test for soils: Part 13 “Direct shear test” Dec. 2011(second revision)
23. IS 2720 (PART 3), Methods of Test for Soils, Determination of Specific Gravity of Soil, 1980.