LIQUEFACTION OF SOIL AND RECENT USED METHODS OF MITIGATION

[1]Abdifitah Mohamed Yusuf, [2]Faisal Omar Bamunif, [3]Abdullah Salem Badahman

[1] B. Tech final year Student, [2]B. Tech final year Student, [3]B. Tech final year Student

[1]School of Civil Engineering,

Lovely Professional University, Phagwara, Punjab, India.

Abstract: In the history, liquefaction has been a cause of damage, scholars have spent the last 3 decades trying to figure out what criteria should be used to help describe a soil deposit's liquefaction potential. Liquefaction is a soil mechanics issue that frequently impacts structures that are upheld on soaking sand stores. In several seismic events, liquefaction caused significant damage to pipelines, homes, bridges, and other vital infrastructure. A devastation caused by soil liquefaction were forcibly bring into the interest of engineers by catastrophic 1964 earthquake in Niigata, Japan. This paper presents an overall depiction of liquefaction and Recent utilized Methods of Mitigation. This review paper covers all basic knowledge and view of liquefaction. also, this review paper discusses the evaluation method test In-situ testing particularly CPT and SPT test.

***Keywords* - Liquefaction, soil deposit, Sandy soils, Soil Enhancement, Liquefaction hazard, Mitigation.**

I. General Background

1.1 Definition

In saturated sandy soil, liquefaction caused by dynamic or static loading can cause severe damage to building foundations and existing structures, resulting in structural interference, economic losses, and even human life failure (1). This phenomenon has dramatic consequences, including sand boiling, excessive settlement, lateral spreading, structure tilting and/or overturning (2).

1.2 Liquefaction Cause behind

For identify liqu-efaction, is necessary to understand the circumstances that exist in a soil sediment earlier to an earthquake. Soil is essentially collection of many soil atoms that are in constant contact with many other soil particles. The weight of the overlying particles produces contact powers that hold close individual soil elements in position and provide strength. Formalized paraphrase to comprehend liquefaction (1,3).

1.3 Liquefaction Related Phenomenon

For many years, earthquakes have been accompanied by liquefaction. Indeed, Indeed, written documents dating back 100, if not 1000 of years contain accounts of earthquake symptoms that are now considered to be synonymous with liquefaction. NW Peloponnesus, Greece a strong earthquake (Mw=6.4) struck the NW Peloponnesus, Greece, on Sunday June 8, 2008, causing several earthquake environmental effects and structural damage in the broader epicentral area (4). A seismic series hit a huge region of Northern Italy's Emilia-Romagna district in May to June 2012,, killing 26 people and injuring hundreds more, leaving 15,000 people homeless, severely damaging historical and industrialized zones, and causing an economic estimate toll of two billion euros (5). Alaska earthquake of 1964 Mw = 9.2 had been a turning point in geotechnical seismic design. Prior to this earthquake, liquefaction was a well-known strange phenomenon, but its ability to cause damage during earthquakes was unprecedented (6). The 1989 Loma Prieto, Mw 7.0 earthquake, which followed around 100 km south of San Francisco around the Santa Cruz Mountains, caused extensive liquefaction and associated damage in Northern California's San Francisco-Monterey Bay region (7).

1.4 Factors Influencing Liquefaction Features

According to Prakash 1981, a liquefaction potential of a soil deposit is determined by a variety of factors. Nevertheless, it is difficult to identify the impact of each specific factor in the area. In most cases, all or most of these factors interact (8). The following are among the factors that influence a soil deposit's liquefaction capacity:

- The sand's grain-size distribution.
- The deposit's relative density.
- Loading method used.
- The cementation of the sand and the structure of the soil forms deposit.

II. Literature Review

Amini and Qi (2000) directed an exploration study to think about the conduct of separated and similar silty sands through seismic liquefaction requirements for different residue substance and restricting pressing factors ordinary of field conditions. A thorough exploratory plan was attempted in that a sum of one hundred fifty load monitored un - drained cyclic triaxial studies were conducted out. Double techniques for test arrangement were utilized for each dirt sort. These techniques included soggy packing and sedimentation. The sediment content went from ten to half and restricting pressing factors in scope of between 50-250 kPa have being developed (8).

A key finding of this research study is the following:

1) Liquefaction opposition it is not possible to have layered and uniform soils fundamentally unique regardless of the way that the dirt texture created by the two strategies for test planning is very surprising.

2) As the limiting pressing factor expanded, A liquefaction obstruction in sand silty diminished for the pair uniform and layered soil circumstances. An outcome likewise by and large demonstrates that the impact of limiting tension in relation to liquefaction conduct of layered sands and uniform is not considerably unique.

3) In layered soils, however, it was seen that the permeability in the lateral path was significantly higher in comparison to the longitudinal permeability. Furthermore, centrifuge test results showed during liquefaction, a water very weak zone or interlayer of soil may form at the sand silt interface due to variations in permeability.

Amini and Sama (1999) made another investigation program to consider the direct of characterized and homogeneous sand-residue rock composites for various rock and dregs substance throughout seismic liquefaction conditions. A starter system was tried, consisting of 8 squeezing factor monitored undrained cyclic triaxial evaluations. The buildup substance went from 0 to half and soils with 10 and 30% stone substance were attempted. The limiting pressing component overall the test plan was 100 kPa (9). The accompanying essential decisions were acquired because of trial survey.

1) The barrier liquefaction of homogeneous and layered sand-residue rock combinations is not fundamentally extraordinary regardless of the way that the dirt texture delivered by the two strategies for test planning is very surprising.

2) The rise in silt substance caused liquefaction obstruction of sand-sediment rock blends to increment for together layered soil and uniform circumstances.

3) It was observed that each porous water pressure made up curves for the 2 sample preparation techniques have been analogous.

4) In layered soils it was seen that the horizontal porosity was significantly greater than the lateral absorption implying that the pore water pressure will reach faster in the lateral way than in the vertical path.

The lateral accelerations measured are used to assess shear stress and strain histories at various elevations within the tested soil systems. These records were used to investigate the processes of liquefaction caused lateral sand densification and spreading. The identified stress-strain histories revealed: a. A consequent gradual regains in stiffness through cyclic excitation and b. The typical decrease in strength and soil stiffness associated with liquefaction. Throughout easy shear laboratory experiments, similar process outcomes were discovered (Arulmoli et al. 1992) (10).

III. Evaluation Methods of liquefaction

Countless cities' continued growth has resulted in an increase in the construction of larger, on sites with complicated soil conditions, more complex designs. There is relatively select uncertainties, slight evaluated expertise, and other factors in highly and simplistic analytical design approaches in situations where complicated structures are constructed on fragile, stratified soils. Capabilities for logging, measurement and choice of soil parameters, as well as the growing demand for better logging through in-situ techniques (11). Currently, there are 2 main approaches for determining liquefaction potential, i.e., in situ testing as well as laboratory testing. In-situ assessment technique is popular as it causes little disruption and adequately describes the liquefaction potential (12).In geotechnical engineering, in-situ testing has a long history. Even before modern soil mechanics, load bearing tests were a part of foundation design. Before 1930, the standard penetration test and earlier forms of the cone penetration test were the primary techniques for early subsurface exploration, ultimately leading to widely used design processes based on empirical correlations. Since the 1964 Alaska and Niigata earthquakes, geotechnical engineers have been fascinated by the general phenomenon of earthquake-induced liquefaction, also known as cyclic mobility, and the conditions that lead to it. They have sparked a lot of interest in the field because of it (11,13).

In situ tests, Standard penetration test and Cone penetration test , are the highly conventional techniques of liquefaction measurement applied by geotechnical engineers to establish the liquefaction potential soils (12,14). In most cases, the various site characterization tools play complementary roles and are most effective when used together (15). Furthermore, since the measurement is done every 1.5 m, the liquefaction technique assessment according to the SPT cannot offer endless limitations of the SPT blow tally. As it offers consistent and reliable data, using the CPT to assess liquefaction potential is becoming more widely held (12,15). In 1927 has been developed Standard Penetration Test and used more widely than almost any soil test around the world. The test is carried out by lowering a free-falling hammer weighing 63.5 kg onto the drill rods from an elevation of 0.76 m. The number of blows, N, needed to reach a penetration {just under the seating drive 0.15} of a design sample tube is interpreted the saturation a as endurance. Because of the SPT's dynamic nature, there are significant issues with its repeatability and reliability (11,15).

Cone Penetration Tests Several of cone penetration methods were invented and first applied in Europe, but now they are increasing popularity into North America. The simplicity of testing, reproducibility of results, and the higher amenability of the test data to rational analysis are the primary reasons for the growing interest in cone penetration tests (11). For liquefaction evaluations, the CPT has many benefits over the SPT, including being less expensive to operate compared SPT, allowing for a extra thorough ground examination, and the design phases being easier, farther consistent, and as a result, it is more repeatable than the SPT. Due to a lack of a sample for grain size analysis and soil arrangement, as well as the limited sum of CPT-based field records linking to liquefaction potential are the 2 key causes why the CPT has still not been widely used to assess liquefaction (16,17).

IV. Mitigation of Soil Liquefaction

Liquefaction hazard of mitigation through soil enhancement involves increasing soil strength and density so that the soil framework does not fall under quick loading or enhancing soil drainage features. It may be accomplished through a variety of soil improvement techniques. It is critical to identify critical soil properties that have a direct impact on soil performance in the event of liquefaction. few of them are listed as below (18).

- Vibroflotation compacts loose sandy soils by inserting a horizontally vibrating vibroflot into the subsoil profile and jetting water from the vibroflot's bottom end. The vibrations cause the particle building to fail, causing soil around the vibroflot to densify. Gravel backfill & Vibroreplacement is a mixture of vibroflotation results in stone columns that not only that increase densification but also provide reinforcement and are a reliable drainage system.

- Dynamic compaction is achieved by dropping a massive load of steel or concrete from an elevation of 30 to 100 feet. Interior liquefaction can occur beneath the drop goal, allowing the sand grains to densify more effectively.
- Deep soil mixing: This procedure develops soil properties by mixing it mechanically with cement - based binder slurry and a column is created in the soil with the assistance of a strong drill that pumps and mixes the binder slurry into the soil as it progresses.
- Passive site stabilization: It is a not destructing mitigation method that involves slowly injecting a stabilising material such as colloidal silica into the prone region. The stabilising material is injected into the liquefiable layer through injection wells at the site's edge, which is distributed by the pre-existing groundwater flow.
- Compaction piles: Using compaction piles to improve soil is a very efficient method. Pile compaction are typically made up of wood or concrete prestressed. The use of it strengthens and densifies soil. Typically, Piles are forced down to the certain depth of 60 feet (18,19).

V. Conclusion

This paper discussed some of the more recently developed liquefaction mitigation techniques and soil liquefaction; it appears from the above that, while the review paper has covered several liquefaction-related topics thus far. Among the various seismic risks, liquefaction is regarded as a major critical hazard. The most common application of soil improvement techniques is to mitigate or decrease the liquefaction impacts. The large percentage of these methods have evolved beyond time, usually through trial and error. While traditional mitigation methods are widely used, they have drawbacks such as environmental influence, disruption to established buildings when applied to deformations and vibrations, and the area size to be mitigated. A brief discussion of the liquefaction danger related with loose sand sediments, as well as its assessment is monitored through an outline of field engineering functions, along with a concentrate on soil improvement mitigation techniques. As liquefaction hazard mitigation, vibroflotation compacts, dynamic compaction, deep mixing soil, passive site stabilisation, and piles compaction are used.

References

1. Bao X, Jin Z, Cui H, Chen X, Xie X. Soil liquefaction mitigation in geotechnical engineering: An overview of recently developed methods. Soil Dyn Earthq Eng [Internet]. 2019;120(June 2018):273–91. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.soildyn.2019.01.020
2. Dikmen SU, Tonaro M. Liquefaction Analysis of Saturated Sand Deposits With Silt Layers Subject To 1 and 2 Components of Earthquake Motion. 2008;1977–80.
3. Biawas, Amirita. Naik AN. Study on liquefaction of soil A PROJECT REPORT SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE. 2010;(10601006).
4. Konstantinou KI, Evangelidis CP, Melis NS. The 8 June 2008 Mw 6.4 earthquake in northwest Peloponnese, western Greece: A case of fault reactivation in an overpressured lower crust? Bull Seismol Soc Am. 2011;101(1):438–45.
5. Marcaccio M, Martinelli G. Effects on the groundwater levels of the May-June 2012 Emilia seismic sequence. Ann Geophys. 2012;55(4):811–4.
6. Earthquake GA, Harbor D, Islands A, Needle S, Island R, Great T, et al. The 1964 Great Alaska Earthquake and Tsunamis — A Modern Perspective and Enduring Legacies. 2014;(March).
7. Pujol J. Comment on "The 1989 Loma Prieta earthquake imaged from inversion of geodetic data" by Thora Árnadóttir and Paul Segall. J Geophys Res B Solid Earth. 1996;101(B9):20133–6.
8. Of E, Amini ABF. L Iquefaction T Esting of. Manager. 2000;(March):208–17.
9. Amini F, Sama KM. Behavior of stratified sand-silt-gravel composites under seismic liquefaction conditions. Soil Dyn Earthq Eng. 1999;18(6):445–55.
10. Yang Z, Elgamal A, Parra E. Computational Model for Cyclic Mobility and Associated Shear Deformation. J Geotech Geoenvironmental Eng. 2003;129(12):1119–27.
11. Robertson PK. In-situ testing of soil with emphasis on its application to liquefaction assessment. 1982;(December):395.
12. Du G, Gao C, Liu S, Guo Q, Luo T. Evaluation method for the liquefaction potential using the standard penetration test value based on the CPTU soil behavior type index. Adv Civ Eng. 2019;2019.
13. Cox BR. Development of a Direct Test Method for Dynamically Assessing the Liquefaction Resistance of Soils In Situ. Univ Texas Austin. 2006;541.
14. Rajendran K, Rajendran CP, Thakkar M, Tuttle MP. The 2001 Kutch (Bhuj) earthquake: Coseismic surface features and their significance. Curr Sci. 2001;80(11):1397–405.
15. Boulanger, RW and Idriss IM. CPT and SPT Based Liquefaction Triggering Procedures. Cent Geotech Model [Internet]. 2010;(10–02):134. Available from: https://faculty.engineering.ucdavis.edu/boulanger/wp-content/uploads/sites/71/2014/09/Boulanger_Idriss_CPT_and_SPT_Liq_triggering_CGM-14-01_20141.pdf%0Ahttp://nees.ucdavis.edu/publications/Boulanger_Idriss_CPT_and_SPT_Liq_triggering_CGM-14-01_2014.pdf
16. Stark TD, Olson SM. Liquefaction resistance using CPT and field case histories. J Geotech Eng. 1995;121(12):856–9.
17. Iwasaki T, Tokida K, Tatsuoka F. Soil Liquefaction Potential Evaluation with Use of the Simplified Procedure. First Int Conf Recent Adv Geotech Earthq Eng Soil Dyn. 1981;209–14.
18. El Mohtar CS, Bobet A, Santagata MC, Drnevich VP, Johnston CT. Liquefaction Mitigation Using Bentonite Suspensions. J Geotech Geoenvironmental Eng. 2013;139(8):1369–80.
19. He J, Chu J, Ivanov V. Mitigation of liquefaction of saturated sand using biogas. Geotechnique. 2013;63(4):267–75.