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0. A Few Historical Musings

Gravity Walls (Masonry)

“kern” of the masonry base

lateral earth pressure

- Coulomb
- Culmann
- Rankine

Tech. Papers Conferences

Antiquity (pre-18th Century)

Embankment Dams (aka, Slopes)

angle of “repose” of soil

Industrial Revolution (18th/19th Century)

shear strength stability

- Linear
- Circular
- Atterberg

Tech. Papers Conferences
Soil Mechanics and Foundation Engineering (20th-Century; Terzaghi)

Manuals/Books University Courses “Lateral Earth Pressure” (horizontal & inclined)

Geotechnical Engineering

Reinforced Concrete
- cantilever
- buttresses
- counterforts

H. Vidal (1966) Rein. Earth®
- steel strips
- steel mesh
- geotextiles
- geogrids

Manuals/Books University Courses “Soil Slope Stability” (circular & wedge)

Computers (for search)
- Bishop/Mod. Bishop
- Morganstein/Price
- Spencer and others

walls and slopes become indistinguishable

Now this is negative batter!!
Since ~ 1980

Always Computer Design or Analysis (FHWA, NCMA, ReSSA)

- **Internal**
  - Piecewise Linear Compound (Spencer Method)

- **External**
  - Circular Arc Behind & Beneath (Mod. Bishop Method)

Present Status of MSE Walls (many courses on design; just one on failure and remediation)
The Topic Under Discussion……
Note, For Any Facing Type and “ω”
1. Introduction and Background

- Koerner/Soong paper in 2001; 26 failures
- considered failure as being both excessive deformation and/or collapse
- 20 of 26 cases had silt and/or clay backfills
- most cases had no CQA inspection
- only one global geotechnical soil failure
- included an earlier cost survey of public and private walls (Koerner, et al., 2001)
MSE-GS Walls are lowest cost!
But Private Walls are much cheaper than Public – Why?
Possible Reasons for Lower Cost
(in no particular order)

- less conservative computer design code
- poor control of backfill soil and compaction
- less (or no) construction inspection
- vendor design without related project reports
- lack of peer review of plans and specifications
GRI Report #38 (12/16/2009)

- contains 82-case history failures; 23 excessive deformation and 59 collapses (3 were both)
- information obtained from following sources:
  - Published literature = 27 cases
  - GSI files = 13 cases
  - Colleagues’ files = 36 cases
  - Other (e.g., internet, etc.) = 6 cases
- report kept internal to GSI members
Present Status (4/1/2012)

- report stimulated additional case histories
- presently 141-cases with 34 excessive deformation and 107 collapses (3 were both)
- information obtained from following sources
  - published = 53
  - GSI files = 15
  - colleagues files = 67
  - other (internet, etc.) = 6
- let’s see what we have in this regard…
Items Under Investigation

1. Wall ownership (public or private)
2. Location of case history (by continent!)
3. Type of wall facing
4. Maximum (or collapse) wall height
5. Type of geosynthetic reinforcement
6. Service lifetime of wall
7. Primary responsibility
8. Soil backfill type
9. Compaction of soil backfill
10. Basic failure mechanism
2.0 The Two Failure Classifications

(a) Excessive Deformation

- what is excessive?
- owner’s answer differs from contractor’s
- design engineer is probably in the middle
- masonry block most noticeable
- vegetated face least noticeable
- let’s see some of them…
Cases of Excessive Wall Deformations

Photos by GSI and others
(b) Wall Collapse

- visually observable
- some are very extensive in length
- some are narrow, but full height
- some are at top only
- some are at bottom only
- let’s see some of them...
Cases of Wall Collapse

Photos by GSI and others
3.0 Main Statistical Findings

1. all but one were private walls
2. 72% were North American
3. 68% were masonry block faced (i.e., SRWs)
4. 49% were 4 to 8 m high
5. 90% were geogrid reinforced (others GT)
6. 81% failed in less than four years
7. 98% caused by improper design or construction; none (0%) were GG or GT manufacturing failures
8. 62% used silt and clay backfill soils
9. 75% had poor or moderate compaction
10. 58% caused by internal or external water (i.e., remaining 42% caused by soil related issues)
Basic failure mechanisms
(Examples Follow)
(a) Internal Instability Failures – 37 Cases (26%)
(b) External Instability Failures – 23 Cases (16%)

Sloping Toe

Seismic - Nisqually

Global - Front of Wall

Seismic – “Chi-Chi”

Global - Behind Wall

Photos by GSI and others
(c) Internal Water Failures – 51 Cases (36%)
(d) External Water Failures – 30 Cases (22%)

Photos by GSI and others
4.0 Design and Construction Issues

4.1 Fine grained soils in backfill
4.2 Compaction of fine grained soils
4.3 Routing of internal drainage systems
4.4 Surface water control
4.5 Sensitive design details
4.1 Fine Grained Soils in Backfill

Type of soil used in the reinforced soil zones of the cases reported herein.
## Various Criteria for Backfill Soils

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>75-100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 4</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>20-100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 10</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>90-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 40</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0-60</td>
<td>0-60</td>
<td>0-60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 100</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 200</td>
<td>0.075</td>
<td>0-35**</td>
<td>15*</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*PI ≤ 6.0

**PI ≤ 20.0

***2009 Design Manual cautions against use of fine-grained soils!
Regarding Fine Grained Soil Backfill

- use of on-site soil is compelling
- cost savings (vs. imported) is 40-70%
- appears incapable of being stopped
- so, use it, but circumvent the poor drainage by external routing as follows…
The Geocomposite Drain Alternative (compl., TenCate Geosynthetics, Inc.)
Use of continuous and intermittent geocomposite back drains when using fine grained soils in the reinforced soil zone (compl., TenCate Geosynthetics, Inc.)
4.2 Compaction of Fine-Grained Soils

- Use 95% standard Proctor (95% modified Proctor is too much for walls and slopes)
- This reference is from Turnbull in 1950!

Legend 1,2 = modified
3-6 = standard
If no one watches, this is what you get; Photos by A. Filshill
4.3 Routing of **Internal** Drainage Systems

- 16 of 51 (31%) of internal water failures
- catch basins and manholes simply don’t belong in the reinforced soil zone!
- nor does the associated transmission piping!!
- backfill soil settles and these walls deform
- this causes leakage or breakage of these heavy, hard and brittle drainage systems!!!
Various Internal Drainage Failures
A (Not-So) “Radical” Answer

(a) Customary internal drainage for surface water within reinforced soil zone

(b) Recommended external drainage for surface water behind reinforced soil zone

(c) Recommended external drainage for surface water coupled with back/base drain

Shifting of internal drainage systems from within to behind the reinforced soil zone.
This redirection of surface water flow also avoids this from occurring......
(compl. A. Filshill)
4.4 Surface Water Control

- 10 of 30 (33%) of internal water failures
- upper surface must be sealed (GM or GCL); but the water must be properly intercepted and transmitted
- this includes sealing the curb/asphalt intersections
- tension cracks are notorious; if they form, fill and seal them immediately
- following mechanism is well understood
Modular block wall collapse progression due to hydrostatic pressure in tension cracks.
4.5 Sensitivity of Design Details to FS-Values

Typical Failure Surfaces

- 5 – internal (compound) failure via Spencer Analysis
- 6 – external (circular) failure via Bishop Analysis

Analyses to follow used the ReSSA (3.0) computer code
### 4.5.1- Effect of Reinforcement Length-to-Wall Height (L/H) Ratio

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>L/H Ratio</th>
<th>Spencer Analysis</th>
<th>Bishop Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>2.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>2.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>2.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>2.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>1.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>1.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 4.5.2- Effect of Reinforcement Layer Spacing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spacing (m)</th>
<th>Spencer Analysis</th>
<th>Bishop Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>2.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>2.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>2.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$S_v \approx 0.76$ m

$S_v \approx 0.91$ m
4.5.3- Effect of Front Soil Exit Angle at Toe of Wall

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exit Angle at Toe (deg)</th>
<th>Spencer Analysis</th>
<th>Bishop Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>2.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) A-A section

(b) B-B section
4.5.4- Effect of Backfill Soil Shear Strength (Cohesion is Assumed to be Zero)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Friction Angle (deg)</th>
<th>Spencer</th>
<th>Bishop</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>2.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>2.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>1.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.5.5- Effect of Water Filled Tension Crack Behind Reinforced Soil Zone

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Depth (% H)</th>
<th>Spencer</th>
<th>Bishop</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>2.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>2.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>2.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>2.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>2.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Wall is immediately in back of this fence.
4.5.6- Effect of Elevated Phreatic Surface Within Reinforced Soil Zone

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Toe Water Ht. (% H)</th>
<th>Internal Water (% H)</th>
<th>Spencer</th>
<th>Bishop</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>2.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Some Comments on Wall Failures

- the wall failure situation is of great concern
- it (mistakenly) looks bad for geosynthetics
- primary causes are poor design and construction
- design-wise it’s lack of proper drainage design
- construction-wise it’s poor placement and compaction of the fine grained soil
- new inspector certification program might help
5.0 Remediation Case Histories

- 34 of 141 failure cases involved excessive deformation of the facing or backfill zone
- 14 of 34 deforming ones were remediated
- this section describes several remediated cases
- note that none of them were dewatered???
5.1 Remediation Using Ground Anchors

5.1.1 Case History in Virginia (Authors)

- 9.1 m high masonry block wall
- bulged in lower and central sections within six months of construction
- ML-CL backfill soil, poorly compacted
- remediated by using ground anchor tendons attached to massive concrete pilasters
Wall Remediation Using Ground Anchors and Reinforced Concrete Pilasters
5.1.2 Case History in Georgia (J. Paulson)

- 9.1 m high masonry block wall
- small section collapsed after two years
- section rebuilt and entire wall stabilized
- ML-SP backfill soil, poorly compacted
- geogrids were laid out incorrectly
- rainfall triggered instability
- ground anchor (type?) tendons tied to H-beams within new facing
Typical Cross-Section of Original Wall and its Newly Constructed Support Wall (after, Paulson, GFR, 2002)
5.1.3 Case History in New Jersey (A. Filshill)

- 4.6 m high masonry block wall
- partial collapse after eight years
- ML-CL backfill soil; poorly compacted
- internal water from leaking catch basins
- remediated using gabions with duckbill anchors at end of driven tendons
Drainage Inlet (Catch Basin) Located in the Reinforced Soil Zone of Collapsed Wall
Remediation to the Collapsed Wall
(A. Filshill)
5.2 Remediation Using Soil Nails

5.2.1 Case History in California (F. Jaecklin)

- 4.6 m high masonry block wall
- deformed after two years
- bulging first; then horizontal sliding
- cause attributed to rainfall events
- stabilized using grouted soil nails and reinforced shotcrete at face
Evidence of Horizontal Sliding Wall Sections
Remediation Using Soil Nails and Reinforced Shotcrete (F. Jaecklin)
5.2.2 Case History in Virginia (D. Leshchinsky)

- 16.5 m high masonry block wall
- \(>>150\) mm deformation after two years
- Internal water pressure from drainage system located within reinforced zone
- Deformations correlated to rainfall events
- Grouted soil nails against concrete panels
- Complex and costly wall stabilization
Remediation Scheme Used to Stabilize Deforming WWM/GG Wall
5.2.3 Case History in New Jersey (M. Yako)

- 11.6 m high masonry block wall
- deformed after 18-months service
- blocks were constantly wet
- ML backfill soil; moderate compaction
- homogeneous HDPE geogrid reinforcement
- tension cracks behind reinforcement
- grouted soil nails attached to concrete pilasters
Drilling for Soil Nails

Cleaning out of Drilled Hole

Soil Nails Completed with Bearing Plates

Installation of Soil Nails

W21C

Insertion of Nail tendon

Plate Installation 2/06/03

Photos compl. of GEI Inc.
Stabilization Scheme Using for this Deforming Masonry Block Wall (M. Yako)
5.3 Rebuilding of Collapsed MSE Walls (authors)

- rebuild is usually using sandy gravel backfill soils with good compaction
- concern is over steep backslope stability, i.e., workers’ safety and OSHA
- this wall had internal drainage problems
Common Problem of Capturing and Transmitting Roof Runoff and Paved Surface Water Flow Within Reinforced Soil Zone
Collapsed Wall Rebuild with Shotcreted Retained Soil Zone for Stability

shotcrete retained soil (see next photos)
6.0 The Cost of Remediation

- we suspect that most remediation projects are “time and materials” contracts
- with a contractor’s professional estimator we did a case-by-case analysis of initial and remediated costs of the ten case histories
- costs are based on 2010 prices for the site-specific location
### Approximate Costs of Remediation of Failed Walls (S. I. Units)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case(1)</th>
<th>Type(2)</th>
<th>Max. Ht. (m)</th>
<th>Length (m)</th>
<th>Area(3) (sq. m)</th>
<th>Original Cost(4) ($/m²)(5)</th>
<th>Remediation Method</th>
<th>Remediated Cost(4) ($/m²)(5)</th>
<th>Remedi./Original Cost Ratio ($1000) ($/m²)</th>
<th>Remedi./Original Cost Ratio ($1000)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D4</td>
<td>MBW</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>1720</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>anchored pilasters</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C24</td>
<td>MBW</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>1147</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>anchored blocks</td>
<td>904</td>
<td>4.66(6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C38</td>
<td>MBW</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>anchored blocks</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C39</td>
<td>MBW</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>anchored gabions</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C40</td>
<td>MBW</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>anchored blocks</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D6</td>
<td>MBW</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>soil nails and shotcrete</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D15</td>
<td>WWM</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>1294</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>soil nails and conc. pads</td>
<td>980</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D18</td>
<td>MBW</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>974</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>soil nails and pilasters</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D19</td>
<td>MBW</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>soil nails and pilasters</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C15</td>
<td>MBW</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>rebuilt MBW completely</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes**
- (1) refers to case history number in GRI Report #38 by Koerner and Koerner, 2009
- (2) MBW = modular block wall facing, and WWM = welded wire wall facing
- (3) calculated as 70% of maximum height (an average height) times the length
- (4) based on prevailing wages in state of wall location
- (5) material cost estimates were in force in 2010
- (6) failed wall was made redundant by constructing a new frontal wall
Remediation of two excessively deforming walls (D4 at 1.05X original and D15 at 3.50X original)
Commentary on Remediation

- as seen, the costs vary from 1.05 to 3.50 times the 2010 cost of building the wall
- the ratio would be much higher compared to the original cost of building the wall
- other than the embarrassment of being associated with a failure are the possibilities of insurance and legal claims
- of course, additional work for this client is questionable and perhaps not likely
7.0 Summary and Conclusion

- 141 failures were examined and classified; watch out for both internal and external water.
- Remediation of deforming walls is not cheap and it destroys the aesthetics.
- Ground anchors and soil nails were illustrated (also one collapsed wall that was rebuilt).
- Dewatering was never used???
Concluding Comments

- state-of-the-practice of MSE wall design and construction is very dicey (in our opinion).....
- designers often don’t explore or visit sites and they often do not have civil, geotechnical, and site plans and details
- subsurface water collection and pipe transmission must be removed from the reinforced soil zone
- contractors seem to use “any” available soil backfill and are quite cavalier in its placement and compaction
- private sector MSE walls really need improvement
- full day course on failures is available as is a full day inspectors course with an associated certification program
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Thanks for Listening
Any Questions???

Worldwide Answering Service is Available Anytime At;
<gmatechline@ifai.com>