

# Geo-Congress 2020

# GSP **321**

University of Minnesota 68th Annual Geotechnical Engineering Conference

Selected Papers from the Geo-Congress 2020 Minneapolis, Minnesota February 25–28, 2020



## Edited by

ASCE

Joseph F. Labuz, Ph.D., P.E.; Brent A. Theroux, P.E.; James P. Hambleton, Ph.D.: Roman Makhnenko, Ph.D.; and This is a preview. Click here to purchase the full publication.



#### GEOTECHNICAL SPECIAL PUBLICATION NO. 321

# GEO-CONGRESS 2020

# UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA 68TH ANNUAL GEOTECHNICAL ENGINEERING CONFERENCE

SELECTED PAPERS FROM SESSIONS OF GEO-CONGRESS 2020

> February 25–28, 2020 Minneapolis, Minnesota

SPONSORED BY The Geo-Institute of the American Society of Civil Engineers

> EDITED BY Joseph F. Labuz, Ph.D., P.E. Brent A. Theroux, P.E. James P. Hambleton, Ph.D. Roman Makhnenko, Ph.D. Aaron S. Budge, Ph.D., P.E.





Published by the American Society of Civil Engineers

Published by American Society of Civil Engineers 1801 Alexander Bell Drive Reston, Virginia, 20191-4382 www.asce.org/publications | ascelibrary.org

Any statements expressed in these materials are those of the individual authors and do not necessarily represent the views of ASCE, which takes no responsibility for any statement made herein. No reference made in this publication to any specific method, product, process, or service constitutes or implies an endorsement, recommendation, or warranty thereof by ASCE. The materials are for general information only and do not represent a standard of ASCE, nor are they intended as a reference in purchase specifications, contracts, regulations, statutes, or any other legal document. ASCE makes no representation or warranty of any kind, whether express or implied, concerning the accuracy, completeness, suitability, or utility of any information, apparatus, product, or process discussed in this publication, and assumes no liability therefor. The information contained in these materials should not be used without first securing competent advice with respect to its suitability for any general or specific application. Anyone utilizing such information assumes all liability arising from such use, including but not limited to infringement of any patent or patents.

ASCE and American Society of Civil Engineers—Registered in U.S. Patent and Trademark Office.

*Photocopies and permissions.* Permission to photocopy or reproduce material from ASCE publications can be requested by sending an e-mail to permissions@asce.org or by locating a title in ASCE's Civil Engineering Database (http://cedb.asce.org) or ASCE Library (http://ascelibrary.org) and using the "Permissions" link.

#### Errata: Errata, if any, can be found at https://doi.org/10.1061/9780784482841

Copyright © 2020 by the American Society of Civil Engineers. All Rights Reserved. ISBN 978-0-7844-8284-1 (PDF) Manufactured in the United States of America.

## Preface

This is the 68th offering of the University of Minnesota Annual Geotechnical Engineering Conference, which was started in 1953, largely through the efforts of Miles Kersten, University of Minnesota; Charles Britzius, Twin City Testing; C.K. Preus, Minnesota Highway Department; and Wilfred Darling, Corps of Engineers. The speakers at the 1st conference included Kersten, Britzius, and Preus, as well as Herbert Wright, University of Minnesota; Rockwell Smith, Association of American Railroads; and Ralph Peck, University of Illinois. In 1979, at the 27th conference, the Kersten Lecture was established and George Sowers, Georgia Institute of Technology, presented the first lecture.

The tradition continues through the Planning Committee, whose members represent the contracting industry, government agencies, consulting engineers, and the University, with a program offering technical information and discussion on recent projects for the geoengineering community. Topics at the 68th conference cover energy geotechnology, numerical modeling in geomechanics, lessons learned from failures, waste on-site disposal, and case histories. The conference provides a forum to interact with peers, meet specialty contractors, and hear researchers and practitioners discuss theory and application of geomechanics.

This volume is one of seven containing the full collection of papers presented at Geo-Congress 2020, numbering well of 400 in total. Each of the seven volumes were reviewed in accordance with ASCE GSP standards. Each paper was subjected to technical review by two or more independent peer reviewers, and publication required concurrence by at least two peer reviewers. These publications and the conference itself would not have been possible without the diligent effort of the individuals recognized in the acknowledgements.

The Editors,

Joseph Labuz, Ph.D., P.E., F.ASCE, University of Minnesota Brent Theroux, P.E., Barr Engineering James P. Hambleton, Ph.D., M.ASCE, Northwestern University Roman Makhnenko, Ph.D., A.M.ASCE, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign Aaron S. Budge, Ph.D., P.E., M.ASCE, Minnesota State University, Mankato

### Acknowledgments

Geo-Congress 2020 and its published proceedings would not have been possible without the diligent, coordinated effort of numerous people, especially the reviewers who provided detailed feedback on papers and the session chairs who made decisions and provided editorial assistance on selected topics. The reviewers recognized below provided assistance specifically with the papers in this special volume. The editorial team is also profoundly grateful to Mr. Derrick Dasenbrock (Conference Chair), Dr. Roman Hryciw (Technical Program Co-Chair), Dr. Nick Hudyma (Technical Program Co-Chair), Dr. Nima Goudarzi, Mr. Brad Keelor, Ms. Erin Ryan, and the ASCE publications team for their crucial roles in the production of these proceedings.

#### **Geo-Congress 2020 Conference Program Committee**

#### Conference Chair

• Derrick D. Dasenbrock, P.E., D.GE, F.ASCE, Minnesota Department of Transportation

#### Technical Program Committee

- Roman D. Hryciw, Ph.D., M.ASCE, University of Michigan
- Nick W. Hudyma, Ph.D., P.E., M.ASCE, Boise State University
- Menzer Pehlivan, Ph.D., P.E., M.ASCE, Jacobs
- Lizan N. Gilbert, P.E., M.ASCE, Guy F. Atkinson Construction, LLC
- Jean Côté, Ph.D., Université Laval Québec (Representative, Canadian Geotechnical Society)
- Domenic D'Argenzio, P.E., M.ASCE, Mueser Rutledge Consulting Engineers (Representative, COPRI of ASCE)
- Brent A. Theroux, P.E., Barr Engineering Co. (Representative, Minnesota Geotechnical Society; Representative, University of Minnesota Annual Conference)

#### Proceedings Editors

- James P. Hambleton, Ph.D., M.ASCE, Northwestern University
- Roman Makhnenko, Ph.D., A.M.ASCE, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
- Aaron S. Budge, Ph.D., P.E., M.ASCE, Minnesota State University, Mankato

#### Reviewers

Pouyan Asem
Chris Behling
Joseph Bentler
Ryan Berg
Aaron Budge

Ivan Contreras Ron Farmer Bryan Field Steve Gale Michael Haggerty Megan Hoppe Nathan Iverson Joseph Labuz Richard Lamb Dan Mahrt

Steve Olson Ryan Petersen Greg Reuter David Saftner Brian Sanchez Joel Swenson Brent Theroux Joseph Westphal

# Contents

The Art of Numerical Modeling in Geomechanics1 Peter A. Cundall
Lessons (Re)learned from Geotechnical Failures14 Richard J. Finno
<b>Twenty-Year Performance of a Mixed LLRW/RCRA Waste Disposal Facility29</b> Rudolph Bonaparte, Beth A. Gross, Ranjiv Gupta, John F. Beech, Leslie M. Griffin, and David K. Phillips
Gas Explosion Analysis
The Use of Steel Sheet Pile as Permanent Building Foundation Walls: Lessons Learned over 15 Years of Design in Minneapolis, Minnesota, USA
<b>Quo Vadis? Inakeyaa! Inferring Flow Directions Using a Bayesian Approach78</b> Randal J. Barnes and Richard Soule
Supporting a Bridge between Countries Case Study: Construction of Baudette Bridge Drilled Shafts
Computational Tools for the Analysis of Stability of Embankments in Frictional-Cohesive Soils
<b>Eisenhower Bridge North Abutment and Approach Settlement: A Case History</b> <b>of Timber Pile Downdrag and Comparative Downdrag Effect on Steel Piles119</b> Steven J. Olson
Washington Park Reservoir Improvements: Accommodating Ancient Landslide Movement with a Compressible Inclusion
A Retrospective on the Evolution of Geotechnical Sensing and Instrumentation for Monitoring at MnDOT
<b>Experimental Study of Forces Induced in Mechanical Excavation of Rock156</b> John Pultorak, Dmitry Drozdov, Jia-Liang Le, and Emmanuel Detournay

An Overview of Performance Monitoring for Drilled Full Displacement Type Rigid Inclusions under Highway Embankments163
Liang Chern Chow, Joseph G. Bentler, Alex Potter-Weight, and Andrew J. Eller
<b>Detecting Pile Length of Sign Structures and High Mast Poles</b>
Sky Harbor Airport Runway Realignment
A Failure Mechanism around Axially Loaded Sockets in Weak Rock
Kennedy Bridge Instrumentation: A Pier Review
A Review of LRFD Bridge Foundation Design and Construction in South Dakota221 Brett E. Belzer, Bret N. Lingwall, and Lance A. Roberts
<b>On Solid Ground: Preventative and Responsive Geotechnical and Structural</b> <b>Mitigation of Geologic Hazards Impacting Oil and Gas Production</b>

#### The Art of Numerical Modeling in Geomechanics

Peter A. Cundall<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Minneapolis, MN, USA. E-mail: pacundall@aol.com

#### ABSTRACT

Numerical modeling is used extensively in the design and evaluation of projects that involve the behavior of rock, soil, and groundwater. There are many potential pitfalls for the modeler, particularly if inexperienced, some of which are discussed. The importance of understanding mechanisms is stressed, and this point is illustrated with examples that show the advantages of building simplified models in addition to detailed models for site analysis.

#### **INTRODUCTION**

Numerical modeling is used widely to understand and predict the behavior of soil, rock and coupled fluids in the fields of mining, geothermal, petroleum and civil engineering. Typical methods are finite elements, finite volume, boundary elements and discrete elements.

Although these calculation schemes are based on mathematical formulations, and thus may be expected to be subject to scientific methodology, there is an art involved in the effective application of numerical models in engineering.

The author was involved in helping users of Itasca codes (*FLAC*, *UDEC*, *PFC*, etc.) for many years and has seen many incorrect usages and inappropriate approaches to modeling, as well as opportunities that have been missed for understanding mechanisms that characterize the behavior of rock, soil and coupled fluid in geomechanical applications. Drawing on these experiences, an attempt is made to formulate some suggestions for successful and informative modeling.

#### UNDERSTANDING MECHANISMS

We believe that the most important aspect of any engineering project is to understand the dominant mechanisms that determine the system's behavior. If a model is too complicated, the mechanisms may not be obvious, so it is worth constructing simple models first, driven by the questions that the models are supposed to answer. This approach was recommended by Cundall and Starfield (1988) and reinforced by Detournay et al. (1993) and Hammah and Curran (2009). As Albert Einstein said, "Everything should be made as simple as possible, but not simpler." A hierarchy of models of increasing complexity is also useful for showing how each added feature contributes to the behavior. Two examples are presented that use simple models to explain mechanisms that occur in complex models.

**Displacements arising from fluid impoundment behind an arch dam:** Consider the question of water seepage from the filling of a reservoir behind a large arch dam. The question we wish to answer is: Will the river banks experience convergence, and over what time scales will they occur? Most large dams are constructed in complex geological environments with irregular topography for the dam placement and reservoir. A model with all this complexity in place is not only time-consuming to run, but the dominant mechanisms are likely to be obscured. The simplest model is two-dimensional elastic, showing how water emplacement in an idealized valley leads to short- and long-term displacements. Figure 1 shows an upstream cross-section of an idealized valley with impounded water, where the colors denote layers of different rock types. In the short term (without fluid migration into the rock), the mechanical response of the saturated

valley is depicted in Figure 2 by vectors and contours of horizontal displacements. There is a downwards and inwards movement that may be termed the "mattress effect," noting that a load applied to the surface of a mattress causes surface displacements towards the load. After the fluid flow has reached steady state at some time, the incremental displacements (due to fluid migration alone) are depicted in Figure 3. The horizontal displacements are outwards from the valley, due to expansion induced by increases in fluid pressure (see Figure 4 for contours of excess pore pressure). Thus, the short-term and long-term valley convergence contributions are opposite in sign. In the simple example, the former is greater than the latter, but in a more realistic model, this order may be reversed. However, the mechanisms revealed by the simple model have given us something to watch out for in more complex models.

It might be tempting to simplify the model further and consider water impoundment over a 1D saturated column. However, no induced displacement would be predicted in this case, since the increase in total stress would balance the increase in fluid pressure. This would be an example of over-simplifying.



Figure 1. 2D model of idealized valley, with rock layers and water level.



Figure 2. Displacement vectors and horizontal displacement contours for short-term response (no fluid migration). The maximum inward displacement is 12 mm.

**Hydraulic fracture interaction:** In the second example, we consider the interaction of two hydraulic fractures. The code *XSite* (Cundall 2011; Itasca 2019) uses a lattice of springs and masses to represent a brittle material that may develop macroscopic fractures that consist of chains of spring breakages, each of which is regarded as a micro-fracture. Each broken spring has a fluid pressure node associated with it, and neighboring nodes are linked by "pipes" that