Recommendations for Design and Analysis of Earth Structures using Geosynthetic Reinforcements – EBGEO

Ernst & Sohn
A Wiley Company

DGGT
Deutsche Gesellschaft
für Geotechnik e. V.
German Geotechnical Society

Recommendations for Design and Analysis of Earth Structures using Geosynthetic Reinforcements – EBGEO

Ernst & Sohn
A Wiley Company

Recommendations for Design and Analysis of Earth Structures using Geosynthetic Reinforcements – EBGEO

Translation of the
2nd German Edition

Published by
the German Geotechnical Society
(Deutsche Gesellschaft für Geotechnik e. V., DGGT)

Ernst & Sohn
A Wiley Company

DGGT
Deutsche Gesellschaft
für Geotechnik e. V.
German Geotechnical Society

Working Group 5.2 ‚Analysis and Dimensioning of Soil Structures using Geosynthetic Reinforcements' Technical Group ‚Synthetics in Geotechnical Engineering' of the German Geotechnical Society
Chairman: AOR Dipl.-Ing. Gerhard Bräu
Technische Universität München
Zentrum Geotechnik
Lehrstuhl und Prüfamt für Grundbau, Bodenmechanik,
Felsmechanik und Tunnelbau
Baumbachstraße 7
81245 München
Germany

Translator: Alan Johnson, Nordstemmen/Adensen, Germany

Cover photographs:
Top left: Geotextile-encased sand columns on the Mühlenberger Loch project, Hamburg (photo: Huesker Synthetic GmbH); Top right: Steep embankment for heavy goods vehicle transport in Aalen, reinforced using geogrids (photo: Tensar International GmbH); Bottom left: Landslide rehabilitation using geogrids along the B115 road near Altenmarkt in Austria (photo: TenCate Geosynthetics Deutschland GmbH); Bottom right: Geogrids as base course reinforcement in redevelopment of a former mining spoil tip along the A38 autobahn near Leipzig (photo: Naue GmbH & Co. KG)

Library of Congress Card No.:
applied for

British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek
The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data are available on the Internet at <http://dnb.d-nb.de>.

© 2011 Wilhelm Ernst & Sohn,
Verlag für Architektur und technische Wissenschaften GmbH & Co. KG, Rotherstr. 21, 10245 Berlin, Germany

All rights reserved (including those of translation into other languages). No part of this book may be reproduced in any form – by photoprinting, microfilm, or any other means – nor transmitted or translated into a machine language without written permission from the publishers. Registered names, trademarks, etc. used in this book, even when not specifically marked as such, are not to be considered unprotected by law.

Coverdesign: Designpur, Berlin
Production Management: pp030 – Produktionsbüro Heike Praetor, Berlin
Typesetting: Manuela Treindl, Fürth
Printing and Binding: Strauss GmbH, Mörlenbach

Printed in the Federal Republic of Germany.
Printed on acid-free paper.

ISBN 978-3-433-02983-1
Electronic version available. O-Book ISBN 978-3-433-60093-1

German Geotechnical Society

Working Group 5.2
Analysis and Dimensioning of Earth structures using Geosynthetic Reinforcements

Chairman: Dipl.-Ing. Bräu, Munich
Deputy Chairman: Dipl.-Ing. Herold, Weimar

Members of the Working Group:

Dr.-Ing. Alexiew, Gescher
Dr.-Ing. Bauer, Olching
Dipl.-Ing. Blume, Overath
Dipl.-Geol. Blume, Bergisch-Gladbach
Dipl.-Ing. Dollowski, Bonn
Prof. Dr.-Ing. Göbel, Dresden
Dipl.-Ing. Hubal, Munich (formerly)
Dipl.-Ing. Jas, AM Oostvoorne (formerly)
Prof. Dr.-Ing. Kempfert, Kassel
Prof. Dr.-Ing. Klapperich, Freiberg
Dr.-Ing. Köhler, Erfurt
Dr.-Ing. Magnus, Leipzig
Dipl.-Ing. Mannsbart, Linz (formerly)
Prof. Dr.-Ing. Meyer, Clausthal-Zellerfeld
Prof. Dr.-Ing. Müller-Rochholz, Münster
Dipl.-Ing. Murray, Dietzenbach
Dipl.-Ing. Naciri, Bonn
Prof. Dr.-Ing. Nimmesgern, Würzburg
Dipl.-Ing. Pachomow, Cottbus
Prof. Dipl.-Ing. Paul, Lindau
Dr.-Ing. Raithel, Würzburg
Dr.-Ing. Retzlaff, Steinfurt
Dr.-Ing. Reuter, Minden
Prof. Dr.-Ing. Rißе, Rostock (formerly)
Dipl.-Ing. Scheu, Lübbecke (formerly)
Dipl.-Ing. Schön, Erlangen
Dr.-Ing. Schwerdt, Köthen
Dr.-Ing. Trunk, Offenbach
Dipl.-Ing. Vogel, Munich
Dipl.-Ing. Vollmert, Espelkamp
Dr. Wilmers, Wetzlar
Prof. Dr.-Ing. Ziegler, Aachen

Recommendations for Design and Analysis of Earth Structures using Geosynthetic Reinforcements (EBGEO). German Geotechnical Society.
© 2011 Ernst & Sohn GmbH & Co. KG.
Published by Ernst & Sohn GmbH & Co. KG.

Consulting Members for Special Issues:

Prof. Dipl.-Ing. Ast, Stuttgart
Dr.-Ing. Aydogmus, Innsbruck
Dipl.-Ing. Heinemann, Hannover
Dr.-Ing. Heitz, Kassel
Dr.-Ing. Lepique, Essen
Dipl.-Ing. Lüking, Kassel
Dipl.-Ing. Maihold, Freiberg
Dipl.-Ing. Müller-Kirchenbauer, Hannover
Dr.-Ing. Sobolewski, Gescher
Dr.-Ing. Stoewahse, Braunschweig
Dipl.-Ing. Wallis, Hamburg
Dr.-Ing. Wehr, Offenbach
Dipl.-Ing. Wittemöller, Hille

Preface

The 1997 edition of EBGEO presented the profession with recommendations for designing and analysing earth structures using geosynthetic reinforcements. It adopted the partial safety factor concept used in geotechnical standards, which was then still being developed, more or less in its entirety. The introduction of the 2005 edition of DIN 1054 as part of the body of legally binding building regulations and the associated European regulations made it necessary to revise EBGEO. In addition, unification of the various analysis approaches was necessary to keep pace with fundamental product developments and new applications. These were implemented exhaustively by the members and guests of the German Geotechnical Society's *(Deutsche Gesellschaft für Geotechnik e. V. (DGGT))* Working Group AK 5.2 'Analysis and Dimensioning of Soil Structures using Geosynthetic Reinforcements' in innumerable meetings comprising both small and large groups. We would like to take this opportunity to say many thanks to all involved!

In addition to a thorough revision of the existing sections, where both practical construction experience and the most recent national and international research results have been incorporated, new sections covering:

- Reinforced Earth Structures over Point or Linear Bearing Elements,
- Foundation Systems Using Geotextile-encased Columns,
- Bridging Subsidence and
- Dynamic Actions on Geosynthetic-reinforced Systems

were included.

Positive experience was gathered on a number of construction projects during the Recommendations' compilation phase and their applicability confirmed – including on international projects. The Working Group also regards this edition of EBGEO as an intermediate stage, because in many cases it is still only possible to design in terms of individual components, but not in terms of the actual 'soil/geosynthetic' composite construction material. However, the latter represents the primary objective, which will be pursued by way of more research and monitoring measures on active construction projects.

EBGEO follows the tradition of similar DGGT recommendations such as the EAB (Recommendations on Excavations) or the Recommendations of the Working Group on Piles, which now represent established best practice. The user is referred to the Notes for the User with regard to the compulsory nature of these Recommendations (see Page XXI, taken from EAB (2006), 4th edition, Ernst & Sohn).

The German Geotechnical Society's *(Deutsche Gesellschaft für Geotechnik e. V. (DGGT))* Working Group AK 5.2 'Analysis and Dimensioning of Soil Structures using Geosynthetic Reinforcements' asks you to send any suggestions and correspondence concerning further development of the Recommendations to the Chairman of AK 5.2 (see Page IV for address).

Munich, 2010 *G. Bräu*

Recommendations for Design and Analysis of Earth Structures using Geosynthetic Reinforcements (EBGEO). German Geotechnical Society.
© 2011 Ernst & Sohn GmbH & Co. KG.
Published by Ernst & Sohn GmbH & Co. KG.

Preface to the English edition

This edition is a translation of the 2nd edition of EBGEO published in April 2010. To improve understanding among the international readership the German limit state designations were translated using the terms employed in EN 1997 (EC7):

GZ 1A	EQU
GZ 1B	STR
GZ 1C	GEO
GZ 2	SLS

However, this does not mean that EBGEO is now based technically on EN 1997 – it is still based on the 2005 edition of the German DIN 1054. If any confusion arises as a consequence of translation, the German original is the authoritative text.

Working Group 5.2 would like to thank everybody involved in publishing the English-language edition, in particular Mr Alan Johnson, who did an excellent job of translating the German original.

Munich, March 2011 *G. Bräu*

Contents

Preface to the English edition VIII

Notes for the User XXI

1 Introduction to the Recommendations and their Application Principles 1

1.1 National and International Regulations 1
1.2 Types of Analysis and Limit States using the Partial Safety Factor Approach 2
1.2.1 New Standards Generation and Transitional Regulations 2
1.2.2 Effects and Resistances 3
1.2.3 Limit States 3
1.2.4 Applying EBGEO in Conjunction with DIN EN 1997-1 5
1.3 Examples of Reinforced Earth Structures 7
1.4 General Definitions 8

2 Demands on Materials 9

2.1 Soil 9
2.1.1 Ground Investigation 9
2.1.2 Fill Soil 9
2.1.2.1 Soil Mechanics Demands 9
2.1.2.1.1 Predominantly Statically Loaded Structures 9
2.1.2.1.2 Predominantly Dynamically Loaded Structures 10
2.1.2.2 Soil Chemistry Demands 10
2.1.2.3 Execution 10
2.1.3 Back-fill and Cover-fill Soils 10
2.2 Geosynthetics 11
2.2.1 General Recommendations 11
2.2.2 Raw Materials 11
2.2.3 Product Properties and Demands 11
2.2.4 Testing and Reduction Factors 12
2.2.4.1 General Recommendations 12
2.2.4.2 Product Identification (DIN EN ISO 10320) 13
2.2.4.3 Mass Per Unit Area (DIN EN ISO 9864) 13
2.2.4.4 Short-term Load-Extenson Behaviour 13
2.2.4.4.1 Tensile Strength and Strain (DIN EN ISO 10319) 13
2.2.4.4.2 Axial Stiffness 17
2.2.4.4.3 Uniaxial and Biaxial Reinforcement 18
2.2.4.4.4 Serviceability Limit State/Strain Behaviour 18
2.2.4.5 Long-term Load-Extension Behaviour (Creep Rupture, Creep) 18
2.2.4.5.1 General Recommendations 18

Recommendations for Design and Analysis of Earth Structures using Geosynthetic Reinforcements (EBGEO). German Geotechnical Society.
© 2011 Ernst & Sohn GmbH & Co. KG.
Published by Ernst & Sohn GmbH & Co. KG.

2.2.4.5.2 Determining Reduction Factor A_1 from Creep Testing 19
2.2.4.5.3 Reduction Factor A_1 for Creep Failure Behaviour 20
2.2.4.5.4 Identifying Long-term Strain Behaviour by Evaluating Isochrones 21
2.2.4.6 Resistance to Mechanical Damage During Installation 24
2.2.4.6.1 General Recommendations 24
2.2.4.6.2 Reduction Factor A_2 for Damage to Geosynthetics During Transportation, Installation and Compaction 24
2.2.4.6.3 In-situ Testing 25
2.2.4.6.4 Laboratory Testing (DIN EN ISO 10722) 26
2.2.4.7 Joins and Connections 26
2.2.4.7.1 General Recommendations 26
2.2.4.7.2 Reduction Factor A_3 for Junctions, Joins, Seams and Connections to Other Structural Elements 26
2.2.4.7.3 Determining the Reduction Factor A_3 by Testing 26
2.2.4.8 Chemical Resistance 27
2.2.4.8.1 Reduction Factor A_4 for Environmental Chemical Impacts 27
2.2.4.8.2 Determining Chemical Resistance by Testing 27
2.2.4.9 Additional Environmental Impacts 28
2.2.4.9.1 Microbiological Resistance 28
2.2.4.9.2 Biological Resistance and Vandalism 28
2.2.4.9.3 Weathering Resistance (UV Resistance) 28
2.2.4.10 Effects of Predominantly Dynamic Actions 29
2.2.4.10.1 Reduction Factor A_5 for Predominantly Dynamic Actions 29
2.2.4.10.2 Determining the Reduction Factor A_5 for Predominantly Dynamic Actions by Testing 29
2.2.4.11 Friction and Composite Behaviour 29
2.2.4.11.1 General Recommendations 29
2.2.4.11.2 Determining Composite Coefficients by Testing 31
2.3 Bibliography 32

3 Analysis Principles 35

3.1 General Principles 35
3.2 Allocation of Geosynthetic-reinforced Structures to Geotechnical Categories 37
3.3 Design Resistances 38
3.3.1 Structural Resistance of Geosynthetics 38
3.3.2 Determining Reduction Factors 39
3.3.3 Pull-out Resistance of Geosynthetics 39
3.3.3.1 Characteristic Pull-out Resistance of Geosynthetics 39
3.3.3.2 GEO Pull-out Resistance Design Values 39
3.3.3.3 STR Pull-out Resistance Design Value 40
3.3.4 Axial Stiffness of Geosynthetics in the Serviceability Limit State 40
3.4 Partial Safety Factors – Supplementary Regulations to DIN 1054 40

4 Embankments on Soft Soils 43

4.1 General Recommendations 43
4.2 Analysing Global Failure 44
4.2.1 General Recommendations 44
4.2.2 Failure Mechanisms 45
4.2.2.1 Failure on Circular Slip Planes 45
4.2.2.2 Defined Slip Plane in Soft Soil 45
4.2.2.3 Slip Plane Between Geosynthetics and Fill Soil or Between Geosynthetics and Soft Soil 45
4.2.2.4 Adopting Reinforcement Wrap-around 45
4.2.3 Actions 49
4.2.4 Resistances 49
4.2.4.1 Design Value of the Friction Resistance on Top of the Geosynthetics $R_{O,d}$ 49
4.2.4.2 Design Value of the Shear Resistance on the Bottom of the Geosynthetics $R_{U,d}$ 49
4.2.4.3 Design Value of the Pull-out Resistance $R_{A,d}$ 50
4.2.4.4 Design Resistance of the Geosynthetic Reinforcement $R_{B,d}$ 50
4.2.4.5 Design Value of the Friction Resistance on Top of the Geosynthetic $R_{3,d}$ 50
4.3 Analysing the Stability of the Ground against ‘Squeezing Out’ . . . 51
4.4 Analysing Bearing Capacity 52
4.5 Engineering Notes 53
4.6 Bibliography 53
4.7 Example Embankment on Soft Soil 53
4.7.1 Failure on Circular Slip Planes 54
4.7.1.1 Initial Stability 55
4.7.1.2 Final Stability 56
4.7.2 Defined Slip Plane in Soft Soil 57
4.7.2.1 Initial Stability 57
4.7.2.2 Final Stability 60
4.7.3 Slip Plane Between Geosynthetics and Fill Soil or Between Geosynthetics and Soft Soil taking the Reinforcement Wrap-around into Consideration 60
4.7.3.1 General Recommendations 60
4.7.3.2 Initial Stability 60
4.7.3.3 Final Stability 62
4.7.4 Analysing the Stability of the Ground against ‘Squeezing Out’ . . . 63
4.7.5 Analysing Bearing Capacity 64
4.7.6 Selecting the Geosynthetics 64
4.7.6.1 Analysing Reinforcement Failure 64
4.7.6.2 Analysing Reinforcement Pull-out 66

5 Reinforced Foundation Pads 71

5.1 Definitions 71
5.2 Application and Modus Operandi 71
5.3 Design and Engineering Notes 71
5.3.1 Construction Principle 71
5.3.2 Reinforcement Configuration 72
5.3.3 Reinforcement Lengths 72
5.3.4 Foundation Pad Dimensions 72
5.3.5 Building Materials 73
5.4 Actions and Resistances 73
5.5 Analysing the Reinforced Foundation Pad 73
5.5.1 General Recommendations 73
5.5.2 Effects 73
5.6 Analysis and Design 74
5.6.1 Analysing Bearing Capacity 74
5.6.1.1 Analysing Sliding Safety (STR) 74
5.6.1.2 Analysing Bearing Capacity (STR) 74
5.6.1.3 Analysing Global Stability (GEO) 79
5.6.1.4 Analysing Reinforcement Failure (STR) 79
5.6.1.5 Analysing Reinforcement Pull-out Resistance (STR) 79
5.6.2 Serviceability Limit State Analysis 80
5.7 Notes on Execution 81
5.8 Bibliography 81
5.9 Example of a Reinforced Foundation Pad below a Strip Foundation 81
5.9.1 Geometry, Loads and Soil Mechanics Parameters 81
5.9.2 Analysing Bearing Capacity 83
5.9.2.1 Design without Foundation Pad 83
5.9.2.2 Design with Foundation Pad – Foundation Pad Geometry 85
5.9.2.3 Analysing Bearing Capacity of the Unreinforced Foundation Pad 86
5.9.2.4 Design with Reinforced Foundation Pad 87
5.9.3 Analysing Sliding Stability 89
5.9.4 Serviceability Limit State Analysis 89

6 Transport Routes 91

6.1 General Recommendations 91
6.2 Trafficked Areas with Non-stabilised Pavement and Large Allowable Deformations 92
6.2.1 Applications 92
6.2.2 Design Concept 92
6.3 Trafficked Areas in Railways Engineering 94
6.4 Installation and Emplacement Notes 95
6.5 Bibliography 95

7 Retaining Structures ... 97

7.1 Definitions ... 97
7.2 Design Notes ... 98
7.2.1 Demands and Boundary Conditions ... 98
7.2.2 Geometry ... 98
7.3 Analysis Principles ... 98
7.3.1 General Principles ... 98
7.3.2 Slip Planes and Failure Mechanisms ... 99
7.3.3 Analysis Overview ... 100
7.4 Analyses in the Ultimate Limit State (ULS) ... 103
7.4.1 General Recommendations ... 103
7.4.2 Actions and Effects ... 104
7.4.3 Resistances ... 104
7.4.4 Analysing General Failure/Slope Failure (GEO) ... 105
7.4.5 Analysing Bearing Capacity (STR) ... 105
7.4.6 Analysing Sliding Safety (STR) ... 105
7.4.7 Position of Bearing Pressure Resultant ... 106
7.4.8 Special Regulations ... 107
7.5 Serviceability Limit State (SLS) Analyses ... 107
7.5.1 General Recommendations ... 107
7.5.2 Analysing the Position of the Bearing Pressure Resultant ... 109
7.5.3 Displacements in the Base Plane ... 109
7.5.4 Ground Settlement v_U ... 109
7.5.5 Intrinsic Settlement of Fill Soil v_E ... 110
7.5.6 Horizontal Displacements of the Slope Front v_{Hi} ... 110
7.5.7 Shear Deformation in the Retaining Structure v_S ... 112
7.5.8 Vertical Displacements at the Surface v_O ... 112
7.5.9 Numerical Methods ... 112
7.6 Facing Analyses ... 112
7.7 Bibliography ... 116
7.8 Retaining Structure Design Example ... 118
7.8.1 Geometry, Soil Properties and Load Assumptions ... 118
7.8.2 Determining the Characteristic Actions ... 119
7.8.3 Analysis in the Ultimate Limit State (ULS) ... 119
7.8.3.1 Analysing Sliding Safety ... 119
7.8.3.2 Position of Bearing Pressure Resultant ... 121
7.8.3.3 Analysing Bearing Capacity ... 122
7.8.3.4 Analysing General Failure ... 123
7.8.2.5 Analysing Facing for Partially Deformable Facing Elements ... 129
7.8.4 Serviceability Limit State (SLS) Analysis ... 129
7.8.4.1 Analysing the Position of the Bearing Pressure Resultant ... 130
7.8.4.2 Displacements in the Base Plane ... 130
7.8.4.3 Settlements ... 130

8 Landfill Engineering – Reinforcement of Surface-parallel Stratified Systems 131

8.1 General Recommendations 131
8.2 Design and Engineering Notes 132
8.3 Analyses 133
8.3.1 Principles 133
8.3.2 Analysing the Stability of the Inclined Liner System 134
8.3.2.1 Actions and Effects 136
8.3.2.2 Resistances 138
8.3.3 Structural Resistance of Reinforcement 139
8.3.4 Anchorage 140
8.4 Bibliography 141
8.5 Example of Landfill Capping using Geosynthetic Reinforcement 142
8.5.1 Geometry, Soil Mechanics Parameters, Geosynthetic Properties and Data for a Selected Construction Vehicle 142
8.5.1.1 Geometry of the Liner System in the Slope 142
8.5.1.2 Characteristic Soil Mechanics Input Values 142
8.5.1.3 Geosynthetics 142
8.5.1.4 Data for a Selected Tracked Vehicle 143
8.5.1.5 Construction State Definition 143
8.5.2 Stability Analysis 143
8.5.3 Analysing Reinforcement Failure 146
8.5.4 Designing the Anchor Trench 146
8.5.4.1 Anchor Trench Geometry 146
8.5.4.2 Friction Resistance Input Values 147
8.5.4.3 Safety Against Failure of the Anchor Trench 147
8.5.4.4 Analysing Failure of the Top of the Embankment 149

9 Reinforced Earth Structures over Point or Linear Bearing Elements 151

9.1 Definitions 151
9.2 Applications and Modus Operandi 153
9.2.1 Applications 153
9.2.2 Modus Operandi 154
9.3 Design and Engineering Recommendations 155
9.4 Actions and Resistances 157
9.5 Point and Linear Bearing Elements 158
9.6 Analysing the Reinforced Earth Structure 158
9.6.1 General Recommendations 158
9.6.2 Effect Situations 159
9.6.3 Characteristic Effects 160
9.6.3.1 Principles 160
9.6.3.2 Stress $\sigma_{zo,k}$ between the Bearing Elements 160

9.6.3.3 Stress $\sigma_{zs,k}$ on the Bearing Elements 164
9.6.3.4 Spreading Forces for Inclined Surface of Reinforced Earth Structure 165
9.6.3.5 Effects on the Geosynthetic Reinforcement 165
9.6.4 Analysing Effect on the Geosynthetic Reinforcement using Numerical Methods 173
9.6.5 Analysing Effects on Geosynthetic Reinforcement for Dynamic Actions 174
9.7 Analyses and Design 174
9.7.1 Analysing Bearing Capacity 174
9.7.1.1 General Recommendations 174
9.7.1.2 Analysing the Geosynthetic Reinforcement 174
9.7.1.3 Analysing Bearing Elements 175
9.7.1.4 Analysing Overall Stability 176
9.7.2 Serviceability Limit State Analysis 176
9.7.2.1 General Recommendations 176
9.7.2.2 Deformations in the Reinforced Earth Structure 176
9.7.2.3 Deformation of Bearing Elements 177
9.7.2.4 Analysing Overall Deformations 177
9.8 Notes on Execution 177
9.8.1 Enabling Works 177
9.8.2 Point and Linear Bearing Elements 177
9.8.3 Reinforced Earth Structures 178
9.9 Bibliography 178
9.10 Design Example: Reinforced Earth Structures over Point or Linear Bearing Elements 180
9.10.1 Geometry, Loads, Soil Mechanics Parameters, Reinforcement and Effect Situation Parameters 180
9.10.2 Effect Situation 1: Construction State (t_1 = 10 h) 183
9.10.2.1 Load Redistribution in the Reinforced Earth Structure 183
9.10.2.2 Characteristic Effects in the Geosynthetic Reinforcement 185
9.10.3 Effect Situation 2: Construction State (t_2 = 500 h) 189
9.10.3.1 Load Redistribution in the Reinforced Earth Structure 189
9.10.3.2 Characteristic Effects in the Geosynthetic Reinforcement 191
9.10.4 Effect Situation 3: Final State (t_3 = 1,000,000 h) 193
9.10.4.1 Load Redistribution in the Reinforced Earth Structure 193
9.10.4.2 Characteristic Effects in the Geosynthetic Reinforcement 194
9.10.5 Special Case: Loss of Subgrade Reaction (t_4 = 1,000,000 h) 196
9.10.5.1 Load Redistribution in the Base Course 196
9.10.5.2 Characteristic Effects in the Geosynthetic Reinforcement 196
9.10.6 Design Values of Effects in the Geosynthetic Reinforcement 198
9.10.7 Design Values of Resistances 199
9.10.8 Analysing Bearing Capacity 200

10 Foundation Systems using Geosynthetic-encased Columns . . 201

10.1 Definitions 201
10.2 Modus Operandi and Applications. 203
10.2.1 Modus Operandi 203
10.2.2 Applications 204
10.3 Manufacturing Methods. 206
10.3.1 General Recommendations 206
10.3.2 Excavation Method. 206
10.3.3 Displacement Methods. 207
10.3.4 Method Selection 207
10.4 Design Recommendations and Engineering Notes 209
10.5 Building Materials 210
10.6 Notes on Analysis and Design 210
10.6.1 General Recommendations 210
10.6.2 Actions and Resistances 211
10.6.3 Designing the Horizontal Geosynthetic Reinforcement. 211
10.6.4 Column Design 212
10.6.4.1 Analysis Model 212
10.6.4.2 Analysis Methods 214
10.6.4.3 Analysing the Transfer of Circumferential Tensile Forces 217
10.6.5 Analysing Overall Stability. 218
10.6.6 Serviceability Limit State Analysis 219
10.6.6.1 Determining Settlement. 219
10.6.6.2 Cyclic-dynamic Actions. 219
10.6.6.3 Overall Deformations. 220
10.7 Inspection Criteria, Tolerances and Quality Assurance 220
10.8 Bibliography 222
10.9 Worked Example: Geotextile-encased Columns 222
10.9.1 Input data 222
10.9.2 Analysis 223
10.9.2.1 Determining Primary Stresses 223
10.9.2.2 Assuming the Load Redistribution Factor E 224
10.9.2.3 Determining the Stiffness Parameter. 224
10.9.2.4 Deformation at the Column Edge 224
10.9.2.5 Determining Settlement. 225
10.9.2.6 Analysing Circumferential Tensile Force. 225

11 Overbridging Systems in Areas Prone to Subsidence. 227

11.1 General Recommendations 227
11.2 Design. 228
11.2.1 Principles and Definitions. 228
11.2.2 Design Notes 231
11.2.2.1 Explanatory Report. 231
11.2.2.2 Determining the Width of the Stabilised Area. 232

11.2.3 Ground and Materials . . . 235
11.2.3.1 Excavation Level . . . 235
11.2.3.2 Composite base course Materials . . . 235
11.2.3.3 Geosynthetic Reinforcement . . . 235
11.2.3.4 Bridging Zone Materials . . . 235
11.2.3.5 Subgrade . . . 235
11.2.4 Load Assumptions and Load Cases . . . 235
11.2.5 Allowable Deformations . . . 236
11.2.6 Structural Models . . . 236
11.3 Analyses . . . 239
11.3.1 Analysis Principles . . . 239
11.3.2 Design . . . 242
11.3.2.1 Determining the Tensile Stress Design Values using the B.G.E. Method . . . 242
11.3.2.2 Determining the Design Value of the Tensile Stress Based on the R.A.F.A.E.L. Method [8] . . . 247
11.3.2.3 Special Methods . . . 249
11.3.2.4 Determining the Required Short-term Tensile Strength . . . 250
11.3.2.5 Analysing Anchorage Lengths . . . 250
11.3.2.6 Analysing Overlap Lengths . . . 251
11.3.3 Safety Theory Analysis . . . 252
11.4 Applying the Observational Method . . . 253
11.5 Notes on Execution . . . 254
11.6 Bibliography . . . 255
11.7 Worked Analysis Example 1 . . . 256
11.7.1 Specifications . . . 256
11.7.2 Allowable Reinforcement Sag and Strain . . . 257
11.7.3 Preselecting the Geosynthetics . . . 257
11.7.4 Determining the Actions . . . 258
11.7.4.1 Normal Stresses . . . 258
11.7.4.2 Load Component Factors . . . 258
11.7.4.3 Design Values of Horizontal Tensile Forces . . . 258
11.7.4.4 Design Values of Actions . . . 259
11.7.5 Determining the Design Values of the Resistances in the Machine and Cross Machine Directions . . . 259
11.7.5.1 Adopted Reinforcement . . . 259
11.7.5.2 Design Value of the Tensile Strength, Criterion 1: Reinforcement Creep Failure . . . 259
11.7.5.3 Design Value of the Tensile Strength, Criterion 2: Reinforcement Creep Strain . . . 260
11.7.5.4 Governing Design Value of the Tensile Strength of the Reinforcement . . . 260
11.7.6 Analysing Adequate Tensile Strength . . . 260
11.7.7 Analysing Anchorages . . . 260
11.7.7.1 Specifications . . . 260

11.7.7.2 Required Reinforcement Anchorage Lengths in Machine Direction Outside of the Sinkhole-prone Area 260
11.7.7.3 Required Reinforcement Anchorage Lengths in Cross Machine Direction Outside of the Sinkhole-prone Area. 261
11.7.7.4 Required Reinforcement Anchorage Lengths in Cross Machine Direction Inside of the Sinkhole-prone Area 261
11.7.8 Overlap Analysis. 261
11.7.8.1 Required Overlap Length in Machine Direction 261
11.7.8.2 Required Overlap Width in Cross Machine Direction 261
11.8 Worked Analysis Example 2 261
11.8.1 Specifications 261
11.8.2 Allowable Reinforcement Sag and Strain. 262
11.8.3 Determining the Actions 262
11.8.3.1 Normal Stresses. 262
11.8.3.2 Design Value of the Actions on the Geosynthetic Reinforcement 263
11.8.4 Determining the Design Values of the Resistances in the Machine Direction 263
11.8.4.1 Adopted Reinforcement. 263
11.8.4.2 Analysing Extreme Anisotropy 263
11.8.4.3 Design Value of the Tensile Strength, Criterion 1: Reinforcement Creep Failure 264
11.8.4.4 Design Value of the Tensile Strength, Criterion 2: Reinforcement Creep Strain 264
11.8.4.5 Governing Design Value of the Tensile Strength of the Reinforcement 264
11.8.4.5 Analysing Adequate Tensile Strength 264
11.8.6 Analysing Anchorages 264
11.8.6.1 Required Reinforcement Anchorage Lengths in Machine Direction Outside of the Sinkhole-prone Area 265
11.8.6.2 Required Reinforcement Anchorage Length in Cross Machine Direction 265
11.8.7 Overlap Analysis. 265
11.8.7.1 Overlap Length in Machine Direction. 265
11.8.7.2 Overlap Length in Cross Machine Direction 265

12 Dynamic Actions on Geosynthetic-reinforced Systems 267

12.1 General Recommendations 267
12.2 Dynamic Actions. 267
12.3 Dynamic Effects 269
12.4 Resistances. 269
12.5 Dynamic Design Cases 269
12.6 Dynamic Actions. 272
12.6.1 Dynamic Actions – Live Loads 272
12.6.1.1 Adopting Live Loads 272

12.6.1.2 Allocation to Dynamic Design Cases – Live Loads 274
12.6.1.3 Design Recommendations 275
12.6.2 Dynamic Actions – Explosions, Impact, Avalanches 276
12.6.3 Dynamic Actions – Seismic Loads 277
12.7 Determining the Dynamic Effects on the Geosynthetics 278
12.7.1 Dynamic Design Case 1 278
12.7.2 Dynamic Design Case 2 278
12.7.3 Dynamic Design Case 3 278
12.8 Determining the Resistances for Dynamic Actions 279
12.8.1 Pull-out Resistance of Reinforcement 279
12.8.1.1 Dynamic Design Case 1 279
12.8.1.2 Dynamic Design Case 2 279
12.8.1.3 Dynamic Design Case 3 280
12.8.2 Structural Resistance of Reinforcement 280
12.8.2.1 Dynamic Design Case 1 280
12.8.2.2 Dynamic Design Case 2 280
12.8.2.3 Dynamic Design Case 3 280
12.9 Demands on Building Materials under Dynamic Loads 281
12.9.1 Fill Soil 281
12.9.1.1 Grain Sizes 281
12.9.1.2 Grain Shape, Grain Strength 281
12.9.1.3 Fill Soil Friction Coefficient 282
12.9.1.4 Relative Compaction 282
12.9.2 Geosynthetics 282
12.9.2.1 Determining Fatigue Behaviour 282
12.9.2.2 Determining Damage 284
12.9.2.3 Determining the Geosynthetic/Fill Soil Composite Coefficient . . 284
12.10 Bibliography 285
12.11 Diagrams 288

13 Figures 307

14 Tables 313

Advertising List 315

Notes for the User

1. The Recommendations of the Working Group on 'Analysis and Dimensioning of Soil Structures using Geosynthetic Reinforcements' represent technical regulations. They are the result of voluntary efforts within the technical-scientific community, are based on valid and current professional principles, and have been tried and tested as 'general best practice'.
2. The Recommendations of the Working Group on 'Analysis and Dimensioning of Soil Structures using Geosynthetic Reinforcements' may be freely applied by anyone. They represent a yardstick for flawless technical performance; this yardstick is also of legal relevance. A duty to apply the recommendations may result from legislative or administrative provisions, contractual obligations or other legal requirements.
3. The Recommendations of the Working Group on 'Analysis and Dimensioning of Soil Structures using Geosynthetic Reinforcements' represent an important source of information for professional conduct in normal design cases. They cannot reproduce all possible special cases in which advanced or more restrictive measures may be required. Note also that they can only reflect best practice at the time of publication of the respective edition.
4. Deviations from the suggested analysis approaches may prove necessary in individual cases, if founded on appropriate analyses, measurements or on empirical data.
5. Use of the Recommendations of the Working Group on 'Analysis and Dimensioning of Soil Structures using Geosynthetic Reinforcements' does not release anybody from their own professional responsibility. In this respect, everybody works at their own risk.

Recommendations for Design and Analysis of Earth Structures using Geosynthetic Reinforcements (EBGEO). German Geotechnical Society.
© 2011 Ernst & Sohn GmbH & Co. KG.
Published by Ernst & Sohn GmbH & Co. KG.

1 Introduction to the Recommendations and their Application Principles

Note: The following paragraphs are taken in part from the EAB (2006) or are based on them.

1.1 National and International Regulations

In Germany the analysis and design of reinforced fill structures, as well as the required safety stipulations, are controlled by DIN 1054 and other relevant standards. These Recommendations are based on DIN 1054:2005-01 'Subsoil – Verification of the Safety of Earthworks and Foundations' and analyses are performed using the partial safety factor approach. In addition, the European design standard EN 1997-1 (EC 7-1) 'Eurocode 7: Draft, Geotechnical Design' is also referenced; it too deals with reinforced structures. See Section 1.2 for details of the formal and planning control use of these two standards.

The following manufacturing standard is used for the individual reinforcement systems:

– DIN EN 14475: 'Execution of Special Geotechnical Work – Reinforced Fill'.

The following standards and regulations apply to quality assurance:

– DIN EN 13251: 'Geotextiles and Geotextile-related Products – Required Characteristics for use in Earthworks, Foundations and Retaining Structures',
– DIN EN 13249: 'Geotextiles and Geotextile-related Products – Required Characteristics for use in the Construction of Roads and other Trafficked Areas',
– *Merkblatt über die Anwendung von Geokunststoffen im Erdbau des Straßenbaus*, M-Geok E 05, FGSV 535, Forschungsgesellschaft für Straßen- und Verkehrswesen,
– *Technische Lieferbedingungen für Geokunststoffe im Erdbau des Straßenbaus*, TL Geok E-StB 05, FGSV 549, Forschungsgesellschaft für Straßen- und Verkehrswesen,
– Guidelines for Determining the Long-term Strength of Geosynthetics for Soil Reinforcement, English Edition ISO/TR 20432.

Inasmuch as no information to the contrary is given in these Recommendations, the respective current editions of the relevant technical regulations (e.g. standards, guidelines, codes of practice and recommendations) shall be observed. They are named in the appropriate sections.

A summary can be found at: http://www.gb.bv.tum.de/fachsektion/index.htm.

Hereinafter, references to standards are given without the publication date. If a certain paragraph is referred to directly the edition is also given.

Recommendations for Design and Analysis of Earth Structures using Geosynthetic Reinforcements (EBGEO). German Geotechnical Society.
© 2011 Ernst & Sohn GmbH & Co. KG.
Published by Ernst & Sohn GmbH & Co. KG.

Details of reference literature are given at the end of each respective section of these Recommendations.

1.2 Types of Analysis and Limit States using the Partial Safety Factor Approach

1.2.1 New Standards Generation and Transitional Regulations

A European Commission decision aims to replace the governing national building design and execution standards by European standards. Numerous European design and execution standards now exist for special geotechnical engineering.

The governing European execution standard for manufacturing reinforced fill structures is given in Section 1.1.

Analysis and design of reinforced fill structures in Europe are dealt with in EN 1997-1: 'Draft, Geotechnical Design' (Eurocode EC 7-1 (EC 7)). The German edition is published with the title DIN EN 1997-1:2005-10 and triggers a transition period within which a National Annex to Eurocode EC 7-1 shall be compiled to comply with European agreements. The National Annex (NA DIN EN 1997-1) will contain national specifications on those sections defined for this purpose in Eurocode EC 7-1. Simultaneously, another transition period begins, by the end of which Eurocode EC 7-1 will be introduced into building regulations in conjunction with the National Annex and all contradictory national regulations are withdrawn. A collateral DIN 1054:2010 standard to be compiled by 2009 may then only include non-contradictory supplements to Eurocode EC 7-1 in conjunction with the National Annex. The National Annex and the DIN 1054:2010 collateral standard have now been compiled in NA 005-05-01-01 and will be published in draft form in 2009. To simplify use of the three parallel standards they will be published together in a standards manual accompanying DIN EN 1997-1:2005 and DIN 1054:2009 'Draft, Geotechnical Design'. The regulations in the National Annex and the collateral standard have been adopted in the text of EC 7-1, and are specially marked.

Until the introduction of the Eurocodes a temporary generation of national standards using the partial safety factor approach meets the needs of all fields of structural engineering.

The following regulations, in particular, govern the construction of geosynthetic-reinforced structures:

– DIN 1055: 'Actions on Structures', in conjunction with DIN Fachbericht (*Technical Report*) 101,
– DIN 1054:2005-01: 'Verification of the Safety of Earthworks and Foundations'.

1.2.2 Effects and Resistances

The foundation for stability analyses is represented by the characteristic values for actions and resistances. The characteristic value, characterised by the index 'k', is a value with an assumed probability neither exceeded nor fallen short of during the reference period, taking the design working life or the corresponding design situation of the civil engineering structure into consideration. Characteristic values are generally specified on the basis of test results, measurements, analyses and/or empiricism.

The characteristic values of effects are multiplied by partial safety factors, those of resistances are divided. The variables acquired in this way are known as the design values of effects or resistances respectively and are characterised by the index 'd'. Different limit states are differentiated for stability analyses.

1.2.3 Limit States

The following limit states are differentiated in the partial safety factor approach:

- The ultimate limit state is a condition of the structure which, if exceeded, immediately leads to a numerical collapse or another form of failure. It is known as the ultimate limit state (ULS) in DIN 1054. Three cases of ultimate limit state are differentiated.
- The serviceability limit state (SLS) is a condition of the structure which, if exceeded, no longer fulfils the conditions specified for its use. It is known as the serviceability limit state (SLS) in DIN 1054.

The EQU limit state describes the loss of static equilibrium. It includes:

- analysis of safety against overturning,
- analysis of heave or uplift safety,
- analysis of hydraulic heave safety.

The EQU limit state incorporates favourable and unfavourable actions only, but no resistances.

The governing limit state condition is:

$$F_d = F_k \cdot \gamma_{dst} \leq G_k \cdot \gamma_{stb} = G_d \,, \qquad \text{Eq. (1.1)}$$

i.e. the destabilising actions F_k, multiplied by the partial safety factor $\gamma_{dst} > 1.0$, may only be as large as the stabilising action G_k, multiplied by the partial safety factor $\gamma_{stb} < 1.0$.

The STR limit state describes the failure of structures and structural elements or failure of the ground. It includes:

- analysis of the bearing capacity of structures and structural elements subjected to ground loads or supported by the ground,

– analysis of the bearing capacity of the ground, e.g. provided by passive earth pressure or bearing resistance, to ensure it is not exceeded.

Analysis of the bearing capacity of the ground to ensure it is not exceeded is performed in exactly the same way as for any other construction material. The limit state condition is always the governing condition:

$$E_d = E_k \cdot \gamma_F \leq R_d\,, \qquad \text{Eq. (1.2)}$$

$$R_d = \frac{R_k}{\gamma_R}\,, \qquad \text{Eq. (1.3)}$$

i.e. the characteristic action or effect E_k, multiplied by the partial safety factor γ_F, may only be as large as the characteristic resistance R_k, divided by the partial safety factor γ_R. A characteristic of the STR limit state is that the effects and resistances are determined using characteristic values. The partial safety factors do not come into play until applying the limit state equation.

The GEO limit state is peculiar to geotechnical engineering. It describes the loss of overall stability. It includes:

– analysis of slope stability,
– analysis of global stability.

The governing limit state condition is:

$$E_d \leq R_d\,, \qquad \text{Eq. (1.4)}$$

i.e. the design value E_d of the effects may only be as large as the design value of the resistances R_d. The geotechnical actions and resistances are determined using the design values for shear strength:

$$\tan\varphi'_d = \frac{\tan\varphi'_k}{\gamma_\varphi} \quad \text{and} \quad c'_d = \frac{c'_k}{\gamma_c}\,, \qquad \text{Eq. (1.5)}$$

and

$$\tan\varphi_{u,d} = \frac{\tan\varphi_{u,k}}{\gamma_{\varphi u}} \quad \text{and} \quad c_{u,d} = \frac{c_{u,k}}{\gamma_{cu}} \qquad \text{Eq. (1.6)}$$

i.e. the friction tan φ and cohesion c values adopted in the calculations are reduced from the outset using the partial safety factors γ_φ, $\gamma_{\varphi u}$, γ_c and γ_{cu}. An analogous procedure applies to the interface friction angle and adhesion.

The serviceability limit state describes the state of a structure or structural element at which the conditions specified for its use are no longer met, but without loss of bearing capacity. It is based on a serviceability analysis, i.e. that the anticipated displacements and deformations are compatible with the purpose of the structure. Analysis uses characteristic values, where all partial safety factors are generally 1.0.

1.2.4 Applying EBGEO in Conjunction with DIN EN 1997-1

This edition of EBGEO is based on the stipulations made in DIN 1054. This in turn was closely harmonised with DIN EN 1997-1, Eurocode EC 7-1. DIN 1054 is not identical to Eurocode 7-1 in all details. At the transition to Eurocode 7-1/NA EC 7-1 (see 1.2.1) DIN 1054:2005-01 will be replaced by the collateral standard DIN 1054:2010. The consequences associated with this for applying the present edition of the Recommendations are related below, as well as a preview will allow.

Legally binding rules in terms of the applicability of the individual regulations are specified by the respective controlling authorities. The controlling agencies are deemed to be:

– the building regulations control authorities of the federal German states for building measures subject to the respective state building code; at regular intervals the upper building regulations control authorities of the respective federal states publish a list of technical building regulations applicable to that state.
– the departments of the Federal Ministry of Transport, Building and Urban Affairs responsible for inland waterways, federal roads and road bridges, and the Federal Railway Authority responsible for rail traffic.

Stability analyses as described in Section 1.2.3, Eurocode EC 7-1, provide three options in terms of the STR limit state. DIN 1054 is based on analysis procedure 2 to Eurocode EC 7-1, inasmuch as the partial safety factors are applied to both the effects and the resistances. To differentiate between this and the other permitted scenario, in which the partial safety factors are not applied to the effects but to the actions, this procedure is known as analysis method 2* in the Commentary to Eurocode EC 7-1.

The National Annex represents the link between Eurocode EC 7-1 and national standards. It states which of the possible analysis methods and partial safety factors are applicable in the respective national domains. Remarks, clarifications or supplements to Eurocode EC 7-1 are not permitted. However, the applicable, complementary national codes may be given. The complementary national codes may not, however, contradict Eurocode EC 7-1. Moreover, the National Annex may not repeat information already given in Eurocode EC 7-1.

The revised DIN 1054 will be paramount in the complementary national code; it has the working title ‘DIN 1054:2010’ and is the application rule to Eurocode EC 7-1.

The supplements, improvements and modifications included shall be adhered to inasmuch as they affect the regulations of the EBGEO, if the respective geosynthetic-reinforced structure is designed to Eurocode EC 7-1. However, they may also be utilised accordingly if design is based on DIN 1054.

In the current edition Eurocode EC 7-1 defines the following limit states instead of the limit states GZ 1A, GZ 1B and GZ 1C to DIN 1054:

– EQU: loss of equilibrium of the structure or the ground, which is regarded as rigid. The designation is derived from ‘equilibrium’.
– STR: internal failure or very large deformation of the structure or its components, where the strength of the materials governs resistance. The designation is derived from ‘structural failure’.
– GEO: failure or very large deformation of the structure or the ground, where the strength of the soil or rock governs resistance. The designation is derived from ‘geotechnical failure’.
– UPL: loss of equilibrium of the structure or ground due to buoyancy or water pressure. The designation is derived from ‘uplift’.
– HYD: hydraulic failure, internal erosion or piping in the ground, caused by a flow gradient. The designation is derived from ‘hydraulic failure’.

In order to convey the GZ 1B und GZ 1C (STR and GEO) limit states from DIN 1054 to the terminology used in Eurocode EC 7-1 the GEO limit state is divided into GEO-2 and GEO-3:

– GEO-2: failure or very large deformation of the ground in conjunction with determining the action effects and dimensions; i.e. when utilising the shear strength for passive earth pressure or bearing resistance. The GEO-2 limit state comprises analysis method 2* to Eurocode EC 7-1.
– GEO-3: failure or very large deformation of the ground in conjunction with analysis of overall stability, i.e. when utilising the shear strength for analysis of slope stability and global stability and, generally, when analysing the stability of engineered slope stabilisation measures, including that of structural elements. The GEO-3 limit state comprises analysis method 3 to Eurocode EC 7-1.

The previous limit states are replaced as follows:

– The previous limit state GZ 1A to DIN 1054 now corresponds without restrictions to the EQU, UPL and HYD limit states to Eurocode EC 7-1.
– The previous GZ 1B limit state to DIN 1054 now corresponds in all facets to the Eurocode EC 7-1 STR limit state. The GEO-2 limit state to Eurocode EC 7-1 is also used in conjunction with the design dimensions for foundation elements.
– The previous GZ 1C limit state to DIN 1054 corresponds to the GEO-3 limit state to Eurocode EC 7-1 in conjunction with analysis of overall stability.

Analyses of the stability of engineered slope stabilisation measures are always allocated to the GEO limit state. Depending on the engineering design and function (see DIN 1054) they may be dealt with either according to the previous GZ 1B limit state or the GEO-2 limit state, or according to the previous GZ 1C limit state or the GEO-3 limit state. The geosynthetic material is designed for the STR limit state.