

Experimental and numerical investigation of the response of geocell-reinforced walls to horizontal localized impact

Maxime Soudé, Bastien Chevalier, Michel Grediac, Aurélie Talon, Roland

Gourves

► To cite this version:

Maxime Soudé, Bastien Chevalier, Michel Grediac, Aurélie Talon, Roland Gourves. Experimental and numerical investigation of the response of geocell-reinforced walls to horizontal localized impact. Geotextiles and Geomembranes, 2013, 39, pp.39-50. 10.1016/j.geotexmem.2013.07.006 . hal-00925559

HAL Id: hal-00925559 https://uca.hal.science/hal-00925559

Submitted on 8 Jan 2014

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers. L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

EXPERIMENTAL AND NUMERICAL INVESTIGATION OF THE RESPONSE OF GEOCELL-REINFORCED WALLS TO HORIZONTAL LOCALIZED IMPACT

<u>Authors:</u> Maxime SOUDÉ^{1,2,3} Bastien CHEVALIER ^{2,3} Michel GRÉDIAC^{2,3} Aurélie TALON^{2,3} Roland GOURVÈS¹

Affiliations:

1 Sol Solution Géotechnique Réseaux – 63204 Riom Cedex, France

2 Clermont Université, Université Blaise Pascal, Institut Pascal, BP 10448, F-63000 Clermont-Ferrand, France

3 CNRS, UMR 6602, Institut Pascal, F-63171 Aubière, France

1 <u>Abstract</u>:

2	The aim of this work is to study the effect of a localized impact on a wall made			
3	of soil reinforced with geocells. First, two structures were tested with an impacting			
4	remote-controlled car. Such experiments, carried out on 1/10 th -scale model structures			
5	for practical reasons, are designed to mimic the mechanical response of a alveolar			
6	geocell reinforcement system. Two types of constitutive materials were considered for			
7	the geocells with very different mechanical properties. The test structures were			
8	dismantled after the tests to analyse the influence of the impact on the cell layers,			
9	especially within their bulk. Examining the video of the tests captured with two high-			
10	speed cameras also helped understanding the phenomena that occurred during impact.			
11	These experiments were completed by numerical simulations whose objective was to			
12	understand more clearly the causes of the phenomena observed either within the			
13	dismantled structures or in the videos.			
14				
15	Keywords: geocell, geotextile, Discrete Element Method, impact load, small-			
16	scale model.			
17				
18				
19	1 INTRODUCTION			
20	The mechanical behaviours of soils reinforced with various types of inclusions			
21	such as geosynthetic sheets, steel armatures, geogrids, gabion cells and geocells have			
22	attracted attention from many researchers in the recent past (Chen et al., 2013;			
23	Moghaddas Tafreshi and Dawson, 2012; Parsons et al., 2009; Saran, 2010; Yang et al.,			
24	2012). In particular, the effect of dynamic loads on such structures is a major issue as			
25	far as hazard mitigation is concerned. Indeed loadings such as impacts, earthquakes, or			
26	blasts, involve complex phenomena that are not clearly understood.			

For seismic loading, several experimental and numerical studies are available in the literature (Huang et al., 2011; Koseki, 2012; Lee et al., 2010; Leshchinsky et al., 2009; Ling et al., 2009). In addition, standards such as Eurocode 8-5 (Eurocode 8, 2005) take into account the seismic loadings, considering them as additional equivalent static loads , as proposed by the pseudo-static Mononobe-Okabe method (Okabe, 1924; Mononobe and Matsuo, 1929).

Concerning the effect of blasts on reinforced soils, the papers which have been published so far mainly deal with numerical studies. Experimental studies are scarce (Chew et al., 2003). This is due to the fact that such experiments are generally risky and need highly specific resources. In addition, they are often performed within the framework of private or military investigations and therefore generally remain unpublished.

The case of impact loadings is more and more attractive in the literature though only the case of rockfall embankments has been addressed in practice until now (Nomura, 2002, Bertrand, 2005, Lambert, 2009, Bourrier, 2010, Bourrier, 2011). Furthermore, standards do not really take into account this type of loading because only the deforming capacities of the impacting structure (e.g., a vehicle) are considered in the case of shock rather than those of the impacted structure (Eurocode 1, 1991).

In this context, the aim of the present work is to examine the effect of a localized impact on soils reinforced with geocells. Such reinforced structures can potentially be used to protect pre-existing structures against impacts, so this type of study is necessary to investigate their capacity to provide protection.

Model tests were carried out instead of full-scale tests. The obvious reason is
that they can be much more easily performed compared to full-scale tests, both in terms
of cost and safety. In fact, full-scale tests can be considered as a final step of a
sustainability study for a given solution. This objective is however out of the scope of

the current study. Model tests constitute an essential preliminary stage for observing and 53 understanding qualitatively the mechanisms involved, even in cases where the similarity 54 laws are not satisfied. In the current study, it is too complex to fullfill similitude laws to 55 56 provide a reliable relationship between model and full-scale responses. In this context, the aim of this study is to investigate the mechanisms involved and to reproduce them 57 using Discrete Element Method (DEM) while assuming that similar behaviours are 58 expected at normal scale. Two impact experiments were first carried out on geocell 59 structures at a scale of 1/10th. Two materials featuring very different mechanical 60 properties were chosen for alveolar reinforcement: paper and polymer. These 61 experiments were captured by two high-speed cameras at the same time for thorough 62 investigation of the phenomena occurring during the impacts. The models of reinforced 63 structures were then dismantled and the deformation of the different layers was studied. 64 Finally, numerical simulations were carried out to analyse the global and local 65 mechanisms occurring in the reinforced structures. The results obtained from these 66 experiments and the calculations used are presented and discussed in the different 67 sections of the paper. 68 69 2 EXPERIMENTAL STUDY 70 2.1 Materials and methods 71 2.1.1 Details of the test structures 72 73 Two reinforced material structures were tested in this study. The difference between these two structures is due to the nature of the reinforcement. Each structure 74 was composed of 19 layers of geocells filled with a specific material. In the horizontal 75 76 plane, each layer was 120 cm in length, 55 cm in width and 2.5 cm in height (Fig.1).

The 3 layers at the bottom of the wall were placed below the ground surface. The total

height of this laminated structure was about 47 cm, including the anchoring layers. The

whole structure was built up inside a U-shaped wood coffering, which constituted the boundary conditions of the model on three of its sides. This approach is similar to that used by Racana et al. (2003) wherein they have studied the response of similar structures under static loading. The current size of the cells is expected to mimic the response of an M3S® system to the scale of 1/10th. Apart from the cells located in front of the structures which deformed during the filling and compaction stages, the shape of the cells located in the bulk was nearly square, even after compaction.

The intercellular bonds were formed by 2 staples placed along the width of the 86 reinforcement strips. After filling, the length of the inner cells along the diagonal was 87 about 5.5 cm. They were square in shape whereas the cells located along the boundary 88 were curved. The boundary conditions were made rigid. Before filling the cells, each 89 layer was pre-extended with a wooden strap structure. After filling, the material was 90 compacted twice: before and after the wooden straps were removed. This process was 91 repeated successively for each additional layer placed on those built beforehand, thus 92 93 giving rise to the desired model structure.

- 94
- 95

2.1.2 Mechanical properties of the alveolar reinforcement

Two different reinforcements were studied, namely polymer and paper, which
were intended to provide very different mechanical responses. The first was an extruded
polyethylene film (PE) with a thickness of 0.1 mm. The second was greaseproof paper
(GP).

Tensile tests were performed on both materials in order to characterize and underline their very different mechanical responses. The initial stiffness and strength were also determined because these quantities are used in the second part of this study dealing with the mechanical model. Two types of specimens were considered for each material: a single strip and two bonded strips. The size of the first type of specimen was

25x200 mm². The second type of specimen was made of two strips bonded at
midlength. The strips were embedded in compression clamping devices. Tensile tests
were conducted with a cross-head speed of 4 mm.min⁻¹. A force transducer and an
extensometer were employed to measure the applied tensile force and the global
longitudinal elongation of the specimen, respectively. The mean strain and the tensile
strength were then deduced from the force/elongation curves.

The responses of the different specimens to the tensile tests are shown in Fig.2. 111 112 For the single strip specimens, it can be observed that the GP specimens exhibit a quasilinear elastic response with an initial stiffness of 250 kN/m. The PE specimens have 113 114 response presenting a linear phase with a stiffness of 16 kN/m followed by a yielding phase. Both bonded strip specimens exhibit a plastic response and a force at failure 115 equal to 0.5 kN/mm and 0.25 kN/mm, respectively. Observing the specimens after 116 failure revealed that the strips tore gradually for GP whereas they deformed and 117 plasticized for PE. 118

119

120

2.1.3 Fill material

121

Definition of the fill material

The fill material used was a mixture made of equal volumes of expanded clay 122 and polystyrene micro-beads. The expanded clay particles presented a sub-spherical 123 shape with diameters ranging from 0.5 to 2.5 mm. The diameter of the polystyrene 124 micro-beads ranged from 0.9 to 1.5 mm. These dimensions are in agreement with those 125 126 of the cells in terms of ratio between the size of actual fill materials that typically are expected to be used in full-scale structures, and the size of actual cells. Segregation 127 128 during mixing was avoided by adding 10% in weight of glycerine. This led to a rubbing, light and compressible mixture. 129

130	Various tests were carried out to characterize the mechanical properties of the				
131	fill material, namely oedometric tests, direct shear tests and trench stability tests. These				
132	tests were performed with a material density of 450 kg/m^3 , same as that of the fill				
133	material in the impact experiments.				
134					
135	Young's modulus				
136	An order of magnitude of the Young's modulus was estimated from oedometer				
137	tests. The classic equation linking Young's modulus E , oedometric modulus E_{oed} and				
138	Poisson's ratio v was used to estimate the Young's modulus of this material from				
139	oedometer tests:				
	$E = E_{oed} \frac{(1+\nu)(1-2\nu)}{1-\nu}$	(1)			
140	Assuming the value of the Poisson's ratio is known, it is possible to assume a				
141	value of the Young's modulus from the value of the oedometric modulus using the				
142	above equation. The influence of crushing of the expanded clay particle on Young's				
143	modulus was not considered here since this value was used as an order of magnitude				
144	only.				
145	An average value of the oedometric modulus E_{oed} of 0.6 MPa was obtained. For				
146	values of the Poisson's ratio ranging between 0.2 and 0.35, the Young's modulus ranges				
147	between 0.4 and 0.55 MPa (Eq. 1).				
148					
149	Shear strength characterization				
150	Direct shear tests were performed on circular specimens of 6 cm diameter and				
151	2 cm thickness. The shear tests were conducted up to a maximum displacement of 5 mm				
152	and with vertical confining pressures between 1.4 and 21.7 kPa. An internal friction				
153	angle φ of 44 ° and a cohesion c of 5 kPa were deduced from these tests. The confining				
	6				

154 pressure used were lower than those which are likely to appear in the impact

155 experiment, so the friction angle given here should represent a upper limit value.

156

157

2.1.4 Impacting vehicle

The impact velocity and the geometry of the impacting interface were keyparameters in this experiment. A remote-controlled vehicle was chosen as the impacting device to ensure precise control of the velocity as impact occurred. In addition, a cylindrical steel rod was fixed on the front of the vehicle. This was made to adjust the location of the impact precisely and increase the moment for a given speed.

The size of the front rod fitted the size of the cells: diameter d = 5 cm and length L = 18 cm. Two similar vehicles were prepared: one for each type of reinforced soil structure, since the vehicles were non-reusable after impact. The weight of each vehicle was 5 kg including the front rod. The speed of the vehicle during impact time was set to 10 m.s⁻¹. The modelled impact is found to be equivalent to a vehicle of 5 tons with a speed of 110 km/h at full scale.

169

170

2.1.5 High-speed video cameras

Two high-speed video cameras were used to track the vehicles during each 171 impact (Fig.3). Camera Nr.1 was a Fastcam-APX 120K. It captures 1600 frames/second 172 with a sensor resolution of 1024x768 pixels. This camera was placed in such a way that 173 it recorded the impact with an open angle view. It was located 2.5 m above ground 174 level. Camera Nr.2 was a black and white Photron APX 1024x512 pixels placed directly 175 at ground level. It recorded the impact from a lateral viewpoint. Its sensor resolution is 176 177 the same as that of the other camera but it records 4000 frames/second. Both vehicles were equipped with patched targets on their lateral side to deduce their location, 178 velocity and acceleration in time from footage analysis. 179

182

2.2 Results and discussion

2.2.1 Global analysis

The readers of the electronic version of this paper are invited to watch the videos 183 available on the website of the Journal. Both videos enable us to observe and analyse 184 185 each impact. First the rod penetrated into the structure. The distance travelled within the structure was only a few centimetres: 13 cm for the GP reinforced structure and 17.3 cm 186 for the PE one. The deformation spread from the impact zone to the top free boundary 187 by pushing a cone-shaped part of the reinforced structure. This phenomenon is visible in 188 Fig.4. After having reached its maximal penetration, the vehicle moved back slightly 189 190 and slowly compared to the speed reached just before the impact occurred. It can be 191 noted that despite the rather considerable deformation of the layers, whose vertical deflection reached a few centimetres for both structures, all the layers returned to their 192 193 initial location and geometry apart from the failed cell walls (see below). Finally, it was observed that this phenomenon was localized since the cells located further from the 194 195 impact zone, near the lateral walls for instance, did not move.

- 196
- 197

198

2.2.2 Local analysis after impact and dismantling the reinforced structure

The structures were dismantled layer by layer after the impact. The topography of each layer was measured by collecting the location of the nodes of a virtual mesh with a pitch of 5 cm in both horizontal directions. These data enabled us to draw crosssections of the deformed structures along both the vertical and horizontal planes and deduce the internal deformation of the structures. It was assumed here that the compaction of a layer did not affect the vertical location of the ones previously installed. It must be noted that the impacting vehicles were not removed from the

206	reinforced structures after impact. The zones of the structures affected by the impact
207	were clearly identified. Several conclusions can be drawn from this dismantling stage:
208	- a Coulomb wedge can be clearly identified. It starts at the impact zone
209	and spreads toward the top free boundary (Fig.4);
210	- it is interesting to note that except for the layer located at the level of the
211	impact, the other layers behave as a whole. This is due to the fact that the
212	reinforcement is regularly spatially distributed and spreads the
213	deformation due to the impact within the layers, thus underlining the
214	very positive effect of the reinforcement. This phenomenon is clearer in
215	the PE-reinforced structure than in the GP-reinforced one. It is also
216	interesting to note that this deformation becomes increasingly less in the
217	layers located further from this plane (Fig.5);
218	- the layer located at the level of the impact exhibits a specific response. A
219	significant number of failed GP strips (54) were observed, in particular
220	along the impact direction. On the other hand, only 4 polymeric strips
221	failed. The failed strips are located in a zone defined by the black solid
222	lines in Fig.6. These failed strips are nearly symmetrical with respect to
223	the vertical mid-plane of the rod.
224	
225	2.2.3 <i>Penetration, speed and acceleration of the impacting vehicles</i>
226	It was possible to measure the displacement of the targets placed on the vehicles
227	by processing the videos provided by the lateral high-speed camera. The axis of the
228	camera pointed perpendicularly to the trajectory of the vehicle and focused on the
229	impact zone. In addition, it was placed far enough from the targets. Thus, no corrections
230	were made on the displacement measurements due to view angle. The velocity and the
231	acceleration can thus be obtained by single and double numerical derivation,

respectively. Speed vs. time is plotted in Fig.7. It can be seen that the penetration of the
impacting vehicle regularly increases for both types of structures up to a maximum
value of 18 cm and 14 cm for the GP- and the PE-reinforced structures, respectively.
The initial speed is the same for both tests. It rapidly decreases since the impact lasts
only approximately 28 ms for the PE- structure and 40 ms for the GP-reinforced
structure.

This information is also confirmed by the deceleration curves shown in Fig.8. The deceleration peak equals 400 m.s^{-2} for the PE-structure and 700 m.s^{-2} for the GPreinforced structure.

It is also interesting to investigate the evolution of the equivalent force applied by each impacting vehicle to the structure during the impact. This quantity is obtained using Newton's second law, by multiplying the acceleration by the mass of the impacting vehicle. This force is plotted *vs*. the penetration of the vehicle in Fig.8.

It gives an estimate of the global deformability of each structure in dynamic 245 conditions. The response is linear at first in both cases. The maximum force is reached 246 for the PE-reinforced structure: it is 70% greater than that of the maximum force 247 obtained with the GP-reinforced structure. The apparent dynamic stiffness is also 248 greater for the PE-reinforced structure. This result is somewhat surprising since GP is 249 stiffer than PE. This is certainly due to the intercellular bond failure which caused an 250 apparent softening of the structure. This result is consistent with the fact that the GP-251 reinforced structure exhibits an apparent plastic response for a displacement lying 252 between 75 mm and 160 mm, which is also likely due to the intercellular bond failure. 253 For the PE-reinforced structure, the impact force propagates more easily into the bulk of 254 the whole reinforcement because of the lower number of failures, thus explaining the 255 higher resistance against vehicle penetration. 256

257

2.3 Conclusion

Impact tests performed on two different models of reinforced structures are 259 described in this section. Observing the videos obtained with two high-speed cameras 260 enabled us to describe complex phenomena that occurred during the very short time 261 period of the impacts while dismantling the structures after the tests provided useful 262 information on the spatial distribution of the deformation in the bulk of the layers. The 263 objective now is to propose a numerical model that mimics these experiments in order 264 to assess how certain parameters influence the mechanical response of such structures 265 and to complete the experimental observations. This model, after validation, is expected 266 to pave the way for designing real reinforced structures to resist impact loading. 267

268

258

269

3 NUMERICAL APPROACH

From the observations and characteristics of the small scale impact, numerical models were built using a 2-dimensional Discrete Element Method and particular molecular dynamics (Cundall and Strack, 1979). The behaviour of the reinforced embankment during impact was reproduced qualitatively. The mechanisms involved were observed and compared with those obtained in the experiment. The aim of this part is first to propose a simple model in view to determining the parameters necessary to reproduce the response of the reinforced wall.

The reinforced wall was modelled under 2-dimensional conditions by a vertical cross section starting from the front of the wall and ending at the back of the wall, and including the point of impact between the vehicle and the reinforced wall. In this model, the back of the wall was modelled by a perfectly rigid wall condition. The wall itself was modelled by 19 superimposed layers of geocells filled with a soil material.

282

283

3.1 Fill material modelling

Different materials were modelled by particles whose diameters ranged from 2 284 mm to 4 mm. The fill material was placed in the cells using a radius expansion method. 285 Particle density was set to 600 kg.m⁻³ and the final void ratio e to a value of 0.33 so that 286 an apparent density of 450 kg.m⁻³ was obtained for the particle assemblies. The 287 experimental fill material was modelled by a homogenized sample of particles 288 presenting a unique set of mechanical parameters. The rheological contact model 289 included linear contact laws of stiffness $k_n = 1.2 \ 10^6 \text{ N/m}$ in the normal direction and 290 $k_s = 6 \ 10^5 \ \text{N/m}$ in the tangential direction. A Coulomb friction criterion of coefficient 291 $\mu = 1$ was used to bound the value of the tangential force. In addition, no cohesion was 292 taken into account. A rolling resistance was also considered in the contact model so that 293 the shear resistance of the samples could be increased. Biaxial tests were conducted on 294 representative sample to get the macro-mechanical properties. A Young's modulus 295 value of E = 0.5 MPa, a Poisson's ratio of v = 0.20 and a friction angle of, 24 ° were 296 obtained. The difference between the friction angle of the numerical sample and 297 experimental material is discussed in Section 3.8. 298

299

3.2 Reinforcement material

The modelled reinforcement corresponds to greaseproof paper (GP). It was 300 modelled by a chain of particles of diameter d_{geo} of 1.5 mm, i.e. smaller than the soil 301 particles (Fig.9). Contacts between the chain particles were given an inter-particular 302 cohesion to represent tensile resistance. The behaviour of the GP strips was modelled 303 304 with an elastic-linear-fragile law. The stiffness and inter-particular cohesion (normal and tangential) were set to fit the elastic part of the response of the experimental strips 305 of raw material. The contact friction coefficient of the chain particles was set to the 306 same value as that of the soil particles. 307

308 One reinforcement strip crosses the vertical plane chosen for the model several 309 times. Consequently, the physical continuity of the strip material could not be

310 represented in this vertical cross section. Thus a dummy interaction law was considered 311 between the opposite edges of one cell. This interaction was considered mostly to 312 counter the discontinuity of the strips in the vertical plane and then maintain the global 313 stability of the reinforced wall throughout the calculation. It can be written as follows:

$$F = k_{eq} \cdot d \qquad \text{for } d > d_0 \tag{2}$$
$$F = 0 \qquad \text{for } d < d_0$$

314

where d is the distance between the edges of one cell in the modelling plane, d_0 the 315 316 initial distance between the edges and k_{eq} the stiffness coefficient of the interaction law. Many deformation mechanisms can affect a filled cell, resulting in movements 317 of the fill material and thus different solicitations within the strip. The reinforced wall 318 was modelled here in 2 dimensions here but the mechanisms of deformation of the cells 319 are 3-dimensional. Consequently, it was not possible to predict the deformation 320 321 mechanisms of the cells from modelling. The choice was made to deduce the value of k_{eq} , from an expansion test in the horizontal plane on an assembly of 9 cells (Fig. 10). 322 The 8 peripheral cells were filled with fill material particles. In the centre cell, a single 323 324 particle was installed and its radius was progressively increased. The force in the chain particles and the radius of the centre cell were computed in order to deduce the value of 325 the stiffness k_{eq} of the interaction law between the reinforcement particles. The 326 parameters of the basic reinforcement model are provided in Table 1. 327

328

3.3 Impacting vehicle

Only the steel ram of the radio-controlled vehicle was modelled as a single cylinder of 5 kg, 5 cm in diameter and 18 cm in length. The horizontal impact speed was 10 m.s⁻¹. The micromechanical parameters are specified in Table 2.

332 3.4 *Results*

The response of the model is mainly assessed in terms of velocity of the impacting vehicle vs. time from the impact beginning on. The experimental curve of the velocity vs. time is plotted in Fig.11 along with its counterpart obtained with the experimental model.

It clearly appears that the experimental velocity decreases more quickly than in the numerical model. In other words, the actual deceleration is greater than that predicted by the model. It means that in experimental test, the energy provided by the impact is dissipated more quickly than in the numerical model. It is also worth mentioning that a slope break occurs in the numerical curve at 19 ms. The objective now is to take into account various refinements of this model and to observe whether these changes induce greater deceleration or not.

344

345

3.5 Environment dissipation

Many DEM users consider an environment dissipation translated by a parameter 346 called α to take all these effects more globally into account. Using such a parameter is 347 348 convenient, even though actual physical interpretation remains quite obscure in practice. In this case, the unbalanced force of each particle is multiplied by a coefficient lower 349 than one, thus leading to a vanishing unbalanced force. This automatically increases the 350 energy dissipation in the system. It is often recommended to choose a value of 0.3 for 351 this parameter in the case of cyclic dynamics problems such as earthquakes (Itasca, 352 1999). This value can be lower for fast dynamics problems, as in the current case. 353 Several simulations with various values for this parameter ($\alpha = 2.5\%, 5\%, 10\%$, 354 20%) were carried out in order to observe its influence on the response of the model. 355 The model used here is the basic model presented above, without any change other than 356 introducing this parameter. The curves obtained are shown in Fig.12. 357

It seems that $\alpha = 5\%$ leads to the best agreement between experimental and numerical responses. This value has the same order of magnitude as that used in studies dealing with dynamics described in the literature (Deluzarche, 2006; Bourrier, 2010), for instance.

The strength of this approach is illustrated by this result which shows that taking a correct value for α enables obtaining a numerical model which provides results in agreement with the experimental results. The drawback, however, is that some phenomena are hidden behind this global parameter. Consequently, this makes it difficult to examine the influence of certain parameters that directly influence the response of the structure, thus restricting any further improvement.

The idea now is to perform simulations with $\alpha = 0\%$, but with changes compared 368 to the basic model. The objective at this stage is not really to try to obtain a numerical 369 response which is exactly the same as the experimental one, but mainly to examine in 370 turn the influence of various parameters and to see whether they change the response of 371 372 the reinforced structure in the right direction. The different parameters which are investigated in the following sections are the shape of the impacting vehicle, the 373 presence of a top plate on the box containing the reinforced structure, the stiffness of the 374 375 springs used to model the through-thickness response of the layers, confinement and rolling resistance. 376

377

378

3.6 Enhanced impacting vehicle

A more realistic shape of the impacting vehicle is now considered for the model of the ram, the wheels and their bonds. The modelled masses and gravity centre are equivalent to the experimental car. All particles are bonded as a clump structure. Compared to the preceding model, the idea here is to take into account the

³⁸³ junction between the ram and chassis. This junction is in fact an inclined plate. Some

preliminary numerical simulations which are not detailed here have shown that the friction coefficient between soil and plate do not really influence the response, so adjusting the value of this parameter is not really an issue. In the numerical model used here, energy dissipation is due to the friction occurring between particles. Other sources of energy dissipation like particle crushing are not considered here. The curve obtained with the numerical model is shown in Fig.13 along with the experimental one.

The curve obtained in this case is similar to that of the basic model from 0 to 8 390 ms. From 8 ms on, a first break in the curve appears and the velocity decreases faster, so 391 this goes in the right direction. At about 19 ms, another break in the curve is observed 392 and the velocity decreases less quickly. Comparing this curve with the deformed model 393 vs. time shows that the first break in the slope (at 8 ms) corresponds to the contact 394 between the ram-chassis junction and the reinforced structure (Fig.13, right). The 395 surface which causes internal friction within the soil is suddenly almost doubled, so the 396 penetration resistance increases accordingly. 397

398

399

400

3.7 Enhanced reinforcement model

3.7.1 Influence of the top plate

401 In the model described in section 2, it is explained that a plate was placed at the top of the frame in order to improve the rigidity of boundary conditions. One may 402 wonder whether this plate hinders the vertical movement of the Coulomb wedge and if 403 this affects the velocity curve. A horizontal plate was therefore added at the top of the 404 405 impacted structure and a simulation was carried out with this model. This plate was modelled by a series of grains and springs, their equivalent mechanical properties being 406 407 those of a steel plate with the stiffness of the real one. The curve obtained in this case is shown in Fig.14. 408

From 0 to 19 ms, the horizontal velocity is the same as that obtained with the 409 basic model but it keeps decreasing up to about 35 ms. Consequently the break in slope 410 observed with the basic model at about 19 ms is caused by the movement of the 411 412 Coulomb wedge. Before 19 ms, the weight of this wedge contributes to the deceleration of the impacting vehicle and it is clear that removing this wedge if no plate is placed at 413 414 the top of the model immediately causes the penetration resistance to decrease, and thus 415 the deceleration to decrease, too. In conclusion, it can be said that the top plate has a 416 significant impact on the velocity curve after t = 19 ms, so it must be taken into account in the numerical model. 417

- 418
- 419

3.7.2 Enhanced reinforcement

There are two main solutions to increase the resistance opposed to the lifting of 420 the Coulomb wedge due to the impact. The first consists in increasing the density of the 421 422 particles and therefore the mass of the corner. However, since this parameter was fixed during the experiments, this solution could not be considered. The second solution 423 424 consists in adding a vertical reaction to the reinforcement in the direction opposite to the displacement of the layers. An additional load was then considered to take into account 425 the anchor effect of each layer that could obviously not be modelled in 2 dimensions. 426 This solution is investigated here. 427

As shown in section 2, the reinforced layers located above the impact level were seen to rise as the impact occurred. This rise was greater in the centre cross-section, i.e. close to the impact point, and progressively decreased towards left and right boundaries until a total vanishing at the lateral edges (Fig.15).

Tension in the strips appeared due to the deformation resulting from the relative displacement between the anchoring zones and central zone. The model was thus enhanced by adding in each layer a vertical effort in the opposite direction of the

435 vertical displacement of the layer d_y , i.e. downward as the layers were lifted upwards 436 during impact. The additional force was modelled by the action of linear springs 437 (Fig.15) located on each side of the central zone and with an initial length l_i and a 438 stiffness k_i . For an upward displacement of a given layer, the restoring force F_{Vi} can be 439 written as follow:

$$F_{Vi} = 2 \cdot \sin\left(\arctan\left(\frac{d_y}{l_i}\right) \cdot k_i \cdot \left(\sqrt{l_i^2 + d_y^2} - l_i\right)\right)$$
(3)

The objective of adding the interaction law was to evaluate its influence on the accuracy and on the improvement of the basic model. Consequently, the initial lengths l_i of the interaction springs were deduced from the image analysis of the experimental results.

The spring stiffness k_i was deduced from extension tests modelled by the reinforced layer in the horizontal plane. The stiffness depends on the length of the layer tested, so that for a given vertical displacement of one layer during impact, the longer the spring, the greater the interaction force.

The maximal vertical force F_{Vmax} corresponds to the lowest lifted alveolar layer with an equivalent spring of stiffness $k_1 = 20.10^3$ N.m⁻¹ and initial length $l_1 = 8$ cm (hard case). The minimal vertical effort F_{Vmin} corresponds to the highest lifted alveolar layer with an equivalent spring of stiffness $k_{11} = 5.10^3$ N.m⁻¹ and initial length $l_{11} = 23$ cm (soft case).

453 Vertical restoring springs were added in the reinforcement model. All the 454 restoring springs were given the same stiffness value: k_1 for the hard case and k_{11} for the 455 soft case. The results obtained are shown in Fig.16.

In both cases, the difference with the basic model is small in terms of vehicle velocity vs. time. A close inspection of the images obtained from the simulation shows, however, that the vertical displacement of the alveolar layers is strongly influenced by

the stiffness of these springs. The fill material escaped from the alveoli in the case of stiff springs. This phenomenon is illustrated in Fig. 17, where the dotted line represents the upper layer for both the stiff and the soft springs. In conclusion, it seems logical that the penetration resistance due to the Coulomb wedge remains the same as that obtained for the basic model.

464

3.8 Enhanced soil model

Modelling of granular media as a set of cylindrical (2D) or spherical (3D) 465 particles leads to high rotational mobility of particles (Iwashita et al., 1998; Jiang et al., 466 2005) resulting in a reduction of the possible values of the macroscopic friction angle. 467 In our case, the friction angle of the fill material equal to 24° , instead 40° in the 468 experiments. Particle shape improvement (Salot et al., 2009; Szarf et al., 2011; 469 Chevalier et al., 2012) and rolling resistance (Iwashita et al., 1998; Jiang et al., 2005) 470 can be used to offset this effect. In this study, the rolling resistance law developed by 471 472 Jiang and al. (2005) was used. Only the general principles of the rolling resistance law are presented here. A more detailed description of this model can be found in the 473 474 reference above.

Jiang's law consists in applying a moment *M* to particles in the direction 475 opposing that of the total relative rotation θ_R of the system considered, i.e. {particle-476 particle} or {particle-wall}. The law can thus be represented by the moment - rotation 477 relation. Physically, Jiang's model is equivalent to considering that particles present a 478 flat surface in the contact zone (Fig.18). The width of the flat surface depends on the 479 shape parameter δ , which is the only parameter of the law. The moment M can thus be 480 deduced from the dummy geometry of the contact using total relative rotation δ . The 481 threshold values M_0 and θ_{R0} depend on the contact properties and forces and their 482 483 expressions are defined as follows (Jiang et al., 2005):

$$\theta_{R0} = \frac{2F_n}{k_n r \delta} \tag{4}$$

$$M_0 = \frac{1}{6} F_n r \delta \tag{5}$$

484 where k_n the normal contact stiffness, F_n the normal component of contact force, δ the 485 shape parameter.

486 The case where $\delta = 0$ corresponds to the free rolling particles and the case where 487 $\delta \rightarrow \infty$ to blocked rotations.

The values of the shape parameter δ and the corresponding macroscopic friction angle are summarized in Table 3. Young's modulus and Poisson's ratio were not modified by the shape parameter δ .

Soils with different macro-mechanical friction angles were modelled to estimate
the influence of this parameter on the mechanical response. The macro-mechanical
friction angle was increased using the rolling resistance law. The other parameters
characterizing the model remain the same as those chosen for the basic simulation (R1
and I1). The corresponding curves are shown in Fig.19.

Strong influence of the friction angle can be observed. The greater the friction angle, the greater the deceleration, which is here the objective: to reflect the experimental response. It is also noteworthy that the break in the slope at 19 ms is still visible in all cases. It must however be pointed out that a computation time approximately 4 times greater than that needed for the basic simulation was required to perform each of these simulations.

502

Conclusion 503 3.9

In conclusion of the simulations presented above, it can be said that the shape of the ram-chassis, the upper plate placed on the model and the friction angle have a significant influence on the velocity curve vs. time, whereas the confinement and rigidity of the springs modelling the link between the layers have almost no influence. The objective now is to combine all these effects to try to obtain a numerical response that better matches the velocity curve of the experimental response.

510

511 **4 CONCLUSION**

512 This paper presents study of the effect of impacts on a soil wall reinforced with 513 geocells based on experimental and numerical results.

Two impact experiments at a one-tenth scale were carried out on geocell 514 structures. Two materials with very different mechanical properties were chosen for the 515 alveolar reinforcement: paper (stiff-fragile mechanical response) and polymer 516 517 (significant strain at failure). The mechanical properties of these materials were characterized with tensile tests. The fill material was a mixture of expanded clay beads 518 519 and polystyrene micro-beads. Glycerine was added to this mixture to avoid segregation 520 during mixing. The size and the density of this model fill material match the experimental fill material well. These experiments provided better understanding of 521 geocell wall behaviour during impact and the parameters that influence this behaviour. 522 Based on these experiments a numerical model using a 2-dimensional discrete 523

524 method and particular molecular dynamics was proposed. This numerical model gives 525 results which are similar to those provided by the paper experiment model. A vertical 526 cross-section of the wall was modelled starting at the front of the wall and ending at its 527 rear. A basic reinforcement model was built and then progressively modified to improve 528 the initial model. These improvements dealt with: (1) introducing a pull-back force on 529 each layer, representing the influence of the missing dimensions of the model, (2)

changing the shape of the impacting vehicle and, (3) increasing the shear strength of thefill material.

Although a difference between numerical and experimental results could be 532 533 observed, it was possible to predict qualitatively the global kinematics response of the wall. The different improvement approaches showed that the main difficulty was to 534 obtain a sufficient level of energy dissipation in the model, especially in the 2-535 dimensional discrete model involving spherically shaped particles. Increasing the shear 536 strength of the fill material narrowed the difference between the experimental and 537 numerical results. It would also be interesting to address the problem of particle 538 crushing in further work because it certainly influences the mechanical behaviour. 539

The effect of broadly used local damping in the model showed that it is possible 540 to obtain good results as soon as the local damping value is well chosen. The dissipation 541 of energy in the numerical modelling is not as important in the experimental test, 542 revealing that some mechanisms still remain unclear and then not reproduced by the 543 544 model. The local damping can be used to counterbalance this difference, as long as its influence on the modelling results is clearly known. In addition, the value of local 545 damping coefficient should be taken as low as possible since its physical significance is 546 547 difficult to explain, especially in dynamic testing.

548 Now that important parameters were identified, future work will focus on 549 refining the numerical analysis by modelling a wall in three dimensions and then 550 moving on to full-scale experiments.

551

5 REFERENCES

553	Bertrand, D., Nicot, F., Gotteland, Ph., Lambert, S., 2005. Modelling a geo-
554	composite cell using discrete analysis. Computers and Geotechnics. 32(8), 564-577.
555	Bourrier, F., Nicot, F., Eckert, N., Darve, F., 2010. Comparing numerical and
556	experimental approaches for the stochastic modeling of the bouncing of a boulder on a
557	coarse soil. European Journal of Environmental and Civil Engineering. 14(1), 87-111.
558	Bourrier, F., Lambert, S., Heymann, A., Gotteland, P., Nicot, F., 2011. How
559	multi-scale approaches can benefit the design of cellular rockfall protection structures
560	Canadian Geotechnical Journal, 48(12), 1803-1816.
561	Chen, RH., Huang, YW., Huang, FC., 2013. Confinement effect of geocells
562	on sand samples under compression. Geotextiles and Geomembranes. 37, 35-44.
563	Chevalier, B., Combe, G., Villard, P., 2012. Experimental and discrete element
564	modeling studies of the trapdoor problem: influence of the macro-mechanical frictional
565	parameters. Acta Geotechnica. 7, 15-39.
566	Chew, S.H., Tan, S.A., Karunratne, G.P., Chiew Chiat, N.G., 2003. Performance
567	of geosynthetic reinforced soil wall subject to blast loading: Experimental and
568	numerical study, in: Ling H.I., Leshchinsky D., Tatsuoka F. (Eds), Reinforced soil
569	Engineering: Advances in research and practice. CRC Press, Boca Raton, pp. 363-393.
570	Cundall, P.A., Strack, O.D.L., 1979. A discrete numerical model for granular
571	assemblies. Geotechnique. 29, 47-65.
572	Deluzarche, R., Cambou, B., 2006. Discrete numerical modeling of rockfill
573	dams. International Journal for Numerical and Analytical Methods in Geomechanics.
574	30(11), 1075-1096.
575	Eurocode 1, 1991. Actions on structures - Part 1-7: Accidental actions from
576	impact and explosions.

577	Eurocode 8, 2005. Eurocode 8: Design of structures for earthquake resistance -
578	Part 5: Foundations, retaining structures and geotechnical aspects, pp. 32-35.
579	Huang, C.C., Horng, J.C., Chang, W.J., Chiou, J.S., Chen, C.H., 2011. Dynamic
580	behavior of reinforced walls - Horizontal displacement response. Geotextiles and
581	Geomembranes. 29, 257-267.
582	Itasca, 1999. PFC2D, Theory and background. Itasca Eds.
583	Iwashita, K., Oda, M., 1998. Rotational resistance at contacts in simulation of
584	shear band development by DEM. Journal of Engineering Mechanics. 124(3), 285-292.
585	Jiang, M.J., Yu, H.S., Harris, D., 2005. A novel discrete model for granular
586	material incorporating rolling resistance. Computers and Geotechnics. 32(5), 340-357.
587	Koseki, J., 2012. Use of geosynthetics to improve seismic performance of earth
588	structures. Geotextiles and Geomembranes. 34. 51-68.
589	Lambert, S., Gotteland, P., Nicot, F., 2009. Experimental study of the impact
590	response of geocells as components of rockfall protection embankments. Natural
591	Hazards and Earth System Sciences. 9, 459-467.
592	Lee, K.Z.Z., Chang, N.Y., Ko, H.Y., 2010. Numerical simulation of
593	geosynthetic-reinforced soil walls under seismic shaking. Geotextiles and
594	Geomembranes. 28, 317-334.
595	Leshchinsky, D., Ling, H.I., Wang, J.P., Rosen, A., Mohri, Y., 2009. Equivalent
596	seismic coefficient in geocell retention systems. Geotextiles and Geomembranes. 27(1),
597	9-18.
598	Ling, H., Leshchinsky, D., Wang, J., Mohri, Y., Rosen, A., (2009). Seismic
599	Response of Geocell Retaining Walls: Experimental Studies. Journal of Geotechnical
600	and Geoenvironmental Engineering. 135(4), 515–524.

601	Moghaddas Tafreshi, S.N., Dawson, A.R., 2012. A comparison of static a,d cycli		
602	loading responses of foundations on geocell-reinforced sand. Geotextiles and		
603	Geomembranes. 32, 55-68.		
604	Mononobe, N., Matsuo, O., 1929. On the determination of earth pressure during		
605	earthquakes, in: Proceeding of the World Engineering Congress, Vol.9, Tokyo (Japan),		
606	pp.176–182.		
607	Nomura, T., Inoue, S., Fuchigami, M., Yokota, Y., Kubo, T., Tatta, N., Arai, K.:		
608	Experimental research of reinforced soil wall for rock-fall protection, in: 7th		
609	International conference on geosynthetics, Nice, France, 22–27 September, 303–308		
610	2002.		
611	Okabe, S., 1924. General theory on earth pressure and seismic stability of		
612	retaining walls and dams. Journal of the Japan Society of Civil Engineering. 10(6),		
613	1277–1323.		
614	Parsons, R.L., Pokharel, S., Han, J., Halahmi, I., Leshchinsky, D., 2009.		
615	Behavior of geocells-reinforced granular bases under static and repeated loading. In:		
616	Iskander, M., Laefer, D.F., Hussein, M.H. (Eds) Contemporary Topics in Ground		
617	Modification, Problem Soils and Geo-support, ASCE, 409-416.		
618	Racana, N., Grédiac, M., Gourvès, R., 2003. Pull-out response of corrugated		
619	geotextile strips. Geotextiles and Geomembranes. 21(5), 265-288.		
620	Salot, C., Gotteland, P., Villard, P., 2009. Influence of relative density on		
621	granular materials behavior: DEM simulations of triaxial tests. Granular Matter. 11(4),		
622	221-236.		
623	Saran, S., 2010. Reinforced soil and its engineering applications, Second edition,		
624	IK International Publishing.		

- 625 Szarf, K., Combe, G., Villard, P., 2011. Polygons vs. clumps of discs: a
- numerical study of the influence of grain shape on the mechanical behaviour of granular
- materials. Powder Technology. 208(2), 279-288.
- 628 Yang, X., Han, J., Pkharel, S.K., Manandhar, C., Parsons, R.L., Leshchinsky, D.,
- Halahmi, I., 2012. Accelerated pavement testing of unpaved roads with geocells-
- reinforced sand bases. Geotextiles and Geomembranes. 32, 95-103.

- 632 Figure caption list:
- 633 Fig.1 Diagram of the experimental reinforced wall
- 634 Fig.2 Results of tensile tests on single and bonded strips of GP and PE
- Fig.3 Views of the experimental site showing the location of the tested walls and the
 high-speed cameras
- Fig. 4 Vertical cross section diagrams of the wall showing the deformation after
 impact
- Fig. 5 Deformation of the front face of the PE wall for the layer located at impact
 level (top view)
- 641 Fig. 6 Location of broken bonds for the GP wall, in the layer located at impact level
- 642 Fig.7 Penetration length and vehicle speed versus time for both the GP and the PE
- 643 walls
- Fig.8 Acceleration and unbalanced force on impacting vehicle versus time for both the
 GP and the PE walls
- 646 Fig. 9 Diagram showing the numerical model used for the reinforcement strips
- 647 Fig. 10 Diagram showing the principle of the numerical expansion test on filled cells
- 648 Fig. 11 Comparison of vehicle velocity versus time for the experimental wall (GP)
- 649 and basic numerical model
- 650 Fig. 12– Influence of the local damping coefficient used in the basic numerical model
- on the response of the wall in terms of vehicle velocity versus time
- Fig. 13– Vehicle velocity versus time for the basic model, the enhanced vehicle model
- and the experimental test
- Fig. 14 Vehicle velocity versus time for the basic model, the top plate model and the
 experimental test
- 656 Fig. 15 Enhanced model for the reinforcement strips
- 657 Fig. 16 Vehicle velocity versus time for the experimental test, the basic numerical
- model and the improved reinforcement models (soft and hard cases)
- 659 Fig. 17 Cross-section of the modelled wall in the case of the improved reinforcement
- model with soft stiffness (left) and hard-stiffness (right) springs. The dotted line
- represents the top boundary of the reinforcement strip during impact
- 662 Fig.18 Description of the rolling resistance model of Jiang et al. (2005)

- 663 Fig. 19 –Effect of rolling resistance on the vehicle velocity versus time for the basic
- case and for the rolling resistance case

Table 1. Physical and micromechanical parameters of the reinforcement

ρ _{GEO} [kg/m ³]	r _{GEO} [mm]	$k_{n,GEO} = k_{s,GEO}$ [N/m]	$n_{b,GEO} = s_{b,GEO}$ [N/m]	μ _{GEO} [-]	k _{eq} [N/m]
300	0,75	3.33 10 ⁸	45	1.0	3 10 ⁵

Table 3. Physical and micromechanical parameters of the impact loading

$ ho_{IMP}$ [kg/m ³]	<i>r_{IMP}</i> [mm]	$k_{n,IMP} = k_{s,IMP}$ [N/m]	μ _{IMP} [-]	<i>v_{IMP}</i> [m.s ⁻¹]	h _{IMP} [cm]
1,41.10 ⁴	25	10^{10}	1,0	10	17,5

δ	$\varphi_{SOL}[^{\circ}]$
0	24
0,2	26
0,4	28
0,6	31
0,8	33
1,0	35
2,0	43,5
00	52

Table 1. Values of shape parameter and macroscopic friction angle

674 Fig.1 – Diagram of the experimental reinforced wall





Fig.2 – Results of tensile tests on single strips and bonded strips of GP and PE.





- Fig.3 Views of the experimental site showing the location of the tested walls and the
- 683 high speed cameras



Overview on the experimental site

View from Camera Nr.1 during impact

- Fig. 4 Vertical cross section diagrams of the wall showing the deformation after



- Fig. 5 Deformation of the front face of the PE wall for the layer located at impact
- level (top view)



Fig. 6 – Location of broken bonds for the GP wall, in the layer located at impact level



Fig.7 – Penetration length and vehicle speed versus time for both GP and PE walls



Fig.8 – Acceleration and unbalanced force on impacting vehicle versus time for both
 GP and PE walls





Fig. 9 – Diagram showing the numerical model used for the reinforcement strips



Fig. 10 – Diagram showing the principle of the numerical expansion test on filled cells



Fig. 11 – Comparison of vehicle velocity versus time for the experimental wall (GP)

and basic numerical model.



Fig. 12– Influence of the local damping coefficient in the basic numerical model on the

response of the wall in terms of vehicle velocity versus time.



Fig. 13– Vehicle velocity versus time for the basic model, enhanced vehicle model and

730 experimental test.





Fig. 14 – Vehicle velocity versus time for the basic model, top plate model and

735 experimental test.



Fig. 15 – Enhanced model for the reinforcement strips.



Fig. 16 – Vehicle velocity versus time for the experimental test, the basic numerical

model and the improved reinforcement models (soft and hard cases).



- Fig. 17 Cross-section of the modelled wall in the case of the improved reinforcement
- model with soft stiffness (left) and hard-stiffness (right) springs. The dotted line represents the top boundary of the reinforcement strip during impact.



Fig.18 – Description of the rolling resistance model of Jiang et al. (2005)



Fig. 19 – Effect of rolling resistance on the vehicle velocity versus time for the basic

case and for the rolling resistance case.

