

**EFFECT OF HYDROSTATIC PRESSURE ON GEOCOMPOSITE  
STABILISED SOIL RETAINING STRUCTURE**



**INSTITUT PENGURUSAN PENYELIDIKAN  
UNIVERSITI TEKNOLOGI MARA  
40450 SHAH ALAM, SELANGOR  
MALAYSIA**

**BY:**

**CHOW SHIAO HUEY  
ANAS IBRAHIM  
DUL NASER ABDUL GHANI**

**NOVEMBER 2008**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>CONTENTS</b>	<b>PAGE</b>
Acknowledgements	i
Table of Contents	ii
List of Tables	vi
List of Figures	viii
Abstract	xii
 <b>CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION</b>	
1.1 Background of Research	1
1.2 Research Objectives	2
1.3 Scope of Research	2
1.4 Significance of Research	3
 <b>CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW</b>	
2.1 Introduction	4
2.2 Reported Laboratory Studies on Waste Material Geocomposite	4
2.3 Reported Field Studies on Waste Material Geocomposite	14
2.4 Reported Laboratory Model Studies on Waste Material Geocomposite	20
2.5 Critical Review	25

## CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1	Introduction	27
3.2	Test Materials	28
3.2.1	Waste Materials	28
3.2.2	Sand	29
3.2.3	Ordinary Portland Cement (OPC)	29
3.3	Preliminary Laboratory Study	30
3.3.1	Particle Size Distribution Test	30
3.3.2	Specific Gravity Test	31
3.3.3	Dry Density Test	32
3.3.4	Limiting Density Test	33
3.3.5	Direct Shear Test	34
3.3.6	Permeability Test	35
3.4	Laboratory Model Wall Test	36
3.4.1	Model Tank Design	36
3.4.2	Instrumentation Scheme	42
3.4.2.1	Soil Pressure Transducer	42
3.4.2.2	Pore Pressure Transducer	44
3.4.2.3	Data Logging Device	45
3.4.3	Test Program	47
3.4.4	Sand Preparation Procedure	51
3.4.5	Geocomposite Mix Design and Casting Procedure	54
3.4.6	Model Testing Procedure	57

## **CHAPTER FOUR: RESULT ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION**

4.1	Introduction	63
4.2	Preliminary Test Results	63
4.2.1	Particle Size Distribution Test	63
4.2.2	Specific Gravity Test	65
4.2.3	Dry Density Test	65
4.2.4	Limiting Density Test	66
4.2.5	Direct Shear Test	67
4.2.6	Permeability Test	67
4.3	Laboratory Model Wall Test Results	68
4.3.1	Repeatability Test on Control Specimen	69
4.3.2	Effect of OPC : Waste Material Ratio	75
4.3.3	Effect of Surcharge	82
4.3.4	Effect of Hydrostatic Pressure	90
4.4	Summary	99

## **CHAPTER FIVE: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

5.1	Introduction	101
5.2	Conclusions	101
5.3	Recommendations	104

<b>REFERENCES</b>	<b>107</b>
-------------------	------------

## ABSTRACT

The use of cement bound waste material geocomposite as compressible backfill behind retaining wall can help to reduce lateral earth pressure behind wall and at the same time help to reduce the rapidly accumulated waste materials. However, their effectiveness is yet to be proven with little research conducted in Malaysia. This study therefore investigated the effectiveness of cement bound waste material geocomposite as compressible layer behind soil retaining structure using laboratory model wall test. Variables affecting the effectiveness of geocomposite were investigated with the main focus on effect of hydrostatic pressure, in addition to effects of waste material content and surcharge. Two locally available waste materials, namely rubber chip and tire chip were bound by Ordinary Portland Cement (OPC) to form the geocomposites. Local sand was used as conventional backfill in the laboratory model wall test. A steel rectangular model wall tank was designed and fabricated with internal dimension of 732 mm high, 700 mm long, and 450 mm width. Lateral earth pressure (at rest condition) and hydrostatic pressure behind top, middle and bottom of wall were monitored. A total of 14 model wall tests were conducted. All geocomposites tested in this study were cast at water-cement ratio of 0.5, cured for 7 days at room temperature and of 40 mm width. Repeatability testing on control specimen (sand and both geocomposites) reported acceptable repeatability of less than 15% differences between identical test pairs. Increasing waste material content in the geocomposite was found to reduce the lateral earth pressure behind wall, thus higher effectiveness for both geocomposites. At no water condition,

application of surcharge at high magnitude was found to increase the lateral earth pressure behind the wall. Application of low surcharge seems to have negligible impact on the effectiveness of the geocomposites. It is also observed that reloading the geocomposites (dry or wet condition) has negligible impact on their effectiveness. An increasing lateral earth pressure was observed with increasing water level for the geocomposites. Effectiveness of the geocomposite was reduced by the presence of hydrostatic pressure. It is concluded that both geocomposites are effective in reducing lateral earth pressure behind wall with percentage reduction ranged from 31.89 to 99.3%.