

2005 Tri-Service Infrastructure Conference St. Louis, Missouri 1-4 August 2005

**Presentation for** 

#### Development of Design Criteria for the Rio Puerto Nuevo Contract 2D/2E Channel Walls

Janna Tanner, Jacksonville District David Shiver, Jacksonville District Daniel Russell, INCA Engineers



Contract 2D/2E Channel Walls

Why is the Flood Control Project needed?

- What wall systems are used?
- How were the wall systems selected?
- What design criteria was used?
- How were the walls designed?



1

Jacksonville

District

#### **Project Description**

Includes 11.2 miles of channel improvements, using 8 different channel sections, through the middle of San Juan.

Includes 30 bridge modifications and replacements, 2 debris basins, and 2 stilling basins.

2005 Tri-Service Infrastructure Conference

Jacksonville District









#### **Rio Puerto Nuevo Site Plan** Jacksonville District FLOW MARGARITA CHANNEL (EXIST. CONTRACT 2A) STA: 88+33.21 STA. 90+00.00 CHANNEL WIDTH CHANNEL WIDTH 150' TYPICAL 9 NEW RIVER WALL -DE DIEGO BRIDGE (EXIST. CONTRACT 2D1) 8 5+00-5 8 8 -ROOSEVELT BRIDGE (EXIST. CONTRACT 2B) ö -RIGHT-OF-WAY -RIO PUERTO NUEVO MAIN CHANNEL (FUTURE CONTRACT 3) RIGHT-OF-WAY -JOSEFINA CHANNEL <u>STA</u>. (FUTURE CONTRACT 3) END JOSEFINA CONFLUENCE STA. J 2+00 INV. ELEV. 0.00 R=437.50 START JOSEFINA <u>CONFLUENCE STA. J 0+0</u>0 (= STA. 133+12.44) INV. ELEV. -13.46 PLAN





#### Contract 2D/2E Description

Convert an existing trapezoidal earthen ditch, the Rio Puerto Nuevo, into a 150 foot wide by 15 foot deep rectangular channel.

Channel walls and bottom designed separately.







District

#### Wall Design Goals

Develop least cost wall system for 10,700 lineal feet of channel wall with an average exposed face of 23 feet.

Satisfy hydraulic design, real estate, and construction constraints.



#### Hydraulic Design Constraints

Channel geometry must remain rectangular (i.e. vertical walls) for hydraulic and R/W acquisition reasons.

Wall facing system must have a Manning's roughness constant consistent with finished concrete (I.e. 0.013)



2005 Tri-Service Infrastructure Conference

Jacksonville District



#### Wall System Selection

- VE selected 5 wall systems & 2 proprietary wall systems.
- Further study selected 2 wall types that were fully designed and detailed in the construction documents.
  - Master Pile Wall. The master pile wall consists of a series structural pipe piles alternating with lagging pipe piles.
  - Drilled Shaft Wall. The drilled shaft wall consists of initially installed lean concrete lagging piles with structural drilled shafts installed between and overlapping the lagging piles.









#### **Geotechnical Site Issues**



Jacksonville District

2005 Tri-Service Infrastructure Conference Interlayered Silt and Clay overlies Weathered Bedrock. The top of weathered rock varies in elevation from -30 to -80.

3 different geographical profiles were idealized and used to analyze the different reaches of the channel.













#### Soil & Rock Properties

Soil Layer	Stress State	Internal Friction Angle (degrees)	Cohesion (psf)	Total Unit Weight (pcf)	Saturated Unit Weight (pcf)
Interlayered Silt & Clay (CH)	Q	$\phi = 0$	c = 720	110	115
	S	φ' = 25	c' = 0	110	115
	R	φ = 15	c = 400	110	115
Weathered Bedrock	Q	$\phi = 0$	c = 3,000	125	125
	S	φ' = 35	c' = 0	125	125
	R	φ = 15	c = 750	125	125





- - -

### Subgrade Reaction Moduli Used for LPile Analysis

	Geologic Profile Type			
Elevation (feet)	Α	В	С	
	Subgrade Reaction Modulus, K <sub>h</sub> (pci)			
-15	16	16	16	
-20	22	22	22	
-25	30	30	30	
-30	200	43	43	
-35	200	61	61	
-40	200	76	76	
-45	200	93	93	
-50	200	200	103	
-55	200	200	111	
-60	200	200	120	
-65	200	200	128	
-70	200	200	138	
-75	200	200	148	
-80	200	200	200	
-85	200	200	200	



#### Design Philosophy



The Master Piles were designed using working stress design.

The Drilled Shafts were designed using the ultimate strength, load factor design.



2005 Tri-Service Infrastructure Conference

Jacksonville District

### Serviceability Design

Design for serviceability addresses the concerns related to displacements of the loaded structure, both global stability and deflection.

## For a diaphragm wall there are three stability concerns

Global rotation (deep-seated failure)

- **Rotational failure** (due to inadequate penetration)
- Flexural failure (structural inadequacy)



Jacksonville District





District

#### **Rotational Failure**

Rotational failure is due to inadequate penetration and is prevented by long pile action

Good practice to ensure long pile action
 Have 2 zero-deflection points
 Have nearly zero deflection at the pile tip.





#### **Deflection Criteria**

Good practice is to limit the wall deflection.

Deflection criteria for the static load case has been developed (by team consensus not by EM) to limit the ratio of the top of wall deflection vs. the mudline deflection to 2% of the exposed wall face height.

Seismic deflection does not have a limit, but this structure:

- Must remain elastic during an OBE event
- May be plastic during an MDE event, but no collapse is permitted







- DEFLECTION SHAPE

MUDLINE DEFLECTION

INFLECTION POINT

INFLECTION POINT

PILE TIP DEFLECTION

#### **Design Procedure**

- Determine the structural demand on the walls
- Calculate the depth of embedment necessary to produce long pile action
- Calculate the factor of safety for wall stability
- Calculate the structural capacity of the walls



2005 Tri-Service Infrastructure Conference

Jacksonville District



#### Structural Demand

Calculate individual loads using classical soil mechanics and then combine results into load cases. The individual loads are:

- Hydrostatic (channel side)
- Porewater (landside)
- Construction surcharge
- Active condition soil
- Wall inertia
- Dynamic soil
- Hydrodynamic porewater



#### Pile Embedment

Determine embedment by using LPile
Iterate to shorten pile in order to
Have barely 2 zero deflection points, and
Near zero tip rotation w/one zero deflection point near the tip



2005 Tri-Service Infrastructure Conference

Jacksonville District

#### Stability Check



2005 Tri-Service Infrastructure Conference  Use EM 1110-2-2504 "Design of Sheet Pile Walls" for 3 failure modes
 Deep seated failure

- Rotational failure
- Structural failure

#### EM 1110-2-2504 is used since it's for deep foundations







Deep seated failure – Geotechnical analysis used Slope/W by Ensoft and determined that the walls, as designed, are stable

Rotational failure – Wall as designed has long pile action so is stable for rotational failure

## Structural failure – Wall is designed to have adequate strength

ENGINEERS INC.



#### Load Cases



- Load Case 1 Construction
- Load Case 2A Flood (Undrained)
- Load Case 2B Flood (Drained)
- Load Case 3A Drawdown (Undrained)
- Load Case 3B Drawdown (Drained)
- Load Case 4A OBE Seismic (Undrained)
- Load Case 4B MDE Seismic (Undrained)



2005 Tri-Service Infrastructure Conference

Jacksonville District



#### Load Case 1 Construction



LOAD CASE 1: CONSTRUCTION











Conference

ENGINEERS







#### **Design Results**

The static load cases govern the wall design for all design reaches.

The static shears and moments are approximately twice the dynamic shears and moments.

Since the static cases govern, the seismic coefficient method is an acceptable procedure.



#### **Design Results**

# Maximum Displacements Drilled Shaft Wall

Design Reach	Location	Load Type	Displacement
B1	Тор	Static	3.70 in
		Dynamic	2.34 in
	Mudline	Static	1.49 in
		Dynamic	0.78 in
C2	Тор	Static	3.80 in
		Dynamic	3.21 in
	Mudline	Static	1.40 in
		Dynamic	1.00 in

2005 Tri-Service Infrastructure Conference

Jacksonville District





#### **Design Results**

# Maximum Displacements Master Pile Wall

Design Reach	Location	Load Type	Displacement
B1	Тор	Static	6.02 in
		Dynamic	2.84 in
	Mudline	Static	2.42 in
		Dynamic	0.90 in
C2	Тор	Static	5.54 in
		Dynamic	3.99 in
	Mudline	Static	1.95 in
		Dynamic	1.19 in

Again, the static load cases govern the wall design for all design reaches.





District

#### **Displacement Serviceability**

Design	Relative Displacement (%)		
Reach	Drilled Shaft	Master Pile	
A1	0.7	1.1	
A2	0.7	1.1	
B1	0.8	1.4	
B2	0.8	1.3	
B3	0.9	1.3	
C1	0.8	1.4	
C2	0.8	1.2	

□ All displacements meet the established deflection criteria.





#### Master Pile Wall

Jacksonville District









#### Drilled Shaft Wall









#### Cost Comparison



2005 Tri-Service Infrastructure Conference

#### 2003 MCACES Cost Estimate

- Drilled Shafts w/Precast Facing \$94M
   Drilled Shafts w/CIP Facing \$95M
- Master Piles w/Precast
   Master Piles w/CIP Facing
   \$71M

Foreign Steel Makes Master Piles Cheaper
 Steel Prices Increased Significantly Since 2003



#### Conclusion



2005 Tri-Service Infrastructure Conference Set idealized soil/rock parameters that can be used for long reaches of the project
Set serviceability criteria for deflections
Analyze and design to resist

Deep seated failure
Rotational failure
Structural failure

Let the market determine the least cost

solution – Foreign Steel price fluctuating



#### Master Pile Wall for Contract 2A

800 ft of wall installed

48" dia, 3/4" wall, ASTM A252, Gr 3 (fy = 45 ksi) pipe piles, with average pile length of 70 ft

intermediate pair of AZ 18, ASTM A572, Gr 50, steel sheet piles, with an average length of 35 ft



Jacksonville District





























#### Drilled Shaft Wall at Bechara Industrial Area

#### 2000 linear feet of culvert

Top down excavation

Secant pile wall















Infrastructure <u>Conference</u>















#### Drilled Shaft Walls at 1-90 Mercer Island, Washington





11 w 11

Jacksonville District











# SR 526 Interchange / I-5 Northbound Ramp







![](_page_62_Picture_2.jpeg)

![](_page_63_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_64_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_65_Picture_0.jpeg)

![](_page_66_Picture_0.jpeg)

## Thank You