US-NZ-Japan International Workshop Berkeley, CA – November 2-4, 2016

# Liquefaction-induced flow slides governed by residual shear strength of liquefied soil



Ross W. Boulanger, PhD, PE Professor, Director of CGM

> Physical models show void redistribution effects



> Numerical analyses show void redistribution effects



> Undrained response of cohesionless soils is reasonably understood

- Critical state frameworks work
- Dependence of stress-strain responses on consolidation stress & test type
- > Void redistribution & diffusion effects are a key issue
  - Physical models show the mechanism, but most dramatic results have been limited to tests with adverse conditions
  - Numerical models show the mechanism, but there are challenges with mesh effects & localization scales
  - Field evidence is mixed
    - Effects on lateral spreading displacements or residual strengths are not clear in the case history databases
    - Possible cause of the post-shaking movements observed in various case histories
  - If void redistribution occurs, the field residual strength (S<sub>r</sub>) is a system response rather than a soil property

> Loading path not necessarily bounded by drained & undrained cases



Mean effective stress, p'

# Key underlying geologic/placement processes?

(modified after Naesgaard et al. 2006)



# Key underlying geologic/placement processes?

- Sequence and characteristics of substrata / units
- Spreads versus slopes
  - Cracks & venting may form easily in lateral spreads
  - Cracks may not form easily at the larger depths under an embankment dam



Dam shell (D. Serafini)

Fluvial deposit (R. Boulanger)

Hydraulic fill - USF (C. Davis, LADWP)

- What "residual" strengths do you use in a post-earthquake stability analysis?
  - If limiting r<sub>u</sub> values are triggered in a slope, do you allow for any possible strength loss relative to the original drained conditions?



#### Extrapolating is unavoidable



> Event tree for a risk analysis



> Event tree for a risk analysis



#### Extrapolating – Idriss & Boulanger (2007)



#### Extrapolating – Kramer & Wang (2011)



Equivalent clean-sand, SPT corrected blowcount,  $(N_1)_{60cs-Sr}$ 

#### Extrapolating – comparing ranges



Equivalent clean-sand, SPT corrected blowcount,  $(N_1)_{60cs-Sr}$ 

## Challenges to better evaluation procedures?

- Residual shear strength (S<sub>r</sub>), and the deformations associated with void redistribution, can depend on:
  - pre-earthquake soil state ( $D_R$ ,  $\sigma'_v$ ) & properties,
  - physical geometry & stratigraphy,
  - permeability contrasts & interfaces characteristics,
  - ground motion characteristics.
- > Pre-earthquake measures of the soil state [e.g.,  $D_R$ ,  $(N_1)_{60}$ ] are insufficient for predicting the response.
- Numerical models have problems with localizations and we have problems defining all the initial conditions with confidence.
- Do the documented case histories bound the possible range of strengths we might see in future cases?

# Path forward for advancing understanding/procedures

#### Physical data

- Large-scale physical model tests with more complex stratigraphy and dense arrays to locally measure responses.
- Field instrumentation that can differentiate or identify roles of void redistribution & diffusion in future events

> Numerical models and theories that can:

- Handle localizations more robustly
- Simulate the void redistribution observed in various physical models and recreate delayed deformations
- Simulate the absence of void redistribution in other physical models or cases
- Parametric analyses that better separate the scenarios for improved guidance &/or understanding
- ➤ Validation of simulation tools:
  - Systematic evaluation of simulation tools against sets of physical data that did and did not develop localizations or water films – can we differentiate between these cases?