

# INTERNATIONAL SOCIETY FOR SOIL MECHANICS AND GEOTECHNICAL ENGINEERING



*This paper was downloaded from the Online Library of the International Society for Soil Mechanics and Geotechnical Engineering (ISSMGE). The library is available here:*

<https://www.issmge.org/publications/online-library>

*This is an open-access database that archives thousands of papers published under the Auspices of the ISSMGE and maintained by the Innovation and Development Committee of ISSMGE.*

*The paper was published in the proceedings of the 6th International Conference on Geotechnical and Geophysical Site Characterization and was edited by Tamás Huszák, András Mahler and Edina Koch. The conference was originally scheduled to be held in Budapest, Hungary in 2020, but due to the COVID-19 pandemic, it was held online from September 26<sup>th</sup> to September 29<sup>th</sup> 2021.*

# Pressuremeter based methods to predict the behaviour of grouted micropiles and anchors

Julien Habert

*Terrasol, Paris, France, [julien.habert@setec.com](mailto:julien.habert@setec.com)*

Antoine Guimond

*SNCF, Paris, France, [antoine.guimond-barett@reseau.sncf.fr](mailto:antoine.guimond-barett@reseau.sncf.fr)*

Fahd Cuira

*Terrasol, Paris, France, [fahd.cuira@setec.com](mailto:fahd.cuira@setec.com)*

**ABSTRACT:** Menard pressuremeter based calculation methods efficiently predict the behaviour of foundations and especially enable i) to estimate their (ultimate) resistance, and ii) to assess their load-displacement behaviour. For grouted micropiles and anchors, although static load tests are always performed due to the sensitivity of their execution (and especially grouting stages), semi-empirical methods remain essential in preliminary stages of design. To take into account evolution of contractors practice and development of new execution procedures, a database of static load tensile tests performed in France has been established, with more than 250 tensile static load tests. Their comparison to prediction of calculation approaches enables i) to evaluate and validate the existing pressuremeter based models, and ii) to determine a specific calculation model factor ensuring a predefined target of safety for resistances, following Eurocode 7 requirements.

**Keywords:** pressuremeter; Menard limit pressure; micropiles; grouted anchors; ultimate resistance; critical creep load from LCPC database, established by Bustamante and Doix (1985, [4]).

## 1. Introduction

The Menard Pressuremeter Test is an efficient tool to predict behaviour (both resistance and deformation) of piles, micropiles, anchors and soil nails, based on semi-empirical models.

For piles, current French national application documents of Eurocode 7 NF P94-262 ([1], 2012) dedicated to the design of pile foundations provides details about the semi-empirical pressuremeter models to determine the bearing capacity and tensile resistance of pile foundations. The statistical analysis of the LCPC static load tests database has to assess the quality of the model, including its scatter, that can be quantified through a model factor directly usable in design procedures. (Burlon et al., [2] and [3]), and to

The present paper proposes to adopt a similar approach for grouted micropiles and anchors, for which the target post-grouting pressure is closely linked to the limit pressure of the ground.

## 2. Constitution of the database

### 2.1. Origin of the data

The database has been initiated with more than 300 failure tests coming from SNCF (French National Railway Company) and Cerema (Centre For Studies and Expertise on Risks, Environment, Mobility, and Urban and Country planning) databases.

Over these 300 tests, only 40 tests have been maintained in the database: the other ones have been discarded for different reasons (insufficient maximum load, grouting conditions insufficiently known, issue with the observed free length, etc.. However, the database has been then completed with additional data coming

### 2.2. Ground classification and execution conditions

#### 2.2.1. Ground classification

As for French semi-empirical rules for predicting bearing capacity of both shallow and deep foundations, commonly encountered ground types are sorted in 4 conventional ground classes :

- Clays and silts,
- Sands and gravels (only siliceous sands are addressed here),
- Chalk,
- Marls and calcareous marls, for which the  $\text{CaCO}_3$  content is between 35 and 95 %.

The Menard limit pressure  $p_{IM}$  (corresponding to the doubling of the initial volume of the pressuremeter probe, with a reference volume corresponding to the first contact pressure) is then systematically used.

#### 2.2.2. Execution conditions

Two execution conditions have been kept for the present paper :

- A unique and globally post-grouting, with a grouting pressure  $p$  comprised between  $0,5 p_{IM}$  and  $p_{IM}$ ,
- A selective and multi-stage post-grouting, with a grouting pressure  $p$  systematically superior to  $p_{IM}$ .

During the post-grouting phase, the grouting flow remains small, comprised between 5 and 10 l/s.

### 2.3. Content of the database

The database exclusively contains tensile failure tests, and its content is summarized in Table 1, for different execution conditions and ground types.

**Table 1.** Constitution of the database – number of measurements

Execution conditions → Ground type ↓	Global grouting $0,5 p_{IM}$ $< p < p_{IM}$	Selecting and multistage grouting $p \geq p_{IM}$	Sub-total
Clays and silts	38	57	<u>95</u>
Sands and gravels	40	114	<u>154</u>
Chalks	1	3	<u>4</u>
Marls, calcareous marls	5	18	<u>23</u>
<b>Sub-total</b>	<b><u>84</u></b>	<b><u>192</u></b>	<b><u>276</u></b>

## 3. Analysis of the tensile resistance and unit shaft friction

### 3.1. Evaluated rules

The rules to predict unit axial shaft friction  $q_s$  are based on the ground types given in Table 1, execution conditions, completed by the compacity of the ground, characterized by the net Menard limit pressure  $p_{IM}^*$  ( $p_{IM} - \sigma_{ho}$ ).

The overall tensile resistance of a micropile or grouted anchor is obtained by Equation (1).

$$R = \pi B \int \alpha q_s(x) dx \quad (1)$$

where  $B$  is the diameter of the drilling tool and  $\alpha$  an expansion ratio, depending of the ground class and grouting conditions.

Under these conditions, the unit axial shaft friction  $q_s$  is obtained following Equation (2).

$$q_s = a p_{IM}^* + b \quad (2)$$

The parameters  $a$ ,  $b$  and  $\alpha$  are then provided in Table 2, for the different ground classes and execution conditions.

**Table 2.** Semi-empirical rules

Ground class	Grouting conditions	$a$ (-)	$b$ (MPa)	$\alpha$ (-)
Clays and silts	Global	0,06	0,1	1,1 to 1,4
	Selective and multistage	0,08	0,04	1,4 to 1,8
Sand and gravels	Global	0,1	0	1,1 to 1,2
	Selective and multistage	0,1	0,05	1,4 to 2,0
Chalks and marls	Global	0,05	0,1	1,1 to 1,2
	Selective and multistage	0,07	0,13	1,8

### 3.2. Conventional criterion to derive ultimate resistance

On a first step, an analysis of the failure criteria used to derive tensile resistance for anchors is conducted


In France, test Method 3 is used to test anchors ([5] to [7], 1999 to 2019), that corresponds to a maintained Load Test with monotonous increasing of the applied load during the loading phase.

Even if the loading procedure remains globally the same as before, it also introduces a new conventional failure criterion. Although failure has currently a simple definition, which is the load that can not be supported by the anchor, conventional failure criteria are often introduced used to interpret static load tests performed on geotechnical structures. For anchors, EN 1537:1999 ([8]) first introduced the following failure criterion to derive the tensile resistance, corresponding to a creep value (slope of anchor head displacement versus logarithm of time)  $\alpha_3$  equals to 5 mm. This “new” criterion differs from the one previously used in France ([9], 1993), corresponding to the following conventional anchor head displacement  $w_u$  given by the Equation (3):

$$w_u = \frac{FL}{ES} + \Delta l_{es} \quad (3)$$

where  $F$  is the applied load,  $E$  the Young’s modulus of the tendon,  $S$  its cross section,  $L$  its overall length and  $\Delta l_{es}$  a conventional displacement to fully mobilize the shaft friction at the tip of the bonded length of the micropile or the grouted anchor, equal to 1 cm.

The comparison of the obtained tensile resistance is provided on Figure 1.



**Figure 1.** Comparison of failure criteria

It then appears that the “new” criterion leads to slightly higher tensile resistance (+13 %), but the difference remains acceptable, especially because both compared criteria remain conventional.

### 3.3. Obtained results

On a first step, the obtained raw data are given on Figures 2 and 3, representing the measured unit shaft

friction  $q_{s,mes}$  multiplied by  $\alpha^1$  versus the net Menard limit pressure  $p_{IM}^*$ .

On a second step, the calculated unit shaft friction  $q_{s,cal}$  is represented versus the measured one, on Figures 4 and 5.




Figure 2. Obtained results (by ground types – 276  $q_s$  measurements)

<sup>1</sup> When an interval is given for the expansion ratio  $\alpha$  is available, the lowest value has been used for the present analysis.




Figure 3. Obtained results (by execution conditions – 276  $q_s$  measurements)




Figure 4. Comparison of measured and calculated shaft friction, respectively  $\alpha q_{s,mes}$  and  $\alpha q_{s,cal}$  (by execution conditions – 276  $q_s$  measurements)




Figure 5. Comparison of measured and calculated shaft friction, respectively  $\alpha q_{s,mes}$  and  $\alpha q_{s,cal}$  (by execution conditions – 276  $q_s$  measurements)

### 3.4. Statistical analysis

On a second step, a statistical analysis of the ratio between calculated and measured resistance is conducted. Figure 6 shows the global analysis. Figure 7 and 8 then focus on the two main ground classes, clays and silts then sands and gravels.




Figure 6. Histogram and distribution functions of unit shaft friction ratio




Figure 7. Distribution function of global resistance ratio





Figure 8. Average, median and 90 % fractile for clays and silts then sands and gravels

It then appears that the semi-empirical pressuremeter-based rules is quite well calibrated, as median and especially average values remain quite close from 1,0 value (apart from selective and multistage grouting in clays and silts). The 90 % fractile value highlights the low scatter, and can be directly used as model factor to derive characteristic tensile resistances in accordance with Eurocode 7 provisions.

### 3.5. Critical creep load

Finally, the ratio between the critical creep load  $R_{s,cr}$  (applied load beyond which creep effects become significant, [9] and [10]) and the tensile resistance  $R_s$  is analysed on Figure 9 and is equal to 0,75. It appears to be quite consistent with the commonly used value equals to 0,70, and does not seem to depend of the ground class.



## 4. Conclusion

The present paper shows the statistical analysis of a database of tensile tests and of the semi-empirical pressuremeter-base rules used in France to derive unit shaft friction and then global tensile resistance of post-grouted micropiles and anchors.

Under the specific groutig conditions given above, the commonly used French rules appear hence quite well calibrated, with a limited scatter, that has also been quantified.

Even if systematic tests remain mandatory for these sensitive geotechnical elements, the proposed analysis helps designer to setablish a preliminary design but also to efficiently prepare a campaign of tensile tests.

## Acknowledgement

The work presented in this article has been supported by the French research project ARSCOP (new approaches of ground investigation and structures design based on pressuremeter).

## References

- [1] AFNOR, NF P94-262, French national application document to Eurocode 7 – Design of pile foundations, 2012
- [2] Burlon, S. et al., Model factor for the bearing capacity of piles from pressuremeter test results – Eurocode 7 approach, *Géotechnique*, 64 n°7, 513-525, 2014, <https://doi.org/10.1680/geot.13.P.061>
- [3] Burlon, S. et al., t–z curves for piles from pressuremeter test results. , *Geotechnique*, 66 n°2, 137-148, 2016, <https://doi.org/10.1680/jgeot.15.P.097>
- [4] Bustamante, M., Doix, B., Une méthode pour le calcul des tirants et des micropieux injectés *Bulletin de liaison des Laboratoires des Ponts et Chaussées*, 140, 75-92, 1985
- [5] CEN, EN 1997-1, Design of geotechnical structures, 2004
- [6] CEN, EN 1997-1/A1, Design of geotechnical structures, Amendment A1, 2014
- [7] AFNOR, NF EN 1997-1/NA/A1, Design of geotechnical structures, French National Annex, amendment A1, 2018
- [8] CEN, EN 1537 – Execution of special geotechnical work — Ground anchors, 1999
- [9] ISO, EN ISO 22477-5, Geotechnical investigation and testing — Testing of geotechnical structures — Part 5: Testing of grouted anchors, 2018
- [10] AFNOR, NF P94-153, Essais de tirants d’ancrage, 1993