

IMPROVEMENT OF UPLIFT CAPACITY OF TRANSMISSION TOWER FOUNDATION

Don Viyani Trishantha Amarakoon

198322K

The thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the
degree Master of Science in Geotechnical Engineering

Department of Civil Engineering
Faculty of Engineering

University of Moratuwa
Sri Lanka

March 2024

DECLARATION

I declare that this is my own work and this thesis/dissertation does not incorporate without acknowledgement any material previously submitted for a degree or diploma in any other University or Institute of higher learning and to the best of my knowledge and belief it does not contain any material previously published or written by another person except where the acknowledgement is made in the text. I retain the right to use this content in whole or part in future works (such as articles or books).

Signature: *UOM Verified Signature*

Date: 11/03/2024.

D.V.T Amarakoon

The above candidate has carried out research for the Masters thesis/dissertation under my supervision. I confirm that the declaration made above by the student is true and correct.

Name of Supervisor: Prof. L. I. N. de Silva

UOM Verified Signature

Signature of the Supervisor:

11/03/2024

Date:

Abstract

Electricity transmission is carried out by conductors attached to the lattice tower structures, mostly supported by a shallow spread footing foundation, associated with around 40-45 percent of the total project cost.

The uplift capacity is one of the main factors when selecting the size of a transmission tower foundation. The current design practice considers the weight of the concrete foundation and the soil as an inverted frustum that contributes to resisting forces. However, it is noted through literature that the actual behaviour of the uplift capacity of the foundation does not exactly depend only on the weight of the soil inverted frustum shape and concrete. Instead, it depends on the soil properties, such as friction and cohesion. Global research has been carried out on cement soil stabilization, insertion of fiber to the cement sand backfills, and use of geo-grids as improvement techniques for uplift capacity.

This study aims to assess different techniques and propose suitable techniques to improve the uplift capacity of transmission tower foundation construction. To commence this process, soil samples with low SPT values were collected from five tower locations of ongoing transmission lines in the western province of Sri Lanka. Most of the remoulded samples are tested and identified as Clayey Sand according to the USCS classification. The tri-axial test on remoulded soil resulted in an undrained cohesion value of 5.6 kN/m² to 10.4 kN/m².

Then, modified soil samples are prepared, adding 1 percent and 3 percent cement by soil weight, cured for 7 days, and tested. Uniaxial compressive tests (UCS) are performed on the mixed soil samples. The UCS on samples of 3 percent cement shows a significant improvement of cohesion, resulting in values between 20 to 60 kN/m².

Then a 3D finite element model is developed and verified by using the values of the research carried out by (Consoli, Ruvor, & Schnaid, Uplift Performance of Anchor Plates Embedded in Cement-Stabilized Backfill, 2013). Then, the actual foundation is analyzed for various area configurations. Hence, a series of models are developed incorporating different configurations of foundation depth, improvement angle, and cohesion for full-depth, layer-wise, and partial-depth types of improvement.

In conclusion, the uplift capacity of the transmission tower foundation can be increased significantly by adding 3 percent cement to the existing clayey sand backfill. The uplift capacity increases with the angle of improvement and cohesion of the backfill material. The uplift capacities were compared as a percentage of the remoulded soil backfill at a foundation with a depth of 3.0 m.

When considering full-depth improvement cases, a minimum of 100 and 120 percentages resulted for the foundation depths of 2.0 and 2.5, respectively, with a cohesion value of 40 kPa and a 25-degree angle. However, it is 150 percent for the foundation depth of 3.0 m, even with a cohesion of 20 kPa.

Also, the uplift capacities of layer-wise depth improvement and the total layer improvement of the practical excavation are similar.

Further, improvement as a partial depth with a layer thickness of 1.5 m (starting from the bottom of the foundation) results in 120 and 150 percentages for depth of foundation 2.5 and 3.0 m, respectively, with a cohesion value of 40 kPa and 25-degree angle.

Keywords: - Improvement, Uplift capacity, Foundation, Cement, Cohesion

DEDICATION

I dedicate this thesis to the exceptional individuals who have been instrumental in shaping my life and academic pursuit.

First, I express profound gratitude to my parents, A.D. Theodore and P.D.M. Elizabeth. Their boundless love, unwavering support, and continuous encouragement have propelled my achievements. Their steadfast belief in my capabilities has been an unwavering source of motivation, and I am forever grateful for their countless sacrifices.

To my cherished wife, Dhanushka Chathurangani, I dedicate this work with profound sincerity. Her unwavering love, steadfast support, and invaluable guidance were a huge strength throughout this journey. Her understanding and unwavering patience have made this endeavour possible, and I am profoundly grateful for that.

I also extend this dedication to all individuals who tirelessly pursue knowledge and self-improvement. May this thesis, in some small way, contribute to your enriching journey of growth and discovery.

To everyone dedicated to learning and self-improvement, I also dedicate this thesis to you. May it play a small part in your journey of growth and discovery. Your commitment to learning is inspiring, and I'm grateful to share this work with you.

With profound gratitude and appreciation,

D.V.T Amarakoon

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I wish to express my heartfelt gratitude to the many individuals and institutions whose unwavering support and contributions have been instrumental in completing this thesis. Their assistance and encouragement have played a vital role in this journey, and I am deeply thankful to every one of them.

Foremost, I extend my profound appreciation to my esteemed research supervisor, Prof. L.I. Nalin de Silva. His invaluable guidance, sage advice, and unwavering support have been the cornerstones of this study's success.

I also sincerely thank Prof. S.A.S. Kulathilaka, Prof. U.P. Nawagamuwa, Prof. U.G.A.Puswewala and all other lecturers for their valuable suggestions and constructive feedback throughout this academic course. Their contributions have significantly enriched my knowledge and understanding of the subject matter.

Furthermore, I am grateful to the University of Moratuwa laboratory staff for the essential resources and unwavering support that has been given throughout this research.

Throughout this course, we studied as a team of four members during critical periods of COVID-19, connecting through digital platforms. Therefore, I sincerely thank our team members, T.D Wijesooriya, B.H.T. Ariyaratne, and L.N.S De Silva, for their continuous support throughout the academics and research work.

I owe my family and friends gratitude for their constant support and encouragement. Their belief in me has been a constant motivation throughout this challenging journey.

Lastly, I acknowledge all individuals and organizations whose works, and research have been cited in this thesis. Their contributions have greatly informed and shaped this study.

This research has been a fulfilling and enlightening experience, and I am confident that the knowledge gained during this endeavour will prove invaluable in my future endeavours.

CONTENTS

DECLARATION.....	i
Abstract	ii
DEDICATION.....	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	iv
CONTENTS.....	v
LIST OF FIGURES.....	ix
LIST OF TABLES.....	xii
List of Abbreviations.....	xv
CHAPTER 01 -INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Background	1
1.2 Problem Statement	4
1.3 Research Aim and Objectives	4
1.3.1 Research Aim.....	4
1.3.2 Research Objectives.....	4
1.4 Scope of research	5
CHAPTER 02 – RESEARCH LITERATURE REVIEW	6
2.1 The Current Method for Calculating Uplift Capacity.	6
2.2 Other available Uplift capacity calculation methods.	7
2.2.1 Method described as Cone method.....	7
2.2.2 Method described as Earth pressure method.	9
2.2.3 Method described as Semi-empirical method.....	11
2.3 Uplift capacity variation and applicable calculation methods for undercut foundations	13

2.4 Uplift capacity variation and applicable calculation methods for general foundations.....	14
2.5 Uplift capacity improvement techniques available	15
2.5.1 Uplift capacity Improvement with soil cement stabilization techniques by (Consoli et al., 2013).....	15
2.5.2 Uplift capacity improvement with addition of fiber to soil cement stabilization.....	19
2.5.3 Improvement of uplift capacity using geo-grids.....	21
CHAPTER 03 – METHODOLOGY	25
3.1 Introduction	25
3.2 Data collection procedure.....	26
3.3 Laboratory testing procedure	27
3.4 Development of a Model in 3D Finite element and analysis	27
CHAPTER 04 – RESULTS AND ANALYSIS	29
4.1 Model validation by PLAXIS	29
4.2 Laboratory testing and results	30
4.3 Development of PLAXIS model for analysis	37
4.4 Uplift capacity of foundation with the modified soil using undrained shear strength parameters.	42
4.5 Uplift capacity with the depth of the foundation.....	43
4.5.1 Uplift capacity variation for different depths of foundation with remoulded soil.....	43
4.5.2 Uplift capacity variation for different depths of foundation with modified soil.....	44
4.5.3 Comparison of Uplift capacity variation for different depths of foundation with improved soil.	47

4.6 Uplift capacity variation with the modified soil by changing the Angle of improvement.	48
4.6.1 Uplift capacity variation with the angle of improvement for foundation depth of 2.0 m.	49
4.6.2 Comparison of uplift capacity with the angle of improvement for a foundation depth of 2.0 m.	50
4.6.3 Uplift capacity variation with the angle of improvement for the foundation depth of 2.5 m.	51
4.6.4 Comparison of uplift capacity with the angle of improvement for foundation depth of 2.5 m.	53
4.6.5 Uplift capacity variation with the angle of improvement for the foundation depth of 3.0 m.	53
4.6.6 Comparison of uplift capacity with the angle of improvement for the foundation depth of 3.0 m.	55
4.6.7 Comparison of uplift capacity with the angle and depth of improvement.	55
4.7 Uplift capacity variation of foundation with the improved soil as alternative layers of improvement.	57
4.7.1 Uplift capacity variation of foundation as alternative layers for a foundation depth of 2.0 m.	58
4.7.2 Uplift capacity variation of foundation as alternative layers for a foundation depth of 2.5 m.	60
4.7.3 Uplift capacity variation of foundation as alternative layers for a foundation depth of 3.0 m.	62
4.7.4 Comparison of uplift capacity for alternative layers of soil improvement for different depths of foundation.	64
4.8 Uplift capacity variation of foundation with the improved soil by a layer starting from the bottom of the foundation.	66

4.8.1 Uplift capacity variation of foundation as a 1.5 m improvement layer starting from the bottom of the foundation.	66
4.8.2 Uplift capacity variation of foundation as a 2.0 m improvement layer starting from the bottom of the foundation.	70
4.8.3 Uplift capacity variation of foundation as a 2.5 m improvement layer starting from the bottom of the foundation.	71
4.8.4 Comparison of uplift capacity variation of foundation with the improved soil by a layer starting from the bottom of the foundation.	72
CHAPTER 05 - CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION	76
5.1 Conclusion.....	76
5.2 Recommendation.....	78
REFERENCES.....	80
APPENDIXES	83

LIST OF FIGURES

<i>Figure 2. 1 – Inverted frustum shape considered for the design.....</i>	<i>6</i>
<i>Figure 2. 2 – Arrangement of physical model (Consoli et al., 2013).....</i>	<i>16</i>
<i>Figure 2. 3 - Displacement of pullout tests carried out (Consoli et al., 2012)</i>	<i>21</i>
<i>Figure 2. 4 - Results of FEA and laboratory test by (Yunkul et al.,2021)</i>	<i>22</i>
<i>Figure 3. 1 – Flow chart for the methodology of the research.....</i>	<i>26</i>
<i>Figure 4. 1 - Prepared samples for testing.....</i>	<i>32</i>
<i>Figure 4. 2 – Sample extraction and preparation for triaxial test</i>	<i>33</i>
<i>Figure 4. 3 – Conducting laboratory tests.</i>	<i>34</i>
<i>Figure 4. 4 – Sieve Analysis test results</i>	<i>36</i>
<i>Figure 4. 5 – Typical design of foundation type of S3 of TD3 (as per CEB specification)</i>	<i>37</i>
<i>Figure 4. 6 - Structure of the PLAXIS model</i>	<i>38</i>
<i>Figure 4. 7 – Finite element mesh of the model</i>	<i>39</i>
<i>Figure 4. 8 – Load displacement curve of the model</i>	<i>40</i>
<i>Figure 4. 9 - Deformed shape of the model after analysis</i>	<i>40</i>
<i>Figure 4. 10 – Total displacement diagram</i>	<i>41</i>
<i>Figure 4. 11 – Incremental strain diagram</i>	<i>41</i>
<i>Figure 4. 12 – Uplift capacity variation with the cohesion of improved soil.....</i>	<i>43</i>
<i>Figure 4. 13 – Configuration for different depths of foundation</i>	<i>44</i>
<i>Figure 4. 14 – Uplift capacity variation for different depths with C= 20 kPa.....</i>	<i>45</i>
<i>Figure 4. 15 - Uplift capacity variation for different depths with C= 40 kPa</i>	<i>46</i>
<i>Figure 4. 16 - Uplift capacity variation for different depths with C= 60 kPa</i>	<i>47</i>
<i>Figure 4. 17 - Uplift capacity variation with foundation depth and degree of soil improvement (cohesion)</i>	<i>48</i>
<i>Figure 4. 18 – Configuration of uplift capacity improvement with angle.....</i>	<i>49</i>
<i>Figure 4. 19 - Uplift capacity variation with cohesion and different improvement angles for a 2.0 m founding depth.....</i>	<i>51</i>
<i>Figure 4. 20 - Uplift capacity variation with cohesion and different improvement angles for a 2.5 m foundation depth.....</i>	<i>53</i>

<i>Figure 4. 21 – Uplift capacity variation with cohesion and different improvement angles for a 2.0 m founding depth.....</i>	<i>55</i>
<i>Figure 4. 22 – Comparison of uplift capacity variation with cohesion and different improvement angles for a foundation depths of 2.0, 2.5, and 3.0 m</i>	<i>56</i>
<i>Figure 4. 23 - Configuration of Layer-wise improvement.....</i>	<i>57</i>
<i>Figure 4. 24 – Uplift capacity variation of layer-wise improvement with different angles and cohesion for a 2.0 m foundation depth.</i>	<i>59</i>
<i>Figure 4. 25 – Uplift capacity variation of layer-wise improvement with different angles and cohesion for a 2.5 m foundation depth.</i>	<i>61</i>
<i>Figure 4. 26 - Uplift capacity variation of layer-wise improvement with different angles and cohesion for a 3.0 m foundation depth.</i>	<i>63</i>
<i>Figure 4. 27 – Comparison of uplift capacity variation of layer-wise improvement with different angles and cohesions at founding depths of 2.0, 2.5, and 3.0 m.....</i>	<i>64</i>
<i>Figure 4. 28 – Comparison of uplift capacities of layer-wise configuration with the improvement of actual excavation.....</i>	<i>65</i>
<i>Figure 4. 29 – Configurations of improvement as a layer starting from the bottom of the foundation.....</i>	<i>66</i>
<i>Figure 4. 30 – Uplift capacity variation as an improvement of 1.5 m thick layer for a 2.0 m foundation depth.....</i>	<i>67</i>
<i>Figure 4. 31 - Uplift capacity variation as an improvement of 1.5 m thick layer for a 2.5 m foundation depth.....</i>	<i>68</i>
<i>Figure 4. 32 – Uplift capacity variation as an improvement of 1.5 m thick layer for a 3.0 m foundation depth.....</i>	<i>69</i>
<i>Figure 4. 33 - Uplift capacity variation as an improvement of 2.0 m thick layer for a 2.5 m foundation depth.....</i>	<i>70</i>
<i>Figure 4. 34 - Uplift capacity variation as an improvement of 2.0 m thick layer for a 3.0 m foundation depth.....</i>	<i>71</i>
<i>Figure 4. 35 – Uplift capacity variation as an improvement of 2.5 m thick layer for a 3.0 m foundation depth.....</i>	<i>72</i>
<i>Figure 4. 36 – Comparison of uplift capacity variation for an improvement angle of 25 degrees for layer thicknesses of 1.5, 2.0 and 2.5.....</i>	<i>73</i>

Figure 4. 37 – Comparison of uplift capacity variation for an improvement angle of 30 degrees for layer thicknesses of 1.5, 2.0 and 2.5..... 74

Figure 4. 38 - Comparison of uplift capacity variation for an improvement angle of 35 degrees for layer thicknesses of 1.5, 2.0, and 2.5..... 74

LIST OF TABLES

<i>Table 2. 1 – Results of uplift capacities by (Consoli et al., 2013).....</i>	<i>17</i>
<i>Table 2. 2 – Laboratory tests summary of uncemented and cemented backfill (Rattley et al., 2007).....</i>	<i>18</i>
<i>Table 2. 3 – Results of uplift capacity tests carried out for uncemented and cemented sand (Rattley et al., 2007)</i>	<i>18</i>
<i>Table 2. 4 – Peak uplift capacities of the tests (Consoli et al., 2012)</i>	<i>20</i>
<i>Table 4. 1 – Uplift capacities of the physical model vs numerical model</i>	<i>29</i>
<i>Table 4.2 – Soil investigation test data.....</i>	<i>30</i>
<i>Table 4. 3 – Details of prepared samples</i>	<i>31</i>
<i>Table 4. 4 – Laboratory test results of remoulded soil and soil mixed with cement. .</i>	<i>35</i>
<i>Table 4. 5 – Compressive strength test results of specimens mixed with 3% cement. </i>	<i>35</i>
<i>Table 4. 6 – Atterberg test results.....</i>	<i>36</i>
<i>Table 4. 7 – Classification as per USCS</i>	<i>37</i>
<i>Table 4. 8 – Uplift capacity with the cohesion of improved soil</i>	<i>42</i>
<i>Table 4. 9 – Uplift capacity variation with the depth of foundation</i>	<i>44</i>
<i>Table 4. 10 – Uplift capacity for different foundation depths with C=20 kPa.....</i>	<i>45</i>
<i>Table 4. 11 - Uplift capacity for different foundation depths with C=40 kPa.....</i>	<i>46</i>
<i>Table 4. 12 - Uplift capacity for different foundation depths with C=60 kPa.....</i>	<i>47</i>
<i>Table 4. 13 - Uplift capacity for different improvement angles with C=20 kPa and 2.0 m foundation depth.....</i>	<i>49</i>
<i>Table 4. 14 - Uplift capacity for different improvement angles with C=40 kPa and 2.0 m foundation depth.....</i>	<i>50</i>
<i>Table 4. 15 - Uplift capacity for different improvement angles with C=60 kPa and 2.0 m foundation depth.....</i>	<i>50</i>
<i>Table 4. 16 - Uplift capacity for different improvement angles with C=20 kPa and 2.5 m foundation depth.....</i>	<i>51</i>
<i>Table 4. 17 - Uplift capacity for different improvement angles with C=40 kPa and 2.5 m foundation depth.....</i>	<i>52</i>

<i>Table 4. 18 - Uplift capacity for different improvement angles with C=60 kPa and 2.5 m foundation depth.....</i>	<i>52</i>
<i>Table 4. 19 - Uplift capacity for different improvement angles with C=20 kPa and 3.0 m foundation depth.....</i>	<i>54</i>
<i>Table 4. 20 - Uplift capacity for different improvement angles with C=40 kPa and 3.0 m foundation depth.....</i>	<i>54</i>
<i>Table 4. 21 - Uplift capacity for different improvement angles with C=60 kPa and 3.0 m foundation depth.....</i>	<i>54</i>
<i>Table 4. 22 – Summary of percentage-wise improvement for different angle and foundation depths.....</i>	<i>56</i>
<i>Table 4. 23 – Uplift capacity of layer-wise improvement with different angles and C=20 kPa for a 2.0 m foundation depth</i>	<i>58</i>
<i>Table 4. 24 – Uplift capacity of layer-wise improvement with different angles and C=40 kPa for a 2.0 m foundation depth</i>	<i>58</i>
<i>Table 4. 25 – Uplift capacity of layer-wise improvement with different angles and C=60 kPa for a 2.0 m foundation depth</i>	<i>59</i>
<i>Table 4. 26 – Uplift capacity of layer-wise improvement with different angles and C=20 kPa for a 2.5 m foundation depth</i>	<i>60</i>
<i>Table 4. 27 – Uplift capacity of layer-wise improvement with different angles and C=40 kPa for a 2.5 m foundation depth</i>	<i>60</i>
<i>Table 4. 28 – Uplift capacity of layer-wise improvement with different angles and C=60 kPa for a 2.5 m foundation depth</i>	<i>61</i>
<i>Table 4. 29 – Uplift capacity of layer-wise improvement with different angles and C=20 kPa for a 3.0 m foundation depth</i>	<i>62</i>
<i>Table 4. 30 – Uplift capacity of layer-wise improvement with different angles and C=40 kPa for a 3.0 m foundation depth</i>	<i>62</i>
<i>Table 4. 31 – Uplift capacity of layer-wise improvement with different angles and C=60 kPa for a 3.0 m foundation depth</i>	<i>63</i>
<i>Table 4. 32 – Uplift capacity as an improvement of 1.5 m thick layer for a 2.0 m foundation depth.....</i>	<i>67</i>
<i>Table 4. 33 - Uplift capacity as an improvement of 1.5 m thick layer for a 2.5 m foundation depth.....</i>	<i>68</i>

<i>Table 4. 34 - Uplift capacity as an improvement of 1.5 m thick layer for a 3.0 m foundation depth.....</i>	<i>69</i>
<i>Table 4. 35 - Uplift capacity as an improvement of 2.0 m thick layer for a 2.5 m foundation depth.....</i>	<i>70</i>
<i>Table 4. 36 - Uplift capacity as an improvement of 2.0 m thick layer for a 3.0 m foundation depth.....</i>	<i>71</i>
<i>Table 4. 37 - Uplift capacity as an improvement of 2.5 m thick layer for a 3.0 m foundation depth.....</i>	<i>72</i>
<i>Table 4. 38 – Improvement as a percentage increase compared with remoulded soil backfill at 3.0 m depth.....</i>	<i>75</i>

List of Abbreviations

USCS	Unified Soil Classification System
CEB	Ceylon Electricity Board
UCS	Unconfined Compressive Strength
3D FE	Three-Dimensional Finite Element
CWR	Completely Weathered Rock
SC	Clayey Sand