



<http://researchspace.auckland.ac.nz>

ResearchSpace@Auckland

Copyright Statement

The digital copy of this thesis is protected by the Copyright Act 1994 (New Zealand).

This thesis may be consulted by you, provided you comply with the provisions of the Act and the following conditions of use:

- Any use you make of these documents or images must be for research or private study purposes only, and you may not make them available to any other person.
- Authors control the copyright of their thesis. You will recognise the author's right to be identified as the author of this thesis, and due acknowledgement will be made to the author where appropriate.
- You will obtain the author's permission before publishing any material from their thesis.

To request permissions please use the Feedback form on our webpage.

<http://researchspace.auckland.ac.nz/feedback>

General copyright and disclaimer

In addition to the above conditions, authors give their consent for the digital copy of their work to be used subject to the conditions specified on the Library Thesis Consent Form.

**IMPLEMENTATION OF A BUBBLE MODEL IN *FLAC* AND ITS
APPLICATION IN DYNAMIC ANALYSIS**

Bing Ni

Supervised by
Professor M. J. Pender

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Doctoral degree of
Philosophy,
Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering
The University of Auckland, 2007

ABSTRACT

Methodologies of implementing nonlinear constitutive models of soil in *FLAC* are studied in order to reduce numerical distortion, which has been found to occur in nonlinear dynamic analysis when a nonlinear soil model is implemented using an ‘apparent modulus’ approach. Analyses undertaken using several simple nonlinear soil models indicate that use of ‘plastic correction’ approach can eliminate or minimize the problem. This approach is therefore adopted in the thesis to implement in *FLAC* a bounding surface bubble soil model, *i.e.* the Bubble model. Satisfactory performance of the Bubble model has been obtained in dynamic analysis without using any of the additional mechanical damping given in *FLAC*.

An analytical study on the Bubble model is carried out with *FLAC*. On the basis of the study, the hardening function is modified to better incorporate size ratio effects of the yield surface and is explored to eliminate abrupt transition in stiffness from elastic region to yielding. Pore water pressure is formulated with the assumption that the pore water pressure is generated as a response to the constant volume constraint which prevents the tendency for volume change when plastic volumetric strain takes place. The formulation is added to the Bubble model so that pore water pressure can be generated automatically by the model for fully saturated and undrained soil. *FLAC* analyses indicate that the Bubble model is generally in good agreement with published experimental data.

The parameters and initial conditions associated with the Bubble model are studied with *FLAC* analyses in triaxial stress space to investigate their influence on the model and to investigate their effective ranges. Both large and small strain behaviors of the model are explored in the parametric study.

Finally, the Bubble model is applied in the modeling of vertical vibration of rigid strip foundations. The influence of soil nonlinearity on vertical compliance of rigid foundations is investigated. Some major factors are considered, which include initial stress level in soil, level of excitation and mass ratio of foundation.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My sincere gratitude goes to Professor Michael J Pender for his guidance, inspiration and encouragement. His time spent on the initiation of the study, numerous discussions and review of the research proposal and the final thesis is gratefully acknowledged. I also feel very grateful to him for his help in providing many useful reference papers and books and for his kindness to offer opportunities for me to obtain financial support for my study (including attending one national and two international conferences).

I also wish to acknowledge the following individuals: Prof. Ian Collins, Dr Tam J Larkin, Prof. Bruce W Melville (University of Auckland) and Snr. Engineer Sergei Terzaghi (SKM NZ) for their involvement in reviewing the research proposal; Dr. Roger D Hart (Itasca USA) for his thoughts on numerical instability in non-linear dynamic analysis; Philip J Nel (UoA) for his computer support. The Auckland University Engineering Library is thanked for obtaining a key reference paper from overseas.

The University of Auckland Doctoral Scholarship, the financial support and work opportunities from Tonkin and Taylor Ltd are gratefully acknowledged.

Finally, my special thanks go to my wife, Xiao Wang, for her support throughout the study. Without her doing most of the housework, especially looking after our two daughters, the thesis would never have been completed as it was planned.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	i
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ii
LIST OF FIGURES	vi
LIST OF TABLES.....	x
1 INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 General background	1
1.2 Objectives	1
1.3 Scope of work	2
1.4 Layout of the thesis	3
1.5 General remarks	4
2 LITERATURE REVIEW	6
2.1 Constitutive models of soil	6
2.1.1 Critical state soil mechanics and Cam-clay model	6
2.1.2 Two - surface model (Mróz et al. 1979)	10
2.1.3 Kinematic hardening rule (Hashiguchi 1985).....	16
2.1.4 Recent development of two/three-surface models	18
2.2 Nonlinear dynamic analysis with <i>FLAC</i>	30
2.3 Vertical vibration of rigid foundations	33
2.3.1 Classical work.....	33
2.3.2 Nonlinear numerical modeling of vertical vibration of rigid foundations	38
2.4 Summary	43
3 SOME KEY ASPECTS OF PROGRAMMING WITH <i>FLAC</i>	46
3.1 Finite elements in <i>FLAC</i>	46
3.2 Local and global variables	50
3.3 Initialisation	50
3.4 <i>FISH</i> state variables	51
3.4.1 Stress variables.....	51
3.4.2 Sub-element averaging.....	53
3.4.3 Strain increments	57
3.4.4 Pore water pressure	57
3.5 Summary	62
4 PLASTIC CORRECTION APPROACH	63
4.1 ‘Apparent modulus’ approach.....	63
4.2 ‘Plastic correction’ approach	66
4.2.1 Explicit and implicit integration	66
4.2.2 Procedures of plastic correction.....	68
4.3 Implementation of two nonlinear models	71
4.3.1 A hyperbolic model.....	71
4.3.2 A bilinear model	77
4.4 Discussion on numerical distortion.....	82
4.5 Summary	84
5 THE BUBBLE MODEL AND ITS IMPLEMENTATION IN <i>FLAC</i>	85

5.1	Description of the model (Rouania & Wood, 2000).....	85
5.2	Modifications of the Bubble model	92
5.2.1	Plastic modulus function.....	92
5.2.2	Elastic bulk modulus.....	97
5.3	Discussions	97
5.4	Pore water pressure	105
5.5	Implementation	106
Appendix 5.1	Notation.....	108
Appendix 5.2	Expanded equations	111
Appendix 5.3	Derivation of stress gradient	124
Appendix 5.4	<i>FISH</i> code of the Bubble model.....	127
6	VERIFICATION OF THE BUBBLE MODEL.....	141
6.1	Modelling of non-structured soil	141
6.1.1	Example 1	141
6.1.1.1	Drained behaviour.....	143
6.1.1.2	Undrained behaviour.....	147
6.1.2	Example 2	150
6.2	Modelling of structured soil.....	155
6.2.1	Example 1	155
6.2.2	Example 2	161
6.3	Comparison with the modified Cam-clay model	165
6.4	Comparison with experiment.....	166
6.5	Dynamic behaviour of the Bubble model	170
6.5.1	A single-zone <i>FLAC</i> triaxial model	170
6.5.2	A multizone <i>FLAC</i> triaxial model.....	177
6.6	Summary	180
7	PARAMETRIC STUDY OF THE BUBBLE MODEL.....	181
7.1	Typical values of parameters	181
7.2	Size of bubble	184
7.3	Plastic modulus parameters ' <i>B</i> and ψ '	191
7.4	Standard parameters.....	195
7.5	Destructuration parameters	201
7.6	Initial conditions	204
7.7	<i>G</i> – γ curves	210
7.7.1	Laboratory <i>G</i> – γ curves	210
7.7.2	<i>G</i> – γ curves of the Bubble model	211
7.7.3	Smooth transition in shear modulus.....	215
7.8	Summary	217
Appendix 7.1	Data file for modelling triaxial/oedometer tests	219
Appendix 7.2	MathCad programme for processing <i>G</i> – γ curves	224
8	APPLICATION OF THE BUBBLE MODEL	225
8.1	Parameters of the Bubble model	225
8.2	<i>FLAC</i> model.....	227
8.3	Typical response	229
8.4	Vertical compliance of the rigid foundation	233
8.4.1	Comparison between nonlinear and elastic models	234

8.4.2	Effects of dynamic stress level	236
8.4.3	Effects of initial static stress (<i>i.e.</i> factor of safety)	238
8.4.4	Effects of mass ratio.....	240
8.5	Compliance and impedance functions	241
8.6	Summary	244
Appendix 8.1	<i>FLAC</i> data files for vertical vibration of rigid foundations	245
9	CONCLUSIONS AND DISCUSSIONS	248
9.1	Main results and conclusions.....	248
9.1.1	Implementation of soil constitutive models in <i>FLAC</i>	248
9.1.2	Numerical distortion in nonlinear dynamic analysis	249
9.1.3	The Bubble model.....	249
9.1.4	Parameters of the Bubble model	250
9.1.5	Application of the Bubble model.....	252
9.2	Discussion	253
9.3	Suggestions for further research	256
	LIST OF REFERENCES	257

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 2.1 State boundary surfaces	7
Figure 2.2 Yield locus of Original Cam-clay model.....	8
Figure 2.3 Yield locus of modified Cam-clay model	9
Figure 2.4 The two-surface model by Mróz	11
Figure 2.5 Illustration of kinematic hardening rule	13
Figure 2.6 Two- surface model (Hashiguchi 1985)	17
Figure 2.7 The original bubble model (Al Tabbaa & Wood, 1989)	19
Figure 2.8 Bubble model for structured soil (Wood, 1995).....	23
Figure 2.9 3-SKH model.....	25
Figure 2.10 Two-surface by Kavvadas and Amorosi (2000).....	27
Figure.2.11. Cyclic response of a hyperbolic model in simulating a triaxial dynamic test	31
Figure 2.12 Stress-strain response with 2 % local damping.	32
Figure 2.13 A lumped parameter vibrating system.....	36
Figure 2.14 Vertical compliance functions for rigid circular foundations (redrawn after Lysmer and Richart, 1966)	36
Figure 2.15 Vertical compliance functions for rigid strip foundations (redrawn after Gazetas and Roesset, 1979)	38
Figure 2.16 Vertically oscillating circular foundation on elastoplastic half space (redrawn after Borja et al, 1993)	39
Figure 2.17 Cyclic displacement amplitude of a rigid foundation (redrawn after Pender, 2000)	40
Figure 2.18 Compliance function of a rigid foundation subject to vertical vibration (stress amplitude =120 kPa)	41
Figure 2.19 Vertical displacements a rigid strip foundation subject to rocking vibration	41
Figure 2.20 Vertical compliance function (cyclic pressure = 140 kPa).....	42
Figure 2.21 Influence of static factor of safety on displacement amplitude	43
Figure 3.1 Sub-elements in a quadrilateral element.....	46
Figure 3.2 Three single-element 2D axisymmetric models	47
Figure 3.3 Influence of boundary condition and shape of element on stress.....	48
Figure 3.4 Comparison between FISH state variable and user-defined variable.....	53
Figure 3.5 Comparison between FISH state variable and user-defined variable.....	55
Figure 3.6 Influence of location where FISH stress variables are updated	57
Figure 3.7 Effective and total stresses	59
Figure 3.8 Effective stress using user defined variable	61
Figure 4.1 Illustration of ‘apparent modulus’ approach	65
Figure 4.2 Sudden change in apparent modulus	66
Figure 4.3 Conceptual illustration in general stress space of plastic correction.....	67
Figure 4.4 Flow chart of ‘plastic correction’ approach.....	69
Figure 4.5 Conceptual illustration of ‘plastic correction’ approach	70
Figure 4.6 Flow chart of a hyperbolic model modified for cyclic loading	72
Figure 4.7 Dynamic response of the hyperbolic model	73

Figure 4.8 Dynamic response of the hyperbolic model without additional damping.....	73
Figure 4.9 Static response of the hyperbolic model.....	74
Figure 4.10 Dynamic response with a timestep of 1.0×10^{-6} second	74
Figure 4.11 A bilinear model using ‘plastic correction’ approach	78
Figure 4.12 Flow chart of implementation of a bilinear model	78
Figure 4.13 Dynamic response of a multi-zone bilinear model.....	80
Figure 4.14 Comparison of the bilinear model with Mohr-Coulomb model.....	80
Figure 5.1 Three surfaces of the Bubble model.....	88
Figure 5.2 Initial state of a non-structured soil	93
Figure 5.3 Stress-strain behaviour with variable bubble size ($B = 4$).....	93
Figure 5.4 Response of the bubble model to different combinations of B and R.....	94
Figure 5.5 Relationship between B and R	94
Figure.5.6 Relationship of C and R	96
Figure 5.7 Response of the model with new hardening function and constant B.....	96
($R = 0.001 \sim 1.0$, $B = 2000$).....	96
Figure 5.8 Yield surface.....	98
Figure 5.9 Normal consolidation line and swelling line	101
Figure 5.10 Normalised distance of bubble to structure surface	102
Figure 5.11 Kinematic hardening of bubble	103
Figure 5.12 Flow chart for implementation of the Bubble model	107
Figure 6.1 Initial stress conditions of three cases (same structure surface).....	142
Figure 6.2 Drained stress-strain behaviour for Case 2.....	143
Figure 6.3 Location of surfaces at 5% vertical strain	144
Figure 6.4 Location of surfaces at 10% vertical strain	144
Figure 6.5 Location of surfaces at 20% vertical strain	145
Figure 6.6 Drained stress-strain behaviour (same initial structure surface)	145
Figure 6.7 Volumetric strain (same initial structure surface)	146
Figure 6.8 Drained stress path (same initial structure surface).....	146
Figure 6.9 Undrained stress-strain behaviour (same initial structure surface)	148
Figure 6.10 Isotropic hardening of the structure surface	148
Figure 6.11 Undrained effective stress path (same initial structure surface).....	149
Figure 6.12 Pore water pressure (same initial structure surface).....	150
Figure 6.13 Initial stress states of three cases (variable initial structure surface).....	151
Figure 6.14 Undrained stress-strain behaviour (variable initial structure surface).....	151
Figure 6.15 Effective stress path (variable initial structure surface)	153
Figure 6.16 Pore water pressure (variable structure surface)	153
Figure 6.17 Influence of ‘B’ on effective stress path.....	154
Figure 6.18 Initial stress conditions of structured soil.....	155
Figure 6.19 Undrained stress-strain behaviour of structured soil	156
Figure 6.20 Destructuration of structured soil	157
Figure 6.21 Surfaces at 5% strain	158
Figure 6.22 Surfaces at 10% strain	158
Figure 6.23 Surfaces at 30% strain	159
Figure 6.24 Initial stress conditions of structured soil with anisotropy.....	159
Figure 6.25 Influence of anisotropy on stress-strain behaviour.....	160
Figure 6.26 Surfaces after destructuration at 30% strain ($\eta_0 = 0.5$).....	161

Figure 6.27 Initial stress conditions for three cases of a structured soil	162
Figure 6.28 Undrained stress-strain behaviour of structured soil	163
Figure 6.29 Effective stress path of structured soil.....	163
Figure 6.30 Pore water pressure response of the structured soil.....	164
Figure 6.31 Comparison with modified Cam-clay model (Drained).....	165
Figure 6.32 Pressure-void ratio curve for loose sands.....	167
Figure 6.33 Initial stress conditions of three tests.....	167
Figure 6.34 Comparison of Bubble model with published experiment data	169
Figure 6.35 A single zone triaxial model.....	170
Figure 6.36 Initial stress conditions	171
Figure 6.37 Drained dynamic stress-strain behaviour of Case 1 soil	172
Figure 6.38 Dynamic volumetric response of Case 1 soil	172
Figure 6.39 Undrained dynamic stress-strain response of Case 1 soil	173
Figure 6.40 Dynamic pore water pressure of Case 1 soil	173
Figure 6.41 Drained dynamic stress-strain behaviour of Case 2 soil	174
Figure 6.42 Dynamic volumetric response of Case 2 soil (40 cycles).....	174
Figure 6.43 Dynamic volumetric response of Case 2 soil (200 cycles).....	175
Figure 6.44 Undrained dynamic stress-strain response of Case 2 soil	176
Figure 6.44a Cyclic response of undrained deviator stress of Case 2 soil.....	176
Figure 6.45 Dynamic pore water pressure of Case 2 soil	177
Figure 6.46 Initial stress state of the multizone FLAC model.....	178
Figure 6.47 Undrained dynamic stress-strain response of a multizone triaxial model... ..	178
Figure 6.47a Cyclic response of undrained deviator stress of a multizone triaxial model	179
Figure 6.48 Dynamic pore water pressure (40 cycles)	179
Figure 7.1 Initial locations of surfaces associated with reference parameters.....	182
Figure 7.2 Single-element triaxial model.....	184
Figure 7.3 Elastic range vs bubble size ($B = 300$, drained)	185
Figure 7.4 Stress-strain behaviour ($B = 500$, drained).....	186
Figure 7.5 Stress-strain behaviour ($B = 600$, drained).....	186
Figure 7.6 Influence of R on volumetric behaviour ($B = 600$, $\psi = 0.5$, drained)	187
Figure 7.7 Volumetric strain vs mean pressure ($B = 600$).....	187
Figure 7.8 Stress-strain behaviour ($\psi = 1.0$, $B = 1500$, drained).....	188
Figure 7.9 Stress-strain behaviour ($\mu = 0.35$, $B = 250$, drained).....	189
Figure 7.10 Stress-strain behaviour ($\lambda^* = 0.2$, $B = 350$, drained)	189
Figure 7.11 Stress-strain behaviour ($\kappa^* = 0.04$, $B = 280$, drained).....	190
Figure 7.12 Undrained stress-strain behaviour	190
Figure 7.13 Pore water pressure.....	191
Figure 7.14 Influence of 'B' on stress-strain behaviour ($\psi = 0.5$, $R = 0.2$).....	192
Figure 7.15 Influence of parameter B ($\psi = 0.5$, $R = 0.01$).....	192
Figure 7.16 Influence of parameter ψ ($B = 600$)	193
Figure 7.17 Relationship between B and p_{c0} ($\psi = 0.5$).....	194
Figure 7.18 Relationship between B and p_{c0} ($\psi = 1.0$).....	194
Figure 7.19 Relationship between B and p_{c0} ($\psi = 1.5$).....	195
Figure 7.20 Influence of Poisson's ratio on stiffness (undrained)	196

Figure 7.21 Influence of Poisson's ratio on stiffness (drained)	196
Figure 7.22 Influence of λ^* on stiffness and strength (undrained, $\kappa^* = 0.02$)	197
Figure 7.23 Influence of λ^* on stiffness and strength (drained, $\kappa^* = 0.02$)	197
Figure 7.24 Influence of κ^* on stiffness and strength (undrained, $\lambda^* = 0.3$)	198
Figure 7.25 Influence of κ^* on stiffness (drained, $\lambda^* = 0.3$)	198
Figure 7.26 Dimensionless scaling function, M_θ ($M = 1.0$)	199
Figure 7.27 Influence of parameter 'm' (undrained axisymmetrical compression, $m = 0.7 \sim 1.0$)	200
Figure 7.28 Influence of parameter 'm' (undrained axisymmetrical extension)	200
Figure 7.29 Influence of parameter 'A' ($r_0 = 2.0$, undrained)	201
Figure 7.30 Influence of parameter 'A' ($r_0 = 4.0$, undrained)	202
Figure 7.31 Influence of parameter 'k' on destructuration ($r_0 = 2.0$, drained)	202
Figure 7.32 Size of structure surface, rp_c ($r_0 = 2.0$, drained)	203
Figure 7.33 Influence of parameter 'k' on stress-strain behaviour ($r_0 = 2.0$, drained)	203
Figure 7.34 Influence of initial stress (undrained, $p_{co} = 200$ kPa)	204
Figure 7.35 Influence of initial size of reference surface (undrained, $\sigma_3 = 200$ kPa)	205
Figure 7.36 Influence of initial size of structure surface ($p_{co} = 200$ kPa, $k = 8$, undrained)	206
Figure 7.37 Influence of initial anisotropy ($r_0 = 2.0$, $p_{co} = 200$ kPa, $k = 4$, undrained)	206
Figure 7.38 Calculated bulk modulus during undrained triaxial compression	208
Figure 7.39 Influence of K_{max} on static analysis	208
Figure 7.40 Dynamic response of a single-zone triaxial model (10 Hz, 20 cycles, vertical strain amplitude = 2%)	209
Figure 7.41 A typical laboratory $G - \gamma$ curve for cohesive soils	210
Figure 7.42 Influence of κ^* on small strain behaviour ($K_0 = 0$)	213
Figure 7.43 $G - \gamma$ behaviour when $K_0 \neq 0$	214
Figure 7.44 $G - \gamma$ curves with smooth transition in shear modulus ($R = 0.01$, $B = 1000$)	216
Figure 8.1 Undrained stress-strain response of soil ($\sigma_3 = 100$ kPa)	226
Figure 8.2 Pressure-settlement curve	227
Figure 8.3 FLAC model in dynamic loading stage	228
Figure 8.4 Vibration of the soil-foundation model under gravity	229
Figure 8.5 Dynamic displacements (24 Hz, 5 kPa stress amplitude, 100 cycles)	230
Figure 8.6 Dynamic displacements (24 Hz, 20 kPa stress amplitude, 48 cycles)	230
Figure 8.7 Dynamic displacements (24 Hz, 100 kPa stress amplitude, 5 cycles)	231
Figure 8.8 Influence of plastic strain ratio on displacement response (24 Hz, 60 kPa stress amplitude, 10 cycles)	232
Figure 8.9 Transient vibration (0.5 cycle, 24 Hz, 60 kPa, no additional damping)	233
Figure 8.10 Amplitude of displacement (Stress amplitude = 20 kPa)	235
Figure 8.11 Normalised amplitude of displacement (Stress amplitude = 20 kPa)	236
Figure 8.12 Influence of dynamic stress	237
Figure 8.13 Influence of dynamic stress ($a_0 = 0.5$)	237
Figure 8.14 Influence of dynamic stress ($a_0 = 2$)	237
Figure 8.15 Influence of factor of safety ($a_0 = 0.5$, stress amplitude = 20 kPa)	239

Figure 8.16 Influence of factor of safety (stress amplitude = 20 kPa).....	239
Figure 8.17 Time history of displacement ($a_0 = 0.5$, stress amplitude = 20kPa)	240
Figure 8.18 Influence of mass ratio (stress amplitude = 20 kPa, FOS = 3).....	241
Figure 8.19 Comparison of compliance functions of a rigid foundation between FLAC modeling and the semi-analytical solution by Gazetas & Roesset, 1979	242
Figure 8.20 Comparison of impedance functions of a rigid foundation between FLAC modeling and the semi-analytical solution by Gazetas & Roesset, 1979	243
Figure 9.1 Badly deformed elements	255

LIST OF TABLES

Table 5.1 Typical values of parameters λ^* and κ^*	98
Table 7.1 Typical soil parameters for parametric study	182
Table 8.1 Soil parameters in modeling foundation vibration	225
Table 8.2 Average amplitude of displacement in 10 cycles	232