

A303 Amesbury to Berwick Down

Applicant's provision of technical reports supporting the Environmental Information Review

> Ground Investigation - Phase 6 & 7 Factual Report Appendix C

> > Document reference: Redetermination 2.12

Planning Act 2008

The Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010

February 2022

APPENDIX C - IN-SITU TESTING

- (i) Standard Penetration Test (SPT) Summary Sheets
- (ii) SPT N value and N_{60} versus Elevation Plots
- (iii) Falling Head Test Results
- (iv) Packer Test Results
- (v) GCPT Log
- (vi) Pressuremeter Test Report
- (vii) Optical Televiewer and Downhole Geologging Logs
- (viii) Constant Rate Pumping Test Reports

Notes:

1. Tests carried out in general accordance with BS EN ISO 22476-3:2005, including amendment A1 (2011).

2. Reported blows are for 75mm penetration unless indicated "+".

3. Where full test drive was not achieved, actual penetration (R) and total test drive blows are reported.

4. Tests carried out using a split spoon sampler unless noted as SPT(c) (denotes use of solid cone method) in the comments column.

5. Entries in the water depth column reflects the measured water depth at time of test.

 N_{60} = (Measured hammer energy ratio / 60) x N value

Notes:

1. Tests carried out in general accordance with BS EN ISO 22476-3:2005, including amendment A1 (2011).

2. Reported blows are for 75mm penetration unless indicated "+".

3. Where full test drive was not achieved, actual penetration (R) and total test drive blows are reported.

4. Tests carried out using a split spoon sampler unless noted as SPT(c) (denotes use of solid cone method) in the comments column.

5. Entries in the water depth column reflects the measured water depth at time of test.

 N_{60} = (Measured hammer energy ratio / 60) x N value

Notes:

1. Tests carried out in general accordance with BS EN ISO 22476-3:2005, including amendment A1 (2011).

2. Reported blows are for 75mm penetration unless indicated "+".

3. Where full test drive was not achieved, actual penetration (R) and total test drive blows are reported.

4. Tests carried out using a split spoon sampler unless noted as SPT(c) (denotes use of solid cone method) in the comments column.

5. Entries in the water depth column reflects the measured water depth at time of test.

 N_{60} = (Measured hammer energy ratio / 60) x N value

Notes:

1. Tests carried out in general accordance with BS EN ISO 22476-3:2005, including amendment A1 (2011).

2. Reported blows are for 75mm penetration unless indicated "+".

3. Where full test drive was not achieved, actual penetration (R) and total test drive blows are reported.

4. Tests carried out using a split spoon sampler unless noted as SPT(c) (denotes use of solid cone method) in the comments column.

5. Entries in the water depth column reflects the measured water depth at time of test.

GINT_LIBRARY_V8_06.GLB : G - SUMMARY OF SPT TESTS - V3 - A4L : 733442_A3003_STONEHENGE_PHASE_6_GROUND_INVESTIGATION.GPJ : 11/4/19 15:46 : KJ2 :

 N_{60} = (Measured hammer energy ratio / 60) x N value

Notes:

1. Tests carried out in general accordance with BS EN ISO 22476-3:2005, including amendment A1 (2011).

2. Reported blows are for 75mm penetration unless indicated "+".

3. Where full test drive was not achieved, actual penetration (R) and total test drive blows are reported.

4. Tests carried out using a split spoon sampler unless noted as SPT(c) (denotes use of solid cone method) in the comments column.

5. Entries in the water depth column reflects the measured water depth at time of test.

GINT_LIBRARY_V8_06.GLB : G - SUMMARY OF SPT TESTS - V3 - A4L : 733442_A3003_STONEHENGE_PHASE_6_GROUND_INVESTIGATION.GPJ : 11/4/19 15:46 : KJ2 :

 N_{60} = (Measured hammer energy ratio / 60) x N value

Notes:

1. Tests carried out in general accordance with BS EN ISO 22476-3:2005, including amendment A1 (2011).

2. Reported blows are for 75mm penetration unless indicated "+".

3. Where full test drive was not achieved, actual penetration (R) and total test drive blows are reported.

4. Tests carried out using a split spoon sampler unless noted as SPT(c) (denotes use of solid cone method) in the comments column.

5. Entries in the water depth column reflects the measured water depth at time of test.

 N_{60} = (Measured hammer energy ratio / 60) x N value

GINT_LIBRARY_V8_06.GLB LibVersion: v8_06_018 Pr|Version: v8_06 - Core+Full Bristol SI - 012 | Grap G - PLOTS - PER PAGE - A4P | 733442_A3003_STONEHENGE_PHASE_6_GROUND_INVESTIGATION.GPJ - v8_06_| 12/12/18 - 16:38 | AD2 |

GINT_LIBRARY_V8_06.GLB LibVersion: v8_06_018 Pr|Version: v8_06 - Core+Full Bristol SI - 012 | Grap G - PLOTS - SITE - 1 PER PAGE - A4P | 733442_A3003_STONEHENGE_PHASE_6_GROUND_INVESTIGATION.GPJ - v8_06_| 12/12/18 - 16:34 |

GINT_LIBRARY_V8_06.GLB LibVersion: v8_06_018 Pr|Version: v8_06 - Core+Full Bristol SI - 012 | Grap G - PLOTS - PER PAGE - A4P | 733442_A3003_STONEHENGE_PHASE_6_GROUND_INVESTIGATION.GPJ - v8_06_| 12/12/18 - 16:38 | AD2 |

GINT_LIBRARY_V8_06.GLB LibVersion: v8_06_018 Pr|Version: v8_06 - Core+Full Bristol SI - 012 | Grap G - PLOTS - SITE - 1 PER PAGE - A4P | 733442_A3003_STONEHENGE_PHASE_6_GROUND_INVESTIGATION.GPJ - v8_06_| 12/12/18 - 16:34 |

GINT_LIBRARY_V8_06.GLB LibVersion: v8_06_018 Pr|Version: v8_06 - Core+Full Bristol SI - O12 - 012 - 012 | GrapI G- PLOTS - SITE - 1 PER PAGE - A4P | 733442_A3003_STONEHENGE_PHASE_6_GROUND_INVESTIGATION.GPJ - v8_06_| 12/12/

IN-SITU PERMEABILITY TEST - FALLING HEAD In accordance with BS EN ISO 22282-2:2012

Ground Level: **91.52**

Position ID : **R616** Depth (m below GL): **22.43-26.73** Test Number: **1**

Test Date: **14/06/2018 10:03:00** Test Supervisor: **MJJones**

National Grid Co-ordinates: **E:412596.9 N:141916.0**

TEST SETUP DETAILS

Depth measurements recorded from top of casing (top of casing 1.57m above GL).

PLOT OF WATER DEPTH AGAINST TIME

IN-SITU PERMEABILITY TEST - FALLING HEAD In accordance with BS EN ISO 22282-2:2012

Ground Level: **91.52**

Position ID : **R616** Depth (m below GL): **25.20-38.40** Test Number: **2**

Test Date: **14/06/2018 15:31:00** Test Supervisor: **MJJones**

National Grid Co-ordinates: **E:412596.9 N:141916.0**

TEST SETUP DETAILS

Depth measurements recorded from top of casing (top of casing 1.60m above GL).

PLOT OF WATER DEPTH AGAINST TIME

IN-SITU PERMEABILITY TEST - FALLING HEAD In accordance with BS EN ISO 22282-2:2012

Ground Level: **91.52**

Position ID : **R616** Depth (m below GL): **25.62-38.82** Test Number: **3**

Test Date: **15/06/2018 09:17:00** Test Supervisor: **MJJones**

National Grid Co-ordinates: **E:412596.9 N:141916.0**

TEST SETUP DETAILS

Depth measurements recorded from top of casing (top of casing 1.18m above GL).

PLOT OF WATER DEPTH AGAINST TIME

In accordance with BS EN ISO 22282-3 (2012)

INSTALLATION DETAILS

In accordance with BS EN ISO 22283-3 (2012)

In accordance with BS EN ISO 22282-3 (2012)

In accordance with BS EN ISO 22282-3 (2012)

INSTALLATION DETAILS

In accordance with BS EN ISO 22283-3 (2012)

In accordance with BS EN ISO 22282-3 (2012)

In accordance with BS EN ISO 22282-3 (2012)

INSTALLATION DETAILS

In accordance with BS EN ISO 22283-3 (2012)

In accordance with BS EN ISO 22282-3 (2012)

In accordance with BS EN ISO 22282-3 (2012)

In accordance with BS EN ISO 22282-3 (2012)

In accordance with BS EN ISO 22282-3 (2012)

In accordance with BS EN ISO 22282-3 (2012)

INSTALLATION DETAILS

¹ of ² BRISTOL, BS3 4EB

Client Highways England

Page

Bedminster

Contract:
BRISTOL, BS3 4EB

In accordance with BS EN ISO 22282-3 (2012)

INSTALLATION DETAILS

A303 Stonehenge Phase 6 Ground Investigation

¹ of ² BRISTOL, BS3 4EB

Client Highways England

Page

Bedminster

Contract:
BRISTOL, BS3 4EB

In accordance with BS EN ISO 22282-3 (2012)

INSTALLATION DETAILS

¹ of ² BRISTOL, BS3 4EB

Client Highways England

A303 Stonehenge Phase 6 Ground Investigation

Bedminster

Contract:
BRISTOL, BS3 4EB

Page

In accordance with BS EN ISO 22282-3 (2012)

INSTALLATION DETAILS

BRISTOL, BS3 4EB

Client Highways England Page

A303 Phase 6 Ground Investigation

Contract:
BRISTOL, BS3 4EB

1 of 2

In accordance with BS EN ISO 22282-3 (2012)

In accordance with BS EN ISO 22282-3 (2012)

In accordance with BS EN ISO 22282-3 (2012)

INSTALLATION DETAILS

In accordance with BS EN ISO 22282-3 (2012)

INSTALLATION DETAILS

In accordance with BS EN ISO 22282-3 (2012)

INSTALLATION DETAILS

In accordance with BS EN ISO 22282-3 (2012)

 A303 Stonehenge Phase 6 Ground Investigation

Client

¹ of ³ BRISTOL, BS3 4EB

Highways England

Page

Bedminster

Examinister
BRISTOL, BS3 4EB
 CONTACT:

In accordance with BS EN ISO 22282-3 (2012)

Investigation

IN-SITU WATER PRESSURE TEST - DOUBLE PACKER In accordance with BS EN ISO 22282-3 (2012)

Initial pressure:

0.54 bar

In accordance with BS EN ISO 22282-3 (2012)

INSTALLATION DETAILS

A303 Stonehenge Phase 6 Ground Investigation

¹ of ³ BRISTOL, BS3 4EB

Client Highways England

Page

Bedminster

Contract:
BRISTOL, BS3 4EB
 CONTRACT:

IN-SITU WATER PRESSURE TEST - DOUBLE PACKER In accordance with BS EN ISO 22282-3 (2012)

Initial pressure:

1.51 bar

Note: Middle and Bottom Vib. Wire hydrostatic measurements deviate from calculated hydrostatic pressure.

In accordance with BS EN ISO 22282-3 (2012)

INSTALLATION DETAILS

In accordance with BS EN ISO 22282-3 (2012)

INSTALLATION DETAILS

CONTRESS 25 CONTRESS CO

Bedminster

Contract:
BRISTOL, BS3 4EB

IN-SITU WATER PRESSURE TEST - DOUBLE PACKER In accordance with BS EN ISO 22282-3 (2012)

In accordance with BS EN ISO 22282-3 (2012)

INSTALLATION DETAILS

CONTRESS 25 CONTRESS CO

Bedminster

Contract:
BRISTOL, BS3 4EB

IN-SITU WATER PRESSURE TEST - DOUBLE PACKER In accordance with BS EN ISO 22282-3 (2012)

In accordance with BS EN ISO 22282-3 (2012)

INSTALLATION DETAILS

CONTRESS 25 CONTRESS CO

Contract:
BRISTOL, BS3 4EB

IN-SITU WATER PRESSURE TEST - DOUBLE PACKER In accordance with BS EN ISO 22282-3 (2012)

CPT LOG 01

CPT LOG 01

A303 STONEHENGE GROUND INVESTIGATION

Results of pressuremeter testing carried out by Cambridge Insitu Ltd

AECOM project reference: 60547200 Structural Soils reference 733442 Cambridge Insitu reference: CIR1417/18 Original report date: July 2018 Version: 1.0

Volume 1 of 2

TEXT REPORT WITH A SUMMARY OF THE RESULTS

CAMBRIDGE INSITU LTD Little Eversden Cambridge ENGLAND CB23 1HE

PREFACE - EQUATIONS FOR MODULUS

G^s is secant shear modulus at a given fraction of mobilised shear stress. *f* and *g* are shape factors discovered by finite element modelling.

Table of Contents

VOLUME 2 DATA FOR BOREHOLE SBP604 AND CALIBRATIONS

A303 STONEHENGE – GROUND INVESTIGATION

1 INTRODUCTION

Cambridge Insitu Ltd (CI) was contracted by Structural Soils Ltd (the Contractor) to carry out pressuremeter testing at a single location adjacent to Stonehenge. This testing forms part of the feasibility study into the possibility of tunnelling sections of the A303. The material at this location is chalk, potentially phosphatic, and the purpose of the pressuremeter testing was obtaining engineering parameters for strength, stiffness, and if possible data for estimating the insitu stress state.

The Client was Highways England, and their representative was Aecom, who instructed and supervised the pressuremeter operation.

The field work took place between the $1st$ and $5th$ June 2018. Seven successful tests were made between 18 and 36 metres below surface. The sixth test was ended by the membrane rupturing but not before a reasonable quantity of data had been recorded. The type of pressuremeter used was a 95mm High Pressure Dilatometer (HPD) that is placed in a prebored cavity. The cavity wall is completely unloaded prior to the pressuremeter test commencing and this gives some alteration of the insitu stress state. A less disruptive type of pressuremeter test had been specified, using a self-boring probe. The chalk itself could almost certainly be self-bored but if flint was encountered then the test would be severely affected. Pre-boring using conventional rotary coring techniques was the compromise adopted.

This report is concerned only with the presentation of the pressuremeter test results. Any preliminary results are now superseded by the values reported here.

For details of the material, borehole locations etc refer to the report issued by Structural Soils Ltd (their reference 733442).

1.1 Instrument

The 95mm diameter Cambridge High Pressure Dilatometer is based on a smaller design by Dr J.M.O Hughes and was developed to carry out a pressuremeter test in soft to weak rock. In use the instrument is lowered into a nominal 101mm pocket, usually made by a rotary coring rig. Once in position, oil or gas pressure is applied down an umbilical and inflates a membrane covering the central third of the probe, so loading the borehole wall. The expansion of the membrane is monitored by sensitive feelers or 'arms' and the pressure applied is measured by transducers in the probe. The output of the probe is digital data; when converted to engineering units this gives a pressure/displacement curve of the horizontally orientated loading test. It is a complex instrument by normal site standards, uses strain gauged transducers throughout and incorporates a microprocessor controlled data acquisition system.

Although developed to test ground of the strength of weak rock, the pressure and displacement resolution of the instrument is such that it can operate at two extremes of ground conditions. The first is moderately weak rock, where it is likely the ground will only deform elastically and the pressure capability of the instrument will determine the end of the test. The second condition is typically stiff clay or dense sand, when the material will experience substantial plastic deformation at relatively modest pressures, and the strain range of the probe decides the limit of the test.

1.2 Analysis - general

The pressuremeter loading curve can be solved directly using mathematical expressions for the expansion of a cylindrical cavity. The solution conventionally is quoted in terms of stiffness and strength parameters for the material, specifically shear modulus, shear strength or friction angle as appropriate, and the insitu lateral stress. A number of simplifying assumptions are made about the nature of the test and the ground. For example it is assumed that the material is fully saturated, homogenous, isotropic and behaving as a continuum that fails in shear only and that the length of the pressuremeter is sufficient for the test to be modelled as a plane strain expansion.

It is also assumed that the cavity expands as a circle and hence the results have been obtained by analysing the curve derived from the average of all displacement followers as this gives the best representation of a circular expansion. The pressuremeter expands in an approximately circular manner, even if the resulting circle is offset with respect to the pressuremeter axis. Cavity expansion theory usually demands a circular expansion, so a plot of average displacement versus applied pressure is used in the analysis procedure.

The pressuremeter test gives data for the total radial stress and radial displacements of the cavity wall. The displacements are directly related to the hoop strain. In order to solve the boundary problem represented by a cavity expansion the radial strain and circumferential stress must also be known. If it is assumed that the test is undrained (as it usually is for clays) then the loading takes place without generating volumetric strains. This means that radial and shear strains are derived easily from circumferential strain. If the expansion is drained then a more complex solution is required, with shear and volumetric strains derived using assumptions about the dilatant behaviour of the material.

1.3 Analysis – specific parameters

These tests in chalk appear to be drained events in material showing yield for a relatively modest loading stress. They have therefore been treated as cavity expansions in a soil-like material. The decision about which type of analysis is appropriate is guided by the response of the unload/reload cycles, as these indicate if the mean effective stress is changing with the expansion.

For tests in high permeability material the solution proposed by Hughes et al (1977) has been used to identify values for the internal angle of friction and dilation. These estimates, together with other parameters, are used as input for a curve comparison routine based on Carter et al (1986). Some additional information (not directly measured by the HPD) is also required, such as the ambient pore water pressure and the critical state or constant volume friction angle. In general these have to be estimated, although there are techniques for guiding the interpretation.

Values for cavity reference pressure are obtained in the first instance using the construction due to Marsland & Randolph (1978). This method is sensitive to insertion disturbance, and the values quoted in the results have been derived predominantly from the curve optimisation process. On some tests we have experimented with the 'balance point check' technique as an alternative method of deriving insitu lateral stress estimates (Hoopes & Hughes, 2013) and this is explained in Part 5 of this report.

By estimating the overburden and likely pore water profile, and assuming that the best estimate of cavity reference pressure represents the total insitu lateral stress, the coefficient of earth pressure at rest, k_0 , can be derived.

Modulus data are obtained from the local slope of parts of the pressure/strain test curve, or preferable from small cycles of unloading and reloading. The initial slope will be influenced by disturbance - unload/reload cycles avoid this problem and are able to give consistent and repeatable descriptions of stiffness characteristics. In particulate material these cycles appear hysteretic and this non-linearity allows the degradation of stiffness with increasing strain to be described (Bolton & Whittle, 1999).

Pressuremeters shear the material and so the modulus obtained is shear modulus G. If Young's modulus E is required then provided the material is isotropic the relationship $E = 2G(1+\mu)$ can be used where μ is Poisson's ratio. Shear modulus from a horizontally oriented cavity expansion is G_{HH} and will probably need adjustment when used to calculate vertically influenced deformation.

Modulus parameters are also stress dependent. In drained material the mean effective stress and hence the modulus increases throughout the loading and a more complex procedure is required to find the equivalent modulus at the insitu stress state. A modified version of the Bellotti et al (1989) approach has been adopted and the results are given in Table 3.4. An attempt has also been made to estimate the maximum shear modulus and threshold elastic shear strain, using an approach suggested by Fahey & Carter (1993). These results are given in Table 3.5 and are speculative. If comparable data are available from small strain stiffness tests or seismic profiling it may be possible to fine tune our results.

1.4 Report layout

Although it is necessary to make judgments when analysing the data, this remains a factual report. The parameters derived represent what seems a reasonable choice having applied a particular analysis. Other choices are possible and the intention is that this report provides a full description of the tests and analytical methods employed so that the choices made here can be checked or modified. Section three of this volume contains tables of all the results with some figures showing parameters plotted against depth. There are some comments on the tests in section 5.

Appendix D is a guide to the analyses that have been applied, and uses examples from the tests on this contract to show how choices are made and the implications.

The header used on every page of this text report refers to the contract and the approximate date of the field work. The footer (intended for CI internal use only) refers to the document name and version number.

All the test data plots are given in Volume 2 of this report. The raw test data are` also available as files of readings in engineering units in a format easily accessed by several common spreadsheet programs.

1.5 Notation

The data collection system employed on site utilises a limited keyboard that restricts the options for describing a test. In particular it stores tests in the form B*** T** where *** must be a number. The 'B', which may be modified, is intended to refer to the borehole and the 'T' refers to the individual test. The location tested was designated SBP604 so a typical test reference used here is S604T2 – the second test in borehole SBP604. This is a limitation of the data collection software only, the analysed data uses different software and the full test reference.

Calibration tests to evaluate membrane stiffness and system compliance are reported in a similar manner, but using a test number that cannot be confused with an actual test.

1.6 Units

Pressure is quoted throughout in pascals. The smallest increment of pressure quoted is 0.1 kPa. Displacements are quoted in millimetres up to 4 decimal places. Once an estimate of the insitu lateral stress has been made, so allowing the original cavity diameter to be inferred, then displacements are converted to percent cavity strain.

2. DETAILS OF THE WORK CARRIED OUT

Table 2.1 Tests included

Notes:

- 1. Depth is metres below ground level to the centre point of the expanding membrane. For the HPD the membrane is 0.6m long, so ±0.3m of the quoted depth is loaded during the test.
- 2. 'Max Press' is the maximum pressure reached during the test.
- 3. Probe One probe was used for all tests, a 95mm diameter High Pressure Dilatometer (HPD) known as 'Wally'.
- 4. The probe has a calibration for its transducers, and additional calibrations for the membrane being used. The transducer calibrations are only carried out occasionally, the membrane calibrations are performed every time a membrane is changed.
- 5. 'Oper.' Is the operator. The tests were carried out by Robert Whittle of Cambridge Insitu Ltd.

3. SUMMARY OF RESULTS

Table 3.1 Initial stress state -

Notes on table 3.1

- 1. **Depth** is the distance below ground level to the centre of the pressuremeter measuring section.
- 2. **Origin** is the estimated diameter of the cavity when insitu conditions are restored. The cavity was initially cored at 101mm diameter.
- 3. **uo** is the ambient pore water pressure based on an assumed water table at 22.5mBGL.
- 4. **_{σ_{ho}** is our best estimate of the lateral insitu stress. A number of techniques are available} for identifying the lateral stress, and curve matching has been used to justify the choice made.
- 5. The pressuremeter cannot determine the total vertical stress, and so the table gives our best estimate. This affects k_o (the coefficient of earth pressure at rest) and OCR (the overconsolidation ratio).
- 6. **k^o** is the coefficient of earth pressure at rest, being the ratio of the effective lateral stress to the effective vertical stress, using the results in previous columns.
- 7. **ko (M&K)** is the coefficient of earth pressure obtained from the correlation suggested by Mayne & Kulhawy (1983) that combines the internal friction angle and the over consolidation ratio.
- 8. **OCR** is over consolidation ratio, a quasi-result using the ratio of the observed effective yield stress to the effective overburden stress.

Table 3.2 Parameters associated with strength

Notes on table 3.2

- 1. **p^f** (obs) is observed yield stress, the point where the loading response becomes noticeably curved.
- 2. **p^f** (calc) is calculated yield stress, the point where the curve fitting procedure indicates the loading response first becomes fully plastic.
- 3. **p^l** is limit pressure, derived from curve fitting. Because at some strain the chalk is prone to suffering a pore collapse these will be optimistic.
- 4. **c′** is drained cohesion, obtained from curve fitting. It is not possible to say from the pressuremeter results only whether these are reasonable values.
- 5. τ_f is mobilised shear stress at first yield, being p' _osin ϕ' + c' cos ϕ' .
- 6. **′** is the peak angle of internal friction from the slope of the plot of log effective radial stress vs log cavity strain (Hughes et al, 1977).
- 7. ψ is dilation angle and is derived in the same way as the friction angle. The procedure requires that ϕ_{cv} be known. We have assumed 28°.

 Table 3.3 Linear and non-linear parameters for deriving shear modulus

Notes on table 3.3

1. G_i is secant shear modulus from the initial slope. It is affected by insertion disturbance, so a comparison between this value and that from the first unload/reload cycle may be a useful indicator of the degree of disturbance.

- 2. G_{ur} is modulus obtained by taking the slope of the chord bisecting a cycle of unloading and reloading. This can only be shear modulus if the material response over the strain range of the cycle is linear elastic.
- 3. In practice, the strain behaviour of particulate material before achieving the peak strength (yield) is highly non-linear, a response which can be described by a power law. Secant shear modulus is given by a power law of the form $G_s = \alpha \gamma^{\beta-1}$ where α and β are discovered from a plot of reloading data on log scales.
- 4. If the response were linear elastic then $\beta = 1$ and α would be identical to G_{ur}.
- 5. Tangential modulus G_t is given by a power law of the form $G_t = \alpha \beta \gamma^{\beta-1}$
- 6. For comparison purposes, secant shear modulus parameters are given at three plane shear strain levels, γ of 1x10⁻²/10⁻³/10⁻⁴, but any value of shear strain can be used in the range 10^{-4} to 10^{-2} . All these modulus values are G_{hh}.
- 7. To quote values for secant Young's modulus E_s in the *axial* strain range 10⁻⁴ to 10⁻² use the following relationship: $E_s = 2\alpha(1+\nu) (\gamma\sqrt{3})^{\beta-1}$ where *v* is Poisson's ratio. The last 3 columns give the undrained Young's modulus calculated in this way (using a *v* of 0.2).

Table 3.4 Stress adjusted parameters for deriving shear modulus

Notes on Table 3.4

- 1. Stiffness in soil is stress and strain dependent. Because the tests are drained events every unload/reload cycle is taken at a different mean effective stress and gives a different result. From knowing some points on the stiffness/mean effective trend it is possible to correct or adjust to a reference stress level. For these tests the chosen reference stress is the effective horizontal stress, σ'_{ho} (see Table 3.1).
- 2. The data in table 3.3 are used to obtain from each loop a value for shear modulus at 0.1% shear strain, $G_{0.1\%}$
- 3. Estimate the mean effective stress at the cavity wall for each loop, σ'_{av} . The pressure at the start of each cycle can be used to give the radial effective stress p'_{c} and an approximation of σ'_{av} is then given by $[p'_{c}/(1+sin\phi_{pk})]$ - $[c'cos\phi_{pk}/(1+sin\phi_{pk})]$ where ϕ_{pk} and c' are peak angle of internal friction and drained cohesion
- 4. Plot G_{0.1%} values against σ'_{av} values and use this trend to obtain the exponent *n* of the power curve that best fits the response (Janbu, 1963). This describes the stress dependency.
- 5. For each loop calculate a stress adjusted or reference version of α (the shear stress constant) $\alpha_{\text{adj}} = \alpha [\sigma_{\text{ho}} / \sigma'_{\text{av}}]^n$.
- 6. Thereafter stress adjusted values of shear modulus are obtained from $G_{ref} = \alpha_{ref} \gamma^{\beta-1}$ where γ is any value of shear strain in the range 10⁻⁴ to 10⁻².
- 7. To quote values for secant Young's modulus E_s in the *axial* strain range 10⁻⁴ to 10⁻² use the following relationship: $E_s = 2\alpha_{ref}(1+\nu)$ ($\gamma\sqrt{3}$)^{β -1} where *v* is Poisson's ratio.
- 8. Because 0.1% shear strain has been used to derive the stress dependency exponent *n*, the adjusted data is optimised for this strain. The exponent is itself strain dependent, and ideally the steps 2 and 4 should be repeated if a different strain required.
- 9. The procedure was developed for drained tests in sand, and its applicability to this material is therefore speculative. Some data selection are necessary to produce the 'best fit' results. The first cycle in the test may be too close to the origin to be representative. It can be difficult to determine the relevant local stress for a cycle taken on the final contraction.

Table 3.5 Estimating Gmax –using Fahey & Carter, 1993.

Notes on table 3.5

- 1. This table gives the results of a speculative analysis to find the limits of the shear modulus parameters from the pressuremeter tests.
- 2. It is straightforward to rewrite the Bolton & Whittle 1999 result to give shear modulus in terms of the fraction of yielding shear stress : $G_n = \alpha [n\tau_f / \alpha]^{(\beta-1)/\beta}$. Here, n is the fraction and lies between zero and 1. The α value is α^* _{adi}.
- 3. Fahey & Carter (1993) use the following expression that relates the ratio of the current shear modulus to the maximum shear modulus (G/G_{max}) to the current fraction of mobilised shear stress, τ/τ_f : $G/G_{\text{max}} = 1 - f[\tau/\tau_f]^g$ where f and g are shape factors decided by computer modelling. For sand, for example, the Authors suggest 0.9 and 0.25 for *f* and g respectively. For the chalk we have used 0.85 and 0.7 by experiment (see remarks in Part 5 of this report).
- 4. There is a mismatch between the Fahey & Carter modified hyperbolic function and the power curve. However for more than 50% of the available range there is reasonable agreement about the value of G_{max} .
- 5. The threshold shear strain is obtained by inserting the derived value for G_{max} into the power curve expression.
- 6. Quoting values for G_{50} and G_{100} where the numbers refer to the % of mobilised shear stress uses the relationship given in [2] above.

Fig 3.1 Cavity Reference Pressure (Po) vs Depth

Fig 3.3 Friction and dilation angles vs Depth

Fig 3.5 Total Limit Pressure (Plim) vs Depth

Fig 3.7 Secant shear modulus vs Depth

4. FIELD CURVES

5. COMMENTS ON THE TESTS

This section collects together remarks and comments by the analyst that may be helpful when reviewing the data.

5.1 Balance Point Check

Hoopes & Hughes (2013) give a method for finding the cavity reference pressure (p_o) from the contraction phase of a pressuremeter test. The pressure in the probe is lowered to a value likely to be less than any plausible estimate of p_0 and is then raised in small steps, monitoring the change in displacement for each step. In fig 5.1 the pressure has been unloaded to a point A then held for a few seconds – the creep is comparatively large and is inward. The pressure is raised to point B and held. There is a small outward creep. It is raised to point C. There is a greater outward creep. These two readings imply that the pressure inside the probe at point C exceeds p_0 . hence the pressure is lowered to D. Here there is negligible creep, so the external pressure must be above p_0 . The internal pressure is further reduced to point E, about the same pressure as point B. There is a tiny inward creep, so the internal and external pressure are approximately balanced. One more reading at point F confirms this, as the creep inward increases suggesting the internal pressure is below the cavity reference pressure. Hence the conclusion is that p_0 is about 620kPa. It happens that for this test, from other analyses, p_0 was identified as 622kPa.

This may be fortuitous, and it is not quite clear why the method should work. At first sight it would appear to be the same procedure that is a standard part of the Ménard test, the taking of creep readings throughout the loading. This is well-known to give sometimes very misleading estimates when the reference pressure is used to represent the insitu lateral stress.

What is different is the condition of the material at the time the readings are made. The initial part of the loading takes place when the material has suffered reverse plastic failure, so the gradient of the loading is significantly less than the true stiffness of the material. All displacements and creep readings from this part of the test will be large by comparison with what is seen in fig 5.1 because they are plastic. Here the loading phase of the test has erased the stress history of the insertion process, and the cavity contraction is a controlled process starting from a known origin. The contraction has been taken far enough to see reverse failure but when the direction of loading is reversed (point A) the material has to respond elastically, albeit with a non-linear characteristic. All the data in fig 5.1 is part of a reload/unload cycle with stress increments passing through the insitu lateral stress. The only *plastic* creep interval is point A, showing the largest creep. This seems to be why the creep readings are sensitive to the far field stress.

Test 5 also included a balance point check (BPC). Here p_0 is identified as about 750kPa. Other analyses suggested 743kPa. The procedure was also applied to Test 7. Here the BPC suggested p_0 is about 970kPa. Other analyses suggested 993kPa.

5.2 Estimating Gmax and elas.

It is not possible to measure the maximum shear modulus directly with the pressuremeter due to the mechanical limitations of the displacement measuring system. It may be possible to form an estimate by adapting the procedure suggested by Fahey & Carter, 1993.

The Bolton & Whittle 1999 analysis for the decay of secant shear modulus is normally written as follows (the equations below are also given in the preface to this report):

Non-linear secant shear modulus G_s :

$$
G_s = \alpha \gamma^{\beta - 1}
$$
 [P.4]

 α and β are the constant and exponent of a power curve in shear stress: shear strain space and γ is plane shear strain. It is straightforward to rewrite [P.4] in terms of the fraction of mobilised shear stress at first failure, τ_f :

For secant shear modulus at mobilised stress levels less than failure, introduce *n* where 0 < *n* ≤ 1 $G_n = \alpha [n \tau_f / \alpha]^{(\beta - 1)/\beta}$ [P.9a]

If n is 1 then G_s refers to the first failure stress. If n is 0.5 then G_s is that which applies when 50% of the available shear stress is mobilised. The corresponding shear strains can be found by re-arranging [P.4]. Both these values depend on a reasonable estimate of τ_{f} .

From [P.9a] we can obtain a number of estimates that relate G_s and n. These in turn can be inserted into the Fahey & Carter modified hyperbolic function (repeated below):

Fahey & Carter, 1993

$$
G_s/G_{\text{max}} = 1 - f[\tau/\tau_f]^g \qquad [P.11]
$$

f and *g* are shape factors. Deciding appropriate values involves judgement. The multiplier *f* is required otherwise the hyperbolic function predicts infinite strain when $\tau = \tau_f$. Nevertheless it will obviously be a number approaching unity and 0.85 has been chosen to give the widest plateau of consistent agreement.

The shape exponent *g* is more problematic. Fahey & Carter use a range of values including some greater than 1. In the case of these tests g=2 would make the elastic threshold shear strain γ_{elas} greater than 1 x10⁻⁴ for several tests, which seems implausible. The first value of g that gives consistent results for γ_{elas} is 1, and 0.7 has been chosen as the best compromise but of course this is speculative. Figure 5.2 shows the results of some experimentation.

There will always be a mis-alignment of data because the hyperbolic function predicts infinite strain to reach the failure stress, and the power law predicts infinite stiffness at zero strain. Our values are taken to be when the trend is at a minimum, which from fig 5.2 would appear to be when $\tau/\tau_f = 0.2$.

APPENDIX A – DESCRIPTION OF THE EQUIPMENT

1 OUTLINE

The 95mm High Pressure Dilatometer (95HPD) is a pre-bored hole pressuremeter for testing a 101mm diameter pocket. When a test is required it is lowered into a pocket in the ground conventionally formed by an H size barrel. On completion of a test it is removed from the borehole which is then extended by conventional drilling techniques.

The instrument is 2 metres long. The central third of the instrument is covered by a 6mm thick reinforced rubber membrane. Pressure is applied to the inside of the instrument and the membrane expands, pressing against the borehole wall. The radial displacement of the inside boundary of the membrane is measured at six points equally distributed around the centre of the expanding section. It is up to 95mm in diameter at the ends of the membrane and 94mm diameter at the centre of the membrane where displacements are sensed.

This displacement, and the pressure necessary to cause the movement, are continuously monitored by strain gauged transducers contained within the instrument. Also within the instrument is the analogue and digital electronic circuitry necessary to condition the signals from the transducers. Every ten seconds a set of readings from all the measuring circuits are transmitted to the surface as an RS232 data stream which may be connected directly to the serial port of a microcomputer. Plotting these readings of displacement against pressure produces a loading curve for the material being tested. A number of mathematical analyses are available for translating this loading curve to fundamental strength and stiffness parameters for the ground.

Because the instrument has six strain arms there is some redundancy in the measurement of strain, and this enables the user to carry out a successful test even if one of the arms are defective. In order to give a similar level of reliability to the pressure measuring system a

second pressure cell is included in the HPD-MPX, and its readings provide a check of the performance of the first transducer.

The HPD can apply up to 30MPa of pressure to the ground, and can expand from an initial diameter of 95mm to nearly 150mm. It will resolve movements of less than 1 micron and pressure changes of less than 1kPa. Hence although it was developed to test weak rock it can make a test at two extremes of ground conditions - stiff clays, which yield at pressures below 1MPa, and weak rock with a shear modulus greater than 4GPa.

The instrument is based on a smaller device (the 73mm HPD) that has had a long and successful history of site work and has been used worldwide. It is a development of an instrument invented by Dr J.M.O. Hughes in 1978. Although internally complex by the standards normally applied to instrumentation of this kind, it is reliable and robust, and the routine maintenance is straightforward. Because all the signal conditioning electronics is contained in the probe itself , the instrument is unaffected by external changes such as replacing the cable.

An additional feature of this pressuremeter is an electronic compass module fitted to the foot of the instrument. This gives a continuous reading of the orientation of a fixed reference on the instrument with respect to magnetic North. The compass consists of two magneto-resistive sensors at right angles to each other. The output of the compass therefore is two signals which are the sine and cosine of the angle made with the Earth's magnetic field. The quotient of these gives an unambiguous direction.

Like all expansion pressuremeters in commercial use the HPD has one significant uncertainty- the loading curve which it produces is derived from following the movement of the *inside* boundary of an elastic membrane. This is different from the movements of the *outside* boundary of the membrane, and hence the movements in the material itself. For the

majority of the tests for which the HPD is used, this uncertainty is not significant. However for a small number of tests it is critical; for this reason the calibration procedure described in Appendix B necessarily is complex in order to reduce the margin of uncertainty and set limits to it.

The instrument and all associated electronics for capturing the data are powered from a 12volt vehicle battery.

2 THE MEMBRANE

The membrane itself is a nitrile rubber sleeve. Because the behaviour of the membrane has an influence on the derived displacements it is kept relatively thin (8mm for the standard probe) so that its contribution is small. By its very nature there is a gap between the instrument and the borehole and steps have to be taken to prevent the membrane extruding axially. This is achieved by stiffening the ends of the membrane with rings of stainless steel fingers known because of their appearance as 'Christmas Trees'.

There is a version of the membrane which carries local reinforcement at the ends consisting of kevlar strands. When the applied pressures are fairly modest (no more than about 50% of the available range) then this membrane can be used without Christmas trees.

The entire length of the of rubber membrane is covered with a sheath of eighteen stainless steel strips which are axially stiff but free to expand radially. This sheath protects the

membrane from sharp edges, and is known as a 'Chinese Lantern'. The individual strips do not overlap in the closed position.

3 THE PRESSURISING SYSTEM

The instrument is inflated by oil or gas. A strong hose connects the instrument to the pressure source, either a manually operated hydraulic pump or a pneumatic control system.

The passage down the centre of the hose is large enough to incorporate a steel logging cable with four electrical conductors. Three of these conductors are used; one carries the digital signals output by the instrument, and two carry power to the instrument from a conventional 12 volt vehicle battery. The power consumption of the pressuremeter is small; up to 500 metres of hose and cable could be connected to the instrument with only minor modification.

The advantages of the oil inflation are that it is inherently safe, requires very little equipment and because it is re-cycled the consumable costs are low. However if the instrument is on a long cable it takes time for the oil to return to the surface and in a dry hole it will never return unaided.

When working over water, it is normal to fill the probe itself with oil but surcharge it with air. Should the membrane become punctured the oil will keep the water out of the probe.

4 ELECTRONIC INTERFACE UNIT (EIU)

All pressuremeter hardware is powered by a single 12 volt vehicle battery. The battery is connected to the EIU, which introduces some protection and distributes the power to a number of outlets, including one for the pressuremeter. The returning signals from the

pressuremeter connect to the same socket. The digital signals pass through an optoisolation circuit and are then made available on two identical sockets for connection to the serial port of a computer. There is also an analogue signal which represents the output of TPC A.

The unit has a panel meter which can be switched either to read the battery volts or to read the analogue signal representing pressure in the probe.

5 DATA LOGGING / ANALYSIS SOFTWARE

Software developed by Cambridge Insitu is used to log the data during the test, and for analysing the results subsequently.

The logging software stores the incoming data, displays the pressure/expansion curve in real time, and provides a text file output of the test data in engineering units. This file is read directly by the analysis program, but can also be read by any of the common spreadsheet programs.

The analysis software provides routines which implement a number of standard analyses. The analyses tend to be graphically driven, meaning that the analyst identifies and marks significant parts of the curve, either for breakpoints or slope. The final screen for the analysis is then output as hardcopy backup for the decisions made.

APPENDIX B THE CALIBRATION PROCEDURES

INTRODUCTION

There are nine aspects to the calibration of the pressuremeter:

- **1.** Scale factors
- **2.** The displacement measuring system
- **3.** Pressure measuring transducers
- **4.** Reference ('zero') outputs
- **5.** Membrane stiffness
- **6.** Instrument compliance
- **7.** Membrane thinning
- **8.** Repeatability (or how much effort should be devoted to calibrations)
- **9.** Orientation

1. Scale Factors

The transducers in the probes are based on full bridge strain gauge circuits. Any such transducer produces an output dependent on the voltage being applied to it, the stress deflecting it and the amplification or buffering between it and the recording system.

The instruments contain electronic devices that provide a regulated voltage to the transducers and amplification of the resulting output signals. Because this electronic conditioning is a fixed part of the system it is not mentioned when presenting calibrations. The electrical output of the transducer, in volts, is quoted only as a function of the deflecting stress. This function is termed 'sensitivity' and gives the scale factor for deriving pressure or displacement from the transducer electrical output.

Although the output of the transducers is quoted in volts, the true output of the system is a digital data stream of ASCII encoded numbers representing volts. This signal can be connected directly to the serial port of a small computer. All variables associated with producing the final digital output from the strain gauge signals are a function of the pressuremeter itself, and are independent of external changes such as replacing the cable.

When using the sensitivity calibrations to convert readings from volts into engineering units we make two important assumptions about this output; that it is linear and that the hysteresis is negligible. The calibration procedure needs to provide evidence that these assumptions are reasonable.

2. The Displacement Measuring System

The displacement measuring devices used on the HPD are often referred to as 'the arms'. The arms are calibrated by mounting a micrometer above each in turn and recording the output for a given deflection. When calibrating the instrument it is necessary to plot these readings for both an increasing and reducing deflection. The difference at a given point between increasing readings and reducing readings is a measure of the hysteresis. The worst case figure is noted, and corrective action is taken if the hysteresis is outside an acceptable limit - normally 0.5% of the sensitivity.

The slope of the best fit straight line through all the points is used to quote the arm sensitivity - as an output for a given deflection in units of millivolts per millimetre (mV/mm). See fig B.1. A typical figure is 120mV/mm for a 95mm HPD. The arms have a range of 24mm so the output swing is about 3 volts.

3. Pressure Measuring Transducers

For pressure measuring circuits the maximum possible sensitivity is desirable, the only requirement is that the sensitivity be known and be linear and stable.

The sensitivity of internal pressure transducers is determined by placing a large metal cylinder over the probe and applying a known pressure to the inside of the

instrument. The pressure being applied is measured by a standard test gauge. As with the arms, readings are plotted, the hysteresis noted, and the best fit straight line drawn through the plotted points.

Pressure sensitivities are quoted in units of millivolts per MegaPascal and a typical figure for the 95mm HPD is 80mV/MPa. See fig B.2.

4. Reference ('zero') outputs

The other parameter that the transducers have is a known output for an 'at rest' position. This is the value of the outputs produced by the circuits with

atmospheric pressure both inside and outside the instrument, and any displacement measuring system at the initial radius position. This is called a little misleadingly 'zero'.

The absolute value of this figure is normally unimportant - it is not necessary that the figure be zero volts for zero displacement or stress, just that it be known. For practical purposes, as the analogue to digital converter outputs a number between –3.2767 and +3.2767 volts, the 'at rest' readings for the arms are set to be about -2 volts to allow a large output range with a margin for gradual drift over time.

A similar situation applies to the pressure cells – the absolute value of the 'zero' output is unimportant provided it allows the full pressure of the system to be resolved. However an exception is made for cell A. It is convenient to have an analogue representation of the pressure and a buffered output from cell A is taken to the surface via a spare way in the cable. Interpreting the output is easier if zero pressure reads as zero volts and this is arranged in the probe. This output is primarily used when making maintained load tests in softer ground where the resolution of a test gauge is not sufficient to see if the pressure is changing.
Adjustment positions using 1% metal film resistors are provided in the instruments for setting all 'zero' outputs.

It is normal to take zero readings both at ground level and also immediately prior to carrying out a test. A significant change between zero readings must be investigated. 'Significant' would mean a change of 30 millivolts from the last set of zero readings. It is not unusual for shifts of a few millivolts to occur from day to day. It is important that the zero readings be stable when viewed over a period of a few minutes.

Note that when using oil to inflate the probe, ground level readings are the preferred reference because once in the borehole the pressure transducers will read the head of oil. For gas inflation it is probably better to use the zero readings when the probe is in place in the borehole, because it will then be at the temperature most applicable to the test.

5. Membrane stiffness

The membrane that is expanded by the HPD has its own initial tension requiring a finite pressure to move it. The readings measured by the stress cells need to be reduced by this pressure in order to determine the net stress being applied to the ground.

The membrane correction has two components - the pressure to move the

membrane from its position at rest on the instrument, and a second component dependent on the radial expansion.

The technique for obtaining the correction data is to pressurise the instrument in free air, ideally using similar rates of expansion as would be applied during a test. For preference, 'free air' is actually inside a large cylinder that fits closely at the ends of the membrane but allows a large expansion elsewhere. This is partly for safety, but also because the ends of the membrane are usually reinforced by the Christmas trees and it is important that these are not over extended.

The slope and the intercept on the pressure axis of the graph produced by this test give the membrane correction information for each arm. See fig B.3.

Knowing that the membrane does not necessarily possess isotropic properties, it has been customary to derive a different set of figures for each arm position. However recent work indicates that an unconfined inflation in air exaggerates any variation in membrane properties; an average correction factor is more appropriate.

The membrane correction data is quoted as a pressure in kPa to move the membrane from its rest position together with a second pressure in units of kPa/mm representing the pressure increase necessary to maintain the inflation. Typical correction figures might be 45kPa and 15kPa/mm.

6. Instrument compliance

The instrument will deform as a consequence of the pressure being internally applied. Put simply, the instrument stretches. Because the displacement measuring system uses the body of the instrument as a reference, movements of the body are seen as apparent displacements of the membrane; some ingenuity is needed to immunise the displacement measuring system from this problem. This system compliance has implications for the measurement of shear modulus, and it can become a significant source of error when

measuring very high modulus values. There are a number of effects to consider but they are collectively determined using a single procedure. The correction figure which results is known somewhat inappropriately as 'membrane compression'.

The procedure normally suggested to obtain correction data for

'membrane compression' is to inflate the pressuremeter inside a number of cylinders of different bores; by comparing these known bores with the displacements actually obtained from the pressuremeter then a correction curve can be obtained. Because the correction has been assumed to be a function of membrane thickness, then it is expected that the effect reduces as the membrane thins. In other words, it is treated as a strain dependent variable, and a change in membrane means a new correction curve must be derived.

For the Cambridge family of pressuremeters real membrane compression, that is the membrane changing in thickness as a direct result of the pressure differential across it, is almost too small to be measurable. There are a number of other factors to consider of significantly greater magnitude than membrane compression.

Inflating the instrument inside a metal cylinder will in theory provide data on the magnitude of these effects. However a separate source of error, which is a function of the calibration procedure itself, then becomes apparent. The membrane is able to expand axially by a small amount, and as a result experiences a change in thickness which may not occur in the ground. Although steps can be taken to keep this axial movement to a minimum, it cannot be easily eliminated.

As a consequence of the poor fit of a calibration cylinder, and also of the relatively low coefficient of friction between the membrane and the steel by comparison with the membrane and the ground, the instrument will move about in the cylinder - its centre will not be the same as the centre of the cylinder. Only average radial movement can be derived from this calibration process, and it is not possible to obtain good data for each arm.

Much of the apparent correction is due to the Chinese lantern strips taking up the form of the cylinder, a process that would only occur in the ground if the material was good rock.

This is the explanation for much of the initial curvature that occurs when an assembled probe is inflated inside a metal sleeve - it is a serious error to attempt to derive a correction factor from this part of the loading.

Taking account of all the above, the following method is used to calibrate the 95mm HPD. The Chinese lantern is removed, and an aluminium cylinder of known properties with close fitting ends is placed over the membrane of the instrument. It is the same cylinder as is used to do membrane correction tests, and in fact a single test can be used to obtain all membrane parameters. The instrument is inflated slowly until the membrane contacts the wall of the cylinder. This data are used for membrane correction. Now the test continues, either as a gentle continuous inflation or in discrete steps of 10 bars. Each step is held briefly to ensure maximum accuracy. The probe is pressurised up to 200 bars, its safe maximum working pressure. The pressure is then reduced, also in steps of 10 bars. Some users prefer the unloading should be down to 20 bars, then the probe should be reloaded again to maximum pressure and unloaded to zero, in effect doing a large unload/reload cycle. In a good calibration, all loading and unloading slopes will be similar, but it sometimes happens that the probe moves with respect to the cylinder and this will affect the data. In this event doing the second reloading would give the best correction information.

The calibration is obtained by plotting the pressure/displacement data on a large scale, and finding the best fit slope through the points. The slope ought to be the known expansion of the cylinder for a change of 200 bars. In practice it is always a little more, the difference being the 'membrane compression' figure. We quote the figure in terms of 'mm/GPa' a typical compression being 3mm/GPa. The cylinder normally used to carry out the compression test has an elastic slope of 2.7mm/GPa. See fig B.4.

Quoting the compression in this manner allows the software to calculate the appropriate error for every step of pressure and to make the necessary adjustment to the measured displacements.

To put the correction in context, a slope of 5mm/GPa (a relatively large correction) is equivalent to a modulus greater than 4GPa. However, because the calibration is highly repeatable, with an uncertainty of less 0.5mm/GPa, it is reasonable to quote modulus parameters of up to 20GPa.

7. Membrane thinning

During a test the pressuremeter membrane changes in thickness as a consequence of being stretched. This change in thickness can be calculated by assuming to a first approximation that the cross-section area of the membrane remains constant. The calculation is incorporated into the program that converts raw data into engineering units.

Note that the term 'membrane' includes the stainless steel protective sheath, and that the measurement made by the arms is the radial distance to the inside of the membrane.

Definition of Terms

Calculation

At rest the cross-section area of rubber $= \pi (b-t)^2 - \pi a^2$ The expanded cross-section area of rubber $=\pi (r-t)^2 - \pi c^2$ Because the rubber is incompressible, these must be equal:-

Therefore $(b-t)^2 - a^2 = (r-t)^2 - c^2$ Now:- $c = a + d$ and:- $r = b + E$ hence $(b-t)^2 - a^2 = [(b+E)-t]^2 - (a+d)^2$

$$
\therefore [(b-t)+E]^2 = (b-t)^2 - a^2 + (a+d)^2
$$

(b-t)² + d(2a+d)
(b-t)+E = $\sqrt{[(b-t)^2 + d(2a+d)]}$

$$
E = \sqrt{[(b-t)^2 + d(2a+d)]} - (b-t)
$$

This is the form in which the calculation is commonly applied to the data, with 2*a*, 2*b* and *t* being known from the manufacturer's data, and *d* being the measurement made by the displacement sensors during the test.

Typical dimensions for the 95HPD:-

To apply the correction at a given expansion the *average* radius of the expanding membrane is calculated. This average is then entered into the equation and the ratio between the corrected average and the raw average is expressed as a scale factor (it turns out to be about 0.88 for a 95mm HPD at all expansions). The scale factor is then applied to the individual arm displacement outputs.

8. Repeatability (or how much effort should be devoted to calibrations)

Although it is important regularly to check the sensitivities of the strain gauge circuits, it is unusual for them to change markedly. Indeed it is common for the hysteresis to improve with use. 90% of the performance of a strain gauge bridge application can be predicted from its design; the calibration removes the uncertainty due to manufacturing tolerances, and can give early warning of impending problems in a particular circuit.

The expansion test for example is concerned with making relative measurements, not absolute measurements. The HPD displacement measuring system will resolve movements of less than 0.5 microns over a range of 24 millimetres; the pressure measuring system will resolve changes of 0.5 kPa over a range of 20MPa. This resolution is considerably higher than can be seen with a standard micrometer or test gauge. To put it into context, 0.3 microns is approximately the wavelength of ultraviolet light. Obviously there is no practical possibility of checking by measurement a movement so small.

Hence the term 'calibrating' is inappropriate. What is done in practice is to check that the various sensors are linear over a number of relatively coarse steps or intervals. We assume that this linear behaviour will be true for very much smaller changes.

For this reason alone, without considering additional sources of error such as the skill of the operator carrying out the calibration, the accuracy of the standard used to derive this linearity is of secondary importance. We expect successive calibrations on the same sensor to be within 2% and investigate a difference greater than 3%.

We also ignore secondary sources of error in this assumption of linearity, such as temperature change. The full bridge configuration is relatively insensitive to temperature variation provided the strain gauges used are matched to the characteristics of the surface to which they are bonded. When critical measurements are being made during a test, for example when taking a reload loop, it is reasonable to assume the temperature remains constant. The ground is usually at a constant temperature whenever a test is carried out, but sometimes there are problems - the temperature of the gas being supplied to the downhole tool can have an influence especially if the gas bottle reservoir is lying outside in direct sunlight.

A spread sheet is used to to present the results of the calibrations for sensitivity. One benefit of this is that gradients can be calculated by linear regression routines; this ensures different operators given the same set of data will derive identical calibration factors. The calibrations are presented as a tabulation of transducer output against a known reference, with the linearity and hysteresis quoted for each calibration step.

The membrane correction of the HPD seldom changes greatly and the type of material it is used to test means that for the most part any errors in the magnitude of the correction are of minor importance. The total contribution of the correction is less than 200kPa to a typical test.

In general, if the material is weak (shear strength less than 100kPa) then membrane stiffness is important. If the material is extremely stiff (shear modulus greater than 1GPa) then correcting for instrument compliance is important. In between these two extremes the influence of the imperfections of the machine on the derived parameters is negligible.

9 Orientation

The electronics module fitted at the lower end of the instrument contains an electronic compass that can be used to identify the orientation of the probe with respect to magnetic north. The compass consists of two sensors whose output is proportional to the Earth's magnetic field. The sensors are fitted at right angles to each other, each giving a maximum output when that sensor is in line with magnetic north. The consequence is that that at any time the sensors give the sine and cosine of the angle made with magnetic north, permitting an unambiguous direction to be inferred.

To calibrate the sensors, the instrument is rotated slowly through 360 degrees whilst the output of the sensors are logged. From this, the maximum and minimum output of each sensor is derived and is stored. Thereafter, selecting an option 'Heading' in the logging software uses the derived maximum and minimum values and the current data line to determine a direction.

The sensors are hidden inside the electronics module container. A mark on the outside indicates the position of the Cos sensor, and the electronics module fits to the instrument so that this stud is in line with arm 1. The direction that the compass produces, therefore, is the angle of arm 1 with respect to magnetic north.

In practice we note the *mis*-alignment or offset of arm 1 with respect to the cos sensor and introduce a correction later. We also try to identify the declination at the current location so that the final orientation is expressed as a bearing with respect to true north.

The calibration has to be carried out away from any metal such as drill rigs or casing.

APPENDIX C THE TEST PROCEDURE

Before the pressuremeter is deployed it must be fully calibrated. This can be done prior to arrival on site. However if the compass is required then a local calibration has to be done as near the borehole as possible but away from any metal work.

C.1 Making a pocket for the pre-bored test

This part of the test is outside of the control of the pressuremeter operator. The HPD makes a test in a 98-101mm pocket made with a rotary coring rig using a T6H barrel or equivalent. As far as the pressuremeter is concerned a minimum 2-3m section of borehole is required of 100mm diameter in order to have sufficient material to contain the probe safely and leave a sump below the probe for any remaining detritus. How the borehole is formed prior to the coring of the pocket has no consequence for the test.

For deeper tests in competent material the pocket can be many metres long and the tests be a sequence with the deepest test done first. The pressuremeter is then pulled up to the level for the next test in the sequence.

The location of the test is decided by mutual agreement between the operator and the Engineer after inspection of the recovered core. The ideal, from the pressuremeter perspective, is an unbroken section of material. However it is normal to target the worst rather than the best material. The more fractured region of the material should be located at the centre of the expanding membrane, so that the displacement followers are sure to see the least stiff response. The ends of the membrane see the greatest risk of puncturing so these should be located in the best material. An overlong pocket allows some adjustment of the pressuremeter position so that this arrangement can be achieved.

The HPD is lowered on rods to the test depth, with its umbilical taped to the rods at regular intervals. It is arranged that the HPD and its special adaptor rods are a similar length to a standard core barrel, and the rods used are those used to run the core barrel. This avoids any confusion over test depth.

For deep tests the HPD umbilical is made up of 100 metre lengths that are joined using a proprietary coupler arrangement as the probe is lowered to depth.

C.2 Running the pre-bored test

The pre-bored pressuremeter test can be of two kinds:

- After an initial pseudo-elastic phase the material will yield and show significant plastic development. The test will end when sufficient expansion has been seen (in rock, typically 3% cavity strain) or the maximum expansion capability of the probe is reached (soils only).
- There will only be the initial elastic phase the test will end when the maximum working pressure of the probe is reached (20MPa) or at some earlier pressure if in the judgment of the operator there is a significant risk of the membrane rupturing and sufficient data have been recorded to allow a complete analysis.

Tests on this contract were of the first kind.

C.3 Pre-bored tests showing an elastic response only

An example of the elastic only test is given in fig C.1. The procedure is as follows:

1. Before handing the probe over to the drilling crew the computer logging system is started, a unique reference given to the file and a few lines of readings logged. The system is then put on hold as the probe is lowered down the hole, because logging these data would require an electrical connection to a rotating cable drum.

- 2. Once at depth the operator and driller compare notes to make sure both agree the probe location. The computer recommences logging and the test is started, using compressed air to raise the pressure in the probe in a controlled manner.
- 3. The tests are conducted as a series of pressure steps, each step being held for one minute. The steps tend to be at 0.5MPa intervals initially, then increased to 1MPa when the test is more advanced. Data are also recorded between steps at a slow enough rate to give a well defined loading curve where fine detail, such as indications of tensile failure, can be seen.
- 4. At intervals, unload/reload cycles are taken. The intervals vary depending on how much expansion has been seen or how much pressure has been applied. The size of the pressure drop for each cycle is about $1/3^{rd}$ of pressure at the start of the loop. Loops continue to be taken until a consistent response is seen.
- 5. Ideally, each half of the loop needs to be defined by a minimum of 10 data points.
- 6. Prior to taking a loop the pressure is held constant for 3 minutes to allow the creep to reach an insignificant level.

- 7. After the final loop the membrane is further pressurised up to near the maximum working load or until one of the other termination criteria are reached – *see later note, C.5*.
- 8. For some tests, once at maximum load, the pressure is held constant for several hours whilst displacements continue to be recorded. This gives data for a creep strain rate analysis.
- 9. The cavity is then unloaded at a smooth rate to give a well-defined contraction curve. This can include a reload/unload cycle, taken at a pressure that maps the pressure range used for the last cycle on the loading path.

10. The membrane is allowed to deflate, and the probe removed from the hole or raised to the next level, as appropriate.

None of the steps in the procedure is rigid and can be amended in the light of what is seen during the test itself. In fractured material where there is a high chance of membrane rupture or at least a chance the test will be terminated before reaching maximum pressure then the boundaries of the second and third loops can move. It is at the discretion of the operator.

C.4 Pre-bored tests showing yield

An example of such a test is given in fig C.2. In the example the material yields at about 5MPa and a unload/reload cycle is taken either side of this point. Subsequent expansion confirms that the material has indeed failed, and a further loop is taken on the loading after a substantial stress change has taken place. If the material was weak then the point where additional loops are taken would depend on the deformation, say every 1mm – here it is set by the pressure. The pressure drop of the cycles is, roughly, about a quarter of the total radial stress at the cavity wall. Before each cycle the pressure is held for one minute, and is also held for a short period before commencing the final unloading. A substantial deformation has taken place, so the reason for terminating the test is that sufficient data have been gathered and there is no advantage in continuing the loading further.

The pressure at the start of the test when the membrane first moves, and again at the end when the membrane loses contact with the borehole, give some data for the ambient water pressure in the test cavity.

C.5 Terminating an HPD test

The decision about when to stop a test depends on a number of factors:

- Has enough information been gathered? For any test the operator is trying to record at least two unload/reload cycles and to record a full cavity *contraction*. This is because in recent times the advantages of analysing the unloading of a cavity have become apparent.
- If possible the operator wants to see the material yield, and record at least some of the plastic response of the material.
- If the maximum pressure capability of the instrument is reached then this is an obvious termination imperative. In general this is a limit that is appropriate for material showing elastic deformation only.
- This decision making process can be informed by indications that the material is cracking or showing unusual behaviour.
- If the maximum displacement capability of the instrument is reached then this is an obvious reason to terminate the test. Normally the decision to terminate based on displacement depends on the material and the size of the initial pocket. A tight pocket in material that yields at relatively low stress levels can be taken further than one in an oversize pocket that yields at stress levels greater than 100 bars.

C.6 Logging rate

Once power is applied to the instrument, the HPD95 outputs a line of data every 10 seconds.

APPENDIX D INTERPRETING PRESSUREMETER TESTS

This appendix gives details of the methods used to derive the results of pressuremeter tests on this contract. The text is illustrated with examples from the fieldwork.

1 PROPERTIES FROM PRESSUREMETER TESTS IN GRANULAR MATERIAL.

The approach which will be described briefly here is the usual way of interpreting the pressuremeter test in the UK. It relies on solving the boundary problem posed by a cavity expansion in an infinite medium.

The aim of the pressuremeter test is to expand a long cylindrical cavity within an undisturbed mass of soil. Fundamental strength properties of the material can be deduced from measurements made of cavity pressure and displacement. In practice no instrument can be placed into the ground without affecting the surrounding soil. In the case of a selfbored pressuremeter test the disturbance is generally within the elastic range of the soil and can be allowed for in the analysis procedure. For a pre-bored test where the cavity is completely unloaded the material will have experienced reverse failure.

1.1 The pressuremeter test in soil - initially elastic response/failure in shear.

Consider that the material is homogeneous, and shows simple elastic behaviour before failing in shear. The stress path followed by an element of soil adjacent to the cavity is given in fig 1.1 and the corresponding pressure /strain curve is shown alongside.

The radial stress, ideally at the insitu horizontal stress for a perfect installation, increases at the same rate as the circumferential stress decreases, regardless of whether the material is deforming under plane strain or plane stress conditions. The line 0 - 0 represents stress equality, so that in the ideal case considered here the point P_0 is the insitu lateral stress.

Once the radial stress increases above the insitu stress then the shear stress in the soil at the cavity wall will increase. If the insitu lateral stress is low, then it is possible that the circumferential stress would go into tension. However in this example the insitu stress is high enough to ensure that the shear stress limit is reached before tensile stresses can be generated.

The pressure necessary to initiate shear failure is denoted p_f in fig 1.1. After this pressure the strain rate shows a substantial increase, and the form of this part of the pressure/strain curve is a function of the shear strength of the material.

Radial stress and circumferential stress now increase together. If the shear stress limit is constant, and is not influenced by pressure, and if the material deforms at constant volume, then the failure shear strength can be determined by the analytical solution developed by Gibson & Anderson.

Fig 1.1 - Elastic Response followed by failure in shear

Before the shear stress limit is reached the pressuremeter response is elastic, both in loading and unloading. Assuming the material deforms at a constant modulus and the installation is perfect then the slope of the initial loading path gives the shear modulus of the material, using the classic procedure of Bishop, Hill & Mott (1945). The diagram also indicates that reversing the direction of loading causes an initial elastic response giving an alternative means of deriving the shear modulus. This implies that small cycles of unloading and reloading taken anywhere in a test after reaching the shear stress limit can be used as a source of stiffness information (Hughes 1982).

As fig 1.1 suggests, the complete unloading of the pressuremeter can also be used to give strength and stiffness parameters comparable with those obtained from the loading path.

From the right hand side of the stress diagram it is apparent that the pressuremeter provides only a limited set of the necessary information for resolving the stresses and strains around the probe. Specifically it gives the changes in radius of the borehole wall (a special case of hoop strain) and the corresponding changes in radial stress at the borehole wall. There are no data for hoop stress or radial strain or movements in the vertical direction. Test procedures are chosen to allow the missing data to be inferred – for example an undrained expansion means shearing occurs at constant volume and hence changes of radial strain must be equal and opposite to changes in hoop strain. The unseen vertical axis data are rendered redundant by making pressuremeters long with respect to their diameter, allowing plane strain expansion to be assumed.

1.2 Defining strain

For a pressuremeter measuring the radius of an expanding cavity the conversion from displacement to strain is $[R-R_0]/R_0$, where R is the current radius of the cavity and R_0 is the original radius of the cavity in the insitu state. This is simple strain and when displacements are measured at the borehole wall is termed cavity strain, ε_c .

 R_0 can be approximated by the at rest radius of the instrument. The preferred approach is to identify when the applied pressure has reached the insitu lateral stress, and interpolate from this the corresponding radius, which then becomes R_0 .

Note that although the pressuremeter measures the radius of the cavity wall, ε_c is actually a specific instance of circumferential or hoop strain. It is usually expressed as a percentage.

Figure 1.2 shows how pressures and strains in the expanding borehole are defined.

Fig 1.2 Pressures and strains around the expanding cavity

The other strain commonly used is the constant area ratio, which is shear strain. As fig 1.2 indicates it can be defined in terms of simple strain.

1.3 Average displacements versus the output of the separate axes

There are a number of displacement sensors in the expansion probe but recommended practice is to quote parameters from the average displacement curve. This is for two reasons:

- The reference for the measured displacements is the body of the instrument itself trying to separate the individual axes means assuming that the body of the instrument remains fixed at all times, which is not realistic.
- All available analyses assume isotropic properties in the surrounding soil, and only the average pressure/strain curve represents this condition.

These remarks assume that the instrument is in full working order throughout the test failure of a displacement follower means that alternative strategies must be adopted.

The significance of the first point above has been demonstrated by an examination of cycles of unloading taken from separate arms (Whittle 1993) and by work with a six arm version of the Self Boring Pressuremeter (Whittle et al 1995).

1.4 The Analysis program

We use (and supply to others) software for analysing a pressuremeter test. The program is called **WINSITU,** it has been in use for a number of years.

To use the program the user must first read in a text file of test data in engineering units. The program needs to know the type of instrument being used, and the user may choose to enter additional background information about the test.

The next task is to identify for the program the nature of the individual data points. Broadly, the options are these:

- a point can be part of the expansion curve
- or part of a reload loop
- or part of the contraction curve
- or none of the above. This might mean a 'rogue' data point, but it is more likely to be true of parts of the loading where the expansion was slowed prior to taking an unload/reload cycle. Data points recorded at this time are neither part of the expansion nor part of a cycle, and should be identified as such.

There is a quick on-screen routine for marking the points. Once marked, they appear in different colours. Most of the analyses use a limited set of the available data - for example the Gibson & Anderson analysis for undrained shear strength uses only points on the expansion curve.

The program implements all the standard analyses mainly in a graphical form. As fig 1.1 implies, there are significant changes of gradient in the pressure/strain curve denoting critical soil parameters. The user of the program is provided with on-screen tools to mark these breakpoints or to obtain the slope of the loading curve. The tools can be visualised as rulers, whose position is stored by the program in the file of test data. The evidence for any derived parameter is a screen dump of the appropriate analysis that shows the position of any rulers set by the user and quotes the parameter obtained. Even when the user declines to make a choice it is good practice to provide the screen dump as evidence of why a choice is difficult.

The results for a test appear as a summary sheet of derived parameters followed by a number of plots showing the application of the various procedures.

Sometimes analyses are required which are not included in the WINSITU program. In such instances commonly available spreadsheet software is used to implement the new analysis. Inevitably in such circumstances there is some risk of human error affecting the conversion of data in engineering units to the form required for analysis. WINSITU has export facilities and wherever possible is used as the data source for the spreadsheet.

2. ANALYSES FOR INSITU LATERAL STRESS

2.1 Overview

The expansion pressuremeter test is a sequence of measured co-ordinates of pressure and displacement of the cavity wall (once suitable corrections have been made to compensate for the response of the elastic membrane).

In order to solve the boundary problem, an origin for the expansion has to be determined. For insertion methods that imply stress *relief*, the origin is taken to be the point where insitu conditions are restored to the cavity. This means that an estimate of the insitu lateral stress has to be made, and the measured radius of the cavity at the point where the insitu lateral stress is restored is used to convert subsequent displacements to strain.

For a self boring pressuremeter and occasionally other pressuremeters it is possible to recognise the insitu lateral stress by inspection, the so-called lift-off method. It is also possible to recognise by inspection the shear stress limit (the point marked p_f in fig 1.1) as this is indicated by the onset of a markedly non-linear response. An iterative procedure first suggested by Marsland & Randolph (1977) allows the insitu lateral stress to be inferred. The method is not valid for tests in sands and tests in material with non-linear elastic properties. This rules out all soils. Nevertheless it is usual to run the analysis because it tends to set an upper limit to any estimate of insitu lateral stress.

Both methods are outlined by Mair & Wood (1987). Note that these methods amount to obtaining a value for the cavity reference pressure, p_0 . It is impossible to measure the insitu lateral stress σ_{ho} because the act of placing instrumentation always results in some disturbance, even if small. The methods above are indirect indicators for determining σ_{ho} . It is open to question whether the reference stress is equivalent to the insitu lateral stress, and it is usual to bring a range of evidence to bear in order to decide if a particular value for p_0 is also a plausible value for σ_{ho} . External evidence might take the form of using the derived reference stress within a k_0 calculation, or checking that the derived vertical/horizontal anisotropy can be supported by the material shear strength i.e.

$$
\sigma_{ho} - \sigma_{vo} < 2C_u \, . \tag{2.1}
$$

A more complex approach uses the full set of parameters derived from a pressuremeter test within a model, and discovers whether the measured field curve can be recovered. The input data set is then adjusted in a strictly controlled manner until the best match for all parameters is obtained.

2.2 Marsland & Randolph (1977) Analysis

Marsland & Randolph analysis relies on being able to identify the onset of plastic behaviour, the yield stress p_f . The argument is as follows:

- In the vicinity of the insitu lateral stress the soil response is simple elastic manner and therefore the total pressure/ cavity strain plot will be linear
- Elastic behaviour will cease when the undrained shear strength of the soil is reached in the wall of the cavity, and hence the pressure /strain plot will begin to curve (see Fig 1.1).
- This can be expressed as: *p*^f = *p*^o + *c*u[2.2]
	-
- From this it follows that p_0 can be deduced by iteration. Initially a guess is made of a value for *p*o; using this guess to define a temporary strain origin a total pressure:log volumetric strain plot is then generated in order to derive a value for *c*u. The sum of

these two parameters is compared with the selected value of p_f . The choice of p_o is then suitably adjusted and the process repeated until a match is found. It is a straightforward matter to carry out this procedure on the computer.

The modified method in current use is a response to the difficulty that perfectly plastic deformation is not a realistic enough model for many materials and yield may occur at a different shear stress than the large strain shear strength. Hawkins et al (1990) suggested that the most appropriate choice was that value of shear stress pertaining at the apparent onset of plasticity, so [2.2] now becomes:

$$
p_{\rm f}=p_{\rm o}+\tau_{\rm f} \tag{2.3}
$$

 τ_f can be obtained from a total pressure: log volumetric strain plot by selecting the slope at the pressure and strain corresponding to the choice of p_f (in practice, using the Palmer (1972) argument to identify the mobilised shear stress at failure).

The analysis is implemented graphically, using a number of rulers to identify significant points on the curve (Fig 2.1). There are a number of limitations:

- The assumption of simple elastic response in practice most soils exhibit marked nonlinear elastic characteristics, so that the pressure at which the material appears to go fully plastic is more than one increment of shear strength above P_0 - this point is developed later.
- The original analysis was developed as an aid to the interpretation of pre-bored pressuremeter tests where the process of forming the pocket results in the complete unloading of the cavity prior to the test commencing. It is certain therefore that the soil has seen stress relief. It is arguable whether in these circumstances that the yield point

remains unchanged, as more than elastic unloading has taken place. However the form of such tests does tend to give an unambiguous choice for the onset of plasticity.

- In a low disturbance test the situation is not so clear cut. The very factors that make the test desirable also results in more realistic behaviour being seen in the form of the early part of the test, with non-linear elasticity being a feature. Hence a choice of p_f is not obvious. The better the test, the harder such a choice becomes. However it is probable that in a good test the lift off pressure would be a credible choice so that in the wider context it is not a serious problem.
- A disturbed test does not necessarily imply stress relief. In some cases the pressuremeter is pushed or forced into the ground, and the material will have seen a stress greater than the yield stress before the loading of the cavity by the pressuremeter commences. In this event the analysis can contribute nothing – forcing such data to fit the assumptions of the analysis will over-estimate the insitu lateral stress.

Against these objections there is good empirical evidence that no matter the mode of failure, identifying the yield stress and working back to the insitu stress works for all soils, provided one takes the apparent mobilized shear stress at failure, not large strain. For this reason the procedure is often applied with apparent success to tests in frictional material.

2.3 Deriving insitu lateral stress by synthesis

The doubt concerning the appropriateness of using the measured values for cavity reference pressure p_0 as best estimates for the insitu lateral stress σ_{ho} mean that other methods for inferring plausible values are required. We use two models, depending on the manner of the loading. For an undrained test the procedure introduced by Whittle (1999) is used. This assumes an undrained cavity expansion and contraction in a non-linear elastic/perfectly plastic medium. A single set of parameters matches both parts of the test curve. The procedure is rigorous with only one degree of freedom, the ability to adjust the insitu lateral stress.

For drained expansions in c'-phi material (where cohesion can be zero) a modified version of the Carter et al (1986) solution is used. The modified version assumes a non-linear elastic/perfectly plastic medium, and extends the solution to cover the elastic part of the final unloading. There are two degrees of freedom in the model, because cohesion cannot be independently determined and must also be adjusted in addition to the insitu lateral stress.

These procedures can be applied to pre-bored pressuremeter test data but a fit to the early part of the loading will not be possible.

It is only possible to derive one value for insitu lateral stress using these procedures, as isotropy of soil properties is a fundamental assumption. Because the procedure makes uses of all the evidence it is the preferred method for deriving the insitu lateral stress. However the model has to be appropriate. Material approaching a rock-like condition may have a component of tensile strength, which the model does not resolve. The effect will be to exaggerate the insitu lateral stress.

3. SHEAR MODULUS

Terms:

 α Shear stress intercept

3.1 Background

Values of stiffness in real soils, however measured, are strain level and stress level dependent. Pressuremeter stiffness is affected by the additional factor of cross anisotropy. The pressuremeter used conventionally gives shear modulus parameters of type G_{HH} , where the first suffix shows the direction of loading and the second suffix the direction of particle movement. Most design calculations that require a value for shear modulus mean in practice the independent shear modulus G_{VH} . Translating between pressuremeter values and alternative expressions for modulus is complex but worth pursuing because of the high quality of the pressuremeter measure. What follows is a brief outline of a possible approach.

There are three parts of the pressuremeter curve capable of providing information concerning shear modulus:

- From the slope of the initial elastic loading phase
- From the slope of the chord bisecting small rebound cycles
- From the slope of the first part of the contraction curve

3.2 The Initial Shear Modulus

Shear modulus can be derived from the slope of the initial part of the loading curve (see fig 2.1). In a pre-bored pressuremeter test, unless the probe is in good rock, this underestimates the true elastic properties of the material. The initial part of the test is affected by the process of making a pocket and the complete unloading of the cavity wall prior to starting the pressuremeter test.

As fig 1.1 shows, the calculation for shear modulus G is:

$$
G = dP/2d\epsilon_c \tag{3.1}
$$

The origin for deciding cavity strain ε_c is set by the point where the projected initial modulus line cuts the displacement axis. This origin does not apply to other parts of the loading curve and each cycle of unloading and reloading has its own local origin.

3.3 Cycles of elastic unloading and reloading

Data points from an unload/reload cycle are the preferred source of stiffness parameters, because these data are a function of the 'far field' material response . The plots provided show the position of a cursor which has been placed by eye to bisect the cycle. The slope of the cursor is the gradient of the reload loop and the program uses this slope to derive a value for shear modulus. This value is quoted in the top left hand corner of the plot together with an indication of the size of the loop expressed as the change of pressure and strain, and the co-ordinate of the centre of the loop. The theoretical equation used is:

 $G = [1 + \varepsilon_c][dP/2d\varepsilon_c]$ [3.2]

In practice, and using fig. 3.1 as an example, we calculate the gradient of the plotted line as change of pressure divided by change of displacement. This result is then multiplied by the displacement of the midpoint of the line added to the initial radius. This result is 2G and takes account of the alteration in the strain scale represented by loops taken at different stages of the cavity expansion.

It is important that the effects of creep (for whatever cause) be minimised before starting the cycle, and in fig 3.1 'deleted' points before the start of the unloading show where the pressure in the probe was held for a period of time.

3.4 Non-linear stiffness/strain response

In all soils and some rocks the stiffness/strain relationship is not linear. The unload/reload cycle can be made to describe the non-linear relationship by looking at smaller steps of pressure/strain other than the points at the extreme ends of the cycle.

For reasons explained in Whittle et al (1992) it is preferable to examine one half of the rebound cycle only, that following the reversal of stress in a loop. The lowest recorded value of stress and strain then becomes the origin for subsequent data points until the original loading path is re-joined (fig 3.2).

The reloading data can be plotted on axes of log Δp_c versus log $\Delta V/V$. Fig 3.3 is an example. The gradient of the best fit straight line to the data points gives the non-linear elastic exponent, where 1 is a linear elastic response.

The linear relationship between pressure and shear strain on log scales expands to a power law of the form

$$
p_{\rm c} = \eta \gamma^{\beta} \tag{3.3}
$$

where p_c is the change in radial stress at the cavity wall, γ is the corresponding shear strain and η and β are the intercept and gradient of the log log relationship.

Palmer (1972) shows for undrained plane strain loading the connection between cavity pressure and shear stress at any point on the pressure versus strain plot is given by

$$
\tau = \gamma \frac{dP}{d\gamma} \tag{3.4}
$$

Using the right hand side of [3.3] in [3.4] gives

$$
\tau = \gamma \frac{d(\eta \gamma^{\beta})}{d\gamma} \tag{3.5}
$$

The differential equation can now be solved

$$
\tau = \gamma \left(\eta \beta \gamma^{\beta - 1} \right) = \eta \beta \gamma^{\beta}
$$
 [3.6]

Hence the shear stress is related to the radial stress measured at the cavity wall by

$$
\tau = \beta \, p_{\rm c} \tag{3.7}
$$

This is precisely the result obtained by Bolton & Whittle (1999) using an alternative approach. It is convenient at this point to replace the combined coefficient $\eta\beta$ with a single term α , where

$$
\alpha = .\eta \beta \tag{3.8}
$$

This can be turned into a general expression for secant shear modulus G_S by dividing both sides by the shear strain γ :

$$
G_s = \eta \beta \gamma^{\beta-1} = \alpha \gamma^{\beta-1}
$$
 [3.9]

and because the tangential modulus G_t is related to the secant modulus by the following relationship (Muir Wood 1990, Jardine 1992)

$$
G_t = G_s + \gamma \left[\frac{dG_s}{d\gamma} \right] \tag{3.10}
$$

It follows from [3.9] that the solution to [3.10] is

$$
G_t = \eta \beta^2 \gamma^{\beta - 1} = \alpha \beta \gamma^{\beta - 1}
$$
 [3.11]

Tests in good rock show a linear elastic response. Occasionally, where the material is friable or crushable a significant non-linear elastic response is apparent. Often loops carried out later in the loading when the applied stress is higher show the influence of grain crushing, revealed as a tendency for the exponent to become more non-linear.

If the test is drained, meaning the mean effective stress increases throughout the loading, then successive loops will have a higher intercept (fig.3.4). Loops taken too early in the expansion sometimes show an exponent greater than 1. This is a certain indication that the cycle has been taken too soon, and the response is a mixture of elastic and plastic strain changes.

Our practice is to give the exponent and intercept of the power law, and for comparative purposes to quote secant shear modulus parameters at three levels of plane shear strain, 10^{-2} , 10^{-3} and 10^{-4} . It is unwise to use the power law to predict modulus for strains smaller than 10^{-4} .

Fig 3.4 shows, in addition to the stiffness/strain curves, a scatter of points. These arise from applying the Palmer 1972 solution (3.4) directly to the measured field data– inevitably, this gives a noisy result but scattered in a regular way around the curve fitted trend.

3.5 Stress Level

Figure 3.4 is an example of a test in drained material where due to the ever changing mean effective stress the stiffness increases with successive loops. There are procedures for normalising the stiffness curve to a common stress level, usually the effective insitu lateral stress. It is complex because both strain and stress dependence have to be incorporated.

Whittle & Liu (2013) give a method for both stress and strain adjustment. It is based on Bellotti et al (1989) and can be applied to tests that contain at least four unload/reload cycles.

Their solution can be written as:

\n
$$
G = A\sigma^N
$$
\n[3.12]

A and N are both semi-log equations. For most purposes this level of complexity is not required and a simpler approach can be adopted.

- 1) Start by carrying out the non-linear analysis described above and discover α and β . Use these to find, for each cycle, G_s at an intermediate value of shear strain, such as 0.1%.
- 2) Calculate the mean effective stress σ'_{av} at the commencement of each loop. The effective radial stress p´ is measured by the pressuremeter and the calculation is

$$
\sigma'_{av} = p'/(1+sin\ \varphi) - c' \cos\ \varphi/(1+sin\ \varphi)
$$
 [3.13]

where ϕ is the peak angle of internal friction and c' is drained cohesion

3) Plot modulus against effective stress (fig 3.5).

The procedure relies on the material behaving like a soil. The example in fig 3.5 shows all tests from this contract treated in this way – cycles on the unloading have been omitted because[3.13] only applies to the loading. Each test gives a set of points that follow a power

law trend. The exponent of the power law is describing the stress dependency at this level of shear strain. If the material is deforming under constant volume conditions then the exponent will be close to zero. Otherwise it seems to lie between 0.3 and 0.6.

Given the stress dependency exponent n, , for each cycle a stress adjusted version of α is found, α^* :

$$
\alpha^* = \alpha (\sigma'_{\text{ref}} / \sigma'_{\text{av}})^n \tag{3.14}
$$

This is derived from the relationship suggested by Janbu ('63) and forms the basis of the

approach to stress dependency used in Bellotti et al (1989). The reference stress is typically $\sigma'_{\nu o}$ or $\sigma'_{\nu o}$. For applications where a vertical deformation modulus is required it seems sensible to use $\sigma'_{\nu 0}$. α^* is used in place of α in [3.9] to derive the stress adjusted modulus. Figs 3.6 and 3.7 give a 'before' and 'after' example of the method being applied, with a 'best fit' trend added to the stress adjusted plot. Because the material in question is chalk rather than a true soil the adjustment is only approximate.

3.6 Cross hole anisotropy

The pressuremeter test gives values for G_{HH} , the shearing stiffness in the horizontal plane. This is directly applicable to the analysis of radial consolidation or cylindrical cavity expansion due to pile insertion. G_{VH} is applicable all shearing which has an element of deformation in the vertical plane, such as under a footing or round an axially loaded pile.

To convert from G_{HH} to G_{VH} some relationship between the two must be assumed. Wroth et al (1979) suggest that anisotropy arises from two causes:

- Structural anisotropy due to the deposition of soil on well defined planes
- Stress induced anisotropy, due to the differences in normal stress acting in different directions.

The second cause implies the stiffness in any direction will be a function of the effective insitu stress in that direction, ie a function of K_o .

This is as far as argument from first principles can go, because of the additional contribution of the manner in which the material is deposited. K_0 is likely to lie between 0.5 and 2, so from [3.18] E_H/G_{HH} lies between 2 and 3.5. From [3.19] E_V/G_{HH} lies between 1 and 1.75. It is likely that G_{VH} will be linked to E_V by Poisson's ratio in a relationship of the form of equation [3.14]. Plausible values of E_V/G_{VH} would seem to be 2.4 to 3. Hence in a material with K_O of 2, G_{VH} could be as low as G_{HH}/3. Simpson et al (1996) come to the same conclusion, but find in practice heavily over-consolidated London clay gives relationships of the order of $G_{VH} \cong 0.65G_{HH}$. The influence of the strain range is not separately considered in these studies, and it is quite possible that the G_{100} values would be similar in all planes. Lee & Rowe (1989) give details of the anisotropy characteristics of many clays varying from lightly over-consolidated to heavily over-consolidated. The general conclusion is E_V/G_{VH} lies between 4 and 5, rather more than the isotropic relationship of 3. However their paper was concerned with the impact of anisotropic stiffness properties on surface settlement. Deriving G_{VH} from E_V is therefore unsatisfactory, because although G_{VH} is insensitive to the direction of loading, E_V is not.

4. ANALYSES FOR STRENGTH, DRAINED LOADINGS

For drained expansion tests in purely frictional material the strength is described in terms of the peak angle of internal friction and dilation. The method used is that due to Hughes et al (1977). The form of the shear stress:shear strain curve is simple elastic/perfectly plastic and dilation and friction are related by Rowe's dilatency law. Although the soil response during elastic deformation is more realistically described as non-linear elastic, this has no effect on the plastic part of the curve from where strength is derived.

The technique is to plot effective pressure against cavity strain on log scales and to discover by inspection the maximum slope of the resulting curve. It is usual to only quote a single value for friction and dilation. The same assumptions have been applied by Withers et al (1989) to produce a solution for cavity contraction.

Manassero (1989) is a numerical solution that applies Rowe's dilatency law as a flow rule. Elastic strains in the plastic area are ignored for simplicity.

For tests in c' – phi material a method based on the solution of Carter et al (1986) is used. In such material the value for friction angle can often be identified from the Hughes analysis.

4.1 Hughes et al (1977)

In addition to the usual conditions governing the expansion of a cylindrical cavity in plane strain this analysis assumes the following:

- A simple elastic/perfectly plastic model
- The expansion is fully drained, i.e. no excess pore water pressures are allowed to develop
- Following yield the sand deforms at a constant angle of internal friction
- Volumetric and shear strains are connected by Rowe's dilatancy law (1962)

Rowe's dilantancy law can be written:

$$
[(1 + \sin \phi')/(1 - \sin \phi')] = [(1 + \sin \phi'_{cv})/(1 - \sin \phi'_{cv})][(1 + \sin v)/(1 - \sin v)] [4.1]
$$

where ϕ' is the peak angle of internal friction

 ϕ_{cv}' is the critical state angle of friction

 v is the angle of dilation.

At failure the effective pressure at the cavity wall p' is given by:

$$
p' = \sigma'_{ho}(1 + \sin \phi') \tag{4.2}
$$

Following failure:

$$
\ln [p'] = S \ln [(\varepsilon_c/(1+\varepsilon_c) + c/2)] + A \tag{4.3}
$$

where A is a constant

$$
S
$$
 is $[(1 + \sin \Psi) \sin \phi']/(1 + \sin \phi')$

Equation 4.3 indicates that *s* is approximately the gradient of effective pressure plotted against cavity strain on log scales. Once obtained, both sin ϕ' and sin v can be derived:

$$
\sin \phi' = S/[1 + (S - 1) \sin \phi'_{\text{cv}}]
$$
 [4.4]

$$
\sin v = S + (S - 1) \sin \phi'_{cv}
$$
 [4.5]

The factor c/2, representing elastic strain in the plastic region, is usually ignored - it has been shown to introduce an error of about 0.03% in the strain scale for a typical dense sand. An example of the Hughes analysis is shown in fig 4.1. Both the ambient pore water pressure u_0 and ϕ_{cv} are required to implement the analysis. Because the expansion is drained the membrane normally collapses at the head of water pressure, and an estimate of

 u_0 can often be made from this behaviour. ϕ_{cv} must either be given or estimated. The analysis is sensitive to the choice of strain origin.

If the test shown in fig 4.1 was taken to a high enough cavity strain then the final part of the loading would show strain softening indicating that the peak friction angle is passed and the current internal angle is reducing towards a residual value. Curvature at relatively low strain (as in the example) indicates the presence of some cohesion, in which case the ultimate slope of the trend gives the best estimate of the friction angle.

4.2 Manassero (1989)

This analysis is a numerical procedure that makes the same assumptions as Hughes et al (1977). The difference is that Rowes dilatancy relationship is employed as a flow rule, so that the requirement for deformation at a single value of friction angle is not necessary.

The advantage of this analysis is that it can produce a comprehensive stress/strain curve analogous to that of the Palmer (1972) analysis for an undrained expansion. The disadvantage is that the numerical method is very sensitive to even minor fluctuations in the measured data. Manassero suggests that the measured data be fitted with a polynomial function prior to implementing the numerical calculations.

The pressuremeter test provides data for the radial pressure and circumferential strain at the wall of the cavity. The radial strain ε_R at a point (i) corresponding to a measured data point of circumferential strain ε_c and effective pressure P is as follows:

$$
\mathcal{E}_R(i) = \frac{p(i)[\mathcal{E}_C(i-1) + k_a^{\sigma} \mathcal{E}_R(i-1)] - p(i-1) \mathcal{E}_C(i)}{2[p(i)(1 + k_a^{\sigma}) - p(i-1)} + \frac{p(i)[\mathcal{E}_C(i-1) - \mathcal{E}_R(i-1)] + p(i-1)[\mathcal{E}_R(i-1)(1 + k_a^{\sigma}) - \mathcal{E}_C(i)}{2k_a^{\sigma} p(i-1)} \qquad \dots [4.6]
$$

where
$$
k_a^{cv}
$$
 is $1/k_p^{cv}$ and k_p^{cv} is $\frac{1+\sin\phi}{1-\sin\phi_{cv}}$, the constant volume stress ratio coefficient.

Equation [4.6] is solved for each data point in turn, knowing that the expansion starts from zero strain.

Once the radial strain is known, volumetric strain ε_V and shear strain ε_V can be obtained as follows:

$$
\varepsilon_{\gamma} = \varepsilon_{R} - \varepsilon_{C}
$$
 [4.7]

$$
\varepsilon_{\nu} = \varepsilon_{R} + \varepsilon_{C}
$$
 [4.8]

Further more the principal stresses are connected by:

$$
\frac{\sigma_{R}}{\sigma_{C}} = -k_{P}^{\text{cv}} \frac{d\varepsilon_{c}}{d\varepsilon_{R}}
$$
 [4.9]

In principle the analysis can give a full description of the shear stress:shear strain response but as Manassero himself points out, real data are generally too noisy for use as direct input in a numerical analysis, and he suggests curve fitting the field test prior to implementing the solution.

4.3 Carter et al (1986, adapted 2010)

Carter et al (1986) is a closed form analytical solution for cavity expansion tests in ideal cohesive frictional material. There is an explicit small strain expression of the solution which makes a convenient basis for a curve comparison routine. What is presented here is a modified version of the solution incorporating non-linearity in the elastic phase of the test. A power law is used to describe the non-linear response and the parameters for the power law are obtained from rebound cycles carried out during the test. Unload/reload cycles offer the means of obtaining the elastic properties of the ground independently of disturbance caused by the process of placing the instrumentation - it is an important aspect of the methodology presented here that the analysis be constrained by the measured values of soil stiffness.

The process starts with the parameter set already obtained from the conventional analyses for cavity reference pressure, stiffness and internal angle of friction. Using the measured pressures but calculating the cavity strains according to the input parameter set, a

theoretical curve is generated. This is overlaid on the measured field data. If the mis-match is significant, then certain parameters can be adjusted to improve the match. The fixed parameters are the stiffness data. The curve comparison procedure covers elastic loading, plastic loading and elastic contraction – the plastic contraction part of the test is ignored for the present. For simplicity, all stresses in the following description are effective. As does Carter *et al* the method is developed first in terms of a purely frictional material and is then modified for cohesion. The solution is presented in terms appropriate for cylindrical cavity expansion, the spherical case has been ignored.

There are two main reasons for using this procedure. With the analyses available at the present time it is difficult to separate out the contribution of cohesion and friction in a dilating material. This can be done reasonably easily with the curve comparison approach. The other reason is that the influence of cavity reference pressure on the overall curve is very obvious. Tests in material of this type are often pre-bored and there is very little that can be done to assess the cavity reference pressure when the initial part of the loading curve is dominated by disturbance effects. With this procedure implausible values are identified very easily.

Notation – as much of the Carter *et al* notation has been preserved here so some parameters used earlier are now rewritten

- *h* is the exponent of a non-linear elastic power law
- *d* is the stress exponent, describing the variation of stiffness with stress level
- *w* is the intercept of a plot of stiffness against stress level
- *J* is a scale factor to adjust for stiffness at differing stress levels

4.3.1 Carter, Booker and Yeung (1986)

Assuming small deformations (where 10% cavity strain is considered small), Carter *et al* offer the following general solution for a cylindrical cavity expansion:

$$
\frac{u}{r} = \varepsilon_R \left[A \left(\frac{R}{r} \right)^{1+\alpha} + B \left(\frac{R}{r} \right)^{1-\beta} + C \right]
$$
...(4.11)

In terms of parameters that the pressuremeter can measure directly, circumferential strain εc and radial stress *p* at the cavity wall, this solution can be written as

$$
\varepsilon_C = \varepsilon_R \left[A \left(\frac{P}{\sigma_R} \right)^{\gamma} + B \left(\frac{P}{\sigma_R} \right) + C \right]
$$
...(4.12)

Carter et al point out the similarity between this solution and that offered by Hughes et al (1977). Using the current notation the solution of Hughes et al can be written:

$$
\varepsilon_c = \varepsilon_R \left(\frac{P}{\sigma_R}\right)^{\gamma}
$$
..[4.13]

The omission of the linear and constant terms in 4.13 comes about because the earlier solution ignores elastic strain in the plastic region. The attraction of the earlier solution is that plotting cavity strain against radial stress on log scales gives the gradient γ which can used to discover the approximate values of friction angle ϕ and dilation angle ψ , so it is helpful to carry out the Hughes *et al* analysis as a means of providing input parameters for the Carter *et al* solution. The Hughes log-log plot also indicates the influence of cohesion, because the data will plot a strain-softening curve rather than a straight line.

4.3.2 Elastic Strain and non-linear stiffness

In the simple elastic model the cavity strains before yield are given by

Where *p*^o < *p* < ^R *G* 2 *pp ^o C* ..[4.14]

At first yield, when
\n
$$
\varepsilon_C = \frac{p_o \sin \phi}{2G}
$$
\n
$$
\varepsilon = \frac{p_o \sin \phi}{2G}
$$
\n(4.15)

The non-linear elastic versions of.[4.14] and [4.15] are:

Where *p*^o < *p* < ^R *h ref o C q pp* 1 ..[4.16]

At first yield, when

$$
p=\sigma_{\rm R}
$$

$$
\varepsilon_R = \left[\left(\frac{p_0}{q_{ref}} \right) \left(\frac{N-1}{N(2h-1)+1} \right) \right]^{\frac{1}{h}} \tag{4.17}
$$

The derivation of the non-linear elastic equations are given later.

At the end of loading the cavity has a maximum pressure p_{max} and expansion ε_{max} and the first part of the final unloading is elastic with a non-linear characteristic prior to yield in extension. The elastic circumferential strain is given by:

Where $p_{\text{max}} > p > \sigma_{\text{Ru}}$

h ref C ^{*C*} \sim $\frac{1}{q}$ $p_{\text{max}} - p$ 1 max \int_{max} - $\frac{r_{\text{max}}}{Jq_{\text{ref}}}$ $\overline{}$ $\overline{}$ I \mathbf{r} L $|p_{\text{max}} \varepsilon_c = \varepsilon_{\text{max}}$ – ..[4.18]

At yield in extension

 $p_{\text{max}} > p$ and $p = \sigma_{\text{Ru}}$

$$
\varepsilon_{RU} = \varepsilon_{\max} - \left[\left(\frac{p_{\max}}{Jq_{\text{ref}}} \right) \left(\frac{N^2 - 1}{N(2h - 1) + N^2} \right) \right]^{\frac{1}{h}}
$$
...(4.19)

The explanation of the terms q_{ref} and h and J is now presented, based on the methodology of Bolton and Whittle (1999). This solution uses a power law to describe the development of shear stress with strain for strains below the elastic/plastic threshold:

..[4.22]

$$
\tau = q_{ss} \varepsilon_s^h \tag{4.20}
$$

The co-efficient and exponent of the power law in [4.20] can be derived from plotting reloading data from unload/reload cycles. The origins for the data are the loop turnaround points. However for the purposes of curve fitting, the trend of radial stress versus cavity strain is required. This is not shear modulus, where the data would be shear stress plotted against shear strain. Fig 4.2 is an example (not from a test on this contract).

It is easy to manipulate the trends in fig 4.2 to give shear modulus. Assuming no volumetric strains are being developed whilst the material is deforming elastically, shear strain can be derived by multiplying the cavity strain values by two. Furthermore Bolton & Whittle show that the shear stress coefficient is related to the radial stress coefficient as follows:

$$
q_{ss} = hq_{rs} \tag{4.21}
$$

and secant shear modulus G_s is $G_s = q_{ss} \varepsilon_s^{h-1}$

4.3.3 Manipulating stiffness data for changes in mean effective stress

The stiffness data represented by q_{ref} and *h* give the stress/strain response of the elastic part of the curve. It is necessary to know the cavity strain at yield when this relationship will cease, given by [4.17]. Thereafter a single value of shear modulus, at yielding strain, is used implicitly by [4.12].

When the final unloading commences the shear modulus applicable to this part of the test will also depend on *q*ref and *h* with *qref* multiplied by a scale factor decided by the increase in the mean effective stress. All that is then required is to know when the elastic unloading stops, and this is given by [3.24]. The yielding value of shear modulus for [3.17] is likely to be lower than that from simply taking the slope of the first loop in the test but probably higher than the initial slope of the virgin loading curve, which will be influenced by disturbance.

Bellotti et al (1989) give a procedure for converting modulus at intermediate stress levels to a reference level, the insitu mean effective stress p_0 . It is based on the relationship proposed by Janbu (1963) and in terms of the nomenclature used here can be written:

$$
q_{ref} = q_{re} \left(\frac{p_0}{\sigma_{AV}}\right)^d \qquad \qquad ...(4.23)
$$

Given a value of radial stress at the cavity wall *p* , the mean effective stress can be calculated as follows:

Unload/reload
\n
$$
\sigma_{AV} = \left(\frac{p - c \cos \phi}{1 + \sin \phi}\right)
$$
...(4.24]
\n
$$
\sigma_{AV} = \left(\frac{p + c \cos \phi}{1 - \sin \phi}\right)
$$
...(4.25]

These two equations also incorporate the contribution of cohesion, *c*.

The modulus exponent *d* is obtained by plotting the mean effective stress against modulus and finding the best fit power law. The best correlation is obtained using *q* and *h* together as both are needed to fully describe the shape of the elastic response. Once a value for q_{ref} is obtained it is possible to predict the appropriate 'q' value for any other part of the curve, such as the final unloading, by calculating the mean effective stress for that point and multiplying by the ratio of that stress to the initial stress state. This is the scale factor J in [4.18] and [4.19].

4.3.4 Influence of Cohesion

It is surprisingly straightforward to introduce the influence of cohesion using Caquot's principle. All stresses are raised by *c* cot ϕ , so that [4.12] now becomes:

$$
\varepsilon_C = \varepsilon_R \left[A \left(\frac{P + c \cot \phi}{\sigma_R + c \cot \phi} \right)^{\gamma} + B \left(\frac{P + c \cot \phi}{\sigma_R + c \cot \phi} \right) + C \right] \tag{4.26}
$$

If there is no cohesion then the additional terms are zero and the equations revert to the frictional only form.

4.3.5 Deriving the limit pressure

Despite being a small strain solution it is possible to use the Carter et al solution in its adapted form to discover the limit pressure of an infinitely large expansion. At the limit state the ratio R/r*^a* of the elastic-plastic boundary to the current cavity size reaches a constant condition, which can be written:

$$
\frac{1}{\varepsilon_R} = \left[T \left(\frac{R}{r_a} \right)^{1+\alpha} - Z \left(\frac{R}{r_a} \right)^{1-\beta} \right]
$$
...(4.27)

or re-arranged to give

$$
\frac{1}{\varepsilon_R} = \left[T \left(\frac{P_{\text{lim}}}{\sigma_R} \right)^{\gamma} - Z \left(\frac{P_{\text{lim}}}{\sigma_R} \right) \right]
$$
 (4.28)

where P_{lim} is limit pressure. To apply these results, [3.22] is used to discover the elastic yield strain ε_R . Now guess the ratio P_{lim}/σ_R and use [3.33] within an iterative procedure to modify the guess until the known value of ε_R is obtained. Once the ratio has been identified, multiply it by the yield stress σ_R to obtain the limit pressure. This is effective limit pressure and we add to it the ambient pore water pressure to give the total limit pressure.

4.3.6 Deriving the elastic equations

Assuming the non-linear elastic response of the soil prior to yield can be described by a power law of the form $\tau = Q_s \epsilon_s^{h}$ (after Bolton & Whittle 1999) and assuming that whilst the soil is deforming elastically there are no volumetric strains then it follows that the principal stresses at first yield can be written

$$
\sigma_r = p_0 + \frac{\tau}{h}
$$
\n(A.1)\n
$$
\sigma_c = \sigma_r - 2\tau
$$
\n(A.2)

where τ represents the mobilised shear stress at failure. For a perfectly plastic frictional material development of the plastic zone occurs at a constant stress ratio, with the radial stress the major principal stress so at yield we can write

$$
\frac{\sigma_r}{\sigma_c} = N \tag{A.3}
$$

Substituting [A.1] into [A.2] and $Np_0 + \frac{N}{L}\tau - 2N\tau = p_0 + \frac{\tau}{L}$ the result into [A.3] leads to

$$
Np_0 + \frac{1}{h}\tau - 2N\tau = p_0 + \frac{1}{h}
$$

$$
\tau \qquad \begin{bmatrix} N-1 & 7 \end{bmatrix} \qquad (A.5)
$$

(A.4)

(A.7)

(A.9)

And this can be re-arranged to find τ/h :

so substituting into [A.1]

$$
\frac{\tau}{h} = p_0 \left[\frac{N-1}{N(2h-1)+1} \right]
$$
 (A.5)

$$
\sigma_R = p_0 \left[\frac{N2h}{N(2h-1)+1} \right] \tag{A.6}
$$

 $+(h -$

 \overline{a}

 ϕ

Alternatively, in terms of sin ϕ

The final unloading starts with the radial stress at a maximum P_{mx} and the circumferential stress less than this at P_{mx}/N . Yield in extension first occurs at the borehole wall when the radial stress is

 $\sigma_R = p_0 \left(1 + \frac{\sin \phi}{h + (h-1)\sin \phi} \right)$

 I L

 $= p_0 | 1 +$

 L

$$
\sigma_r = p_{mx} - \frac{\tau}{h}
$$
 (A.8)

 $\overline{}$ J

 $\left(2-\frac{1}{l}\right)$

 \setminus

 $=\frac{p_{mx}}{2}+\tau\left(2-\right)$ *N h*

 $\sigma_c = \frac{p_{mx}}{N} + \tau \left(2 - \frac{1}{N}\right)$

The circumferential stress will be

The mobilised shear stress τ is discovered in a similar way to the elastic loading equations noting that yield in contraction occurs with the circumferential stress being the major principal stress. τ/h for the elastic part of the final unloading is:

 $\frac{p}{c} = \frac{p_{mx}}{M}$

$$
\frac{\tau}{h} = p_{mx} \left[\frac{N^2 - 1}{N(2h - 1) + N^2} \right]
$$
\n(A.10)

The equivalent to [A.6] for the final unloading is:

$$
\sigma_{RU} = p_{mx} \left[\frac{N^2 - 1}{N(2h - 1) + N^2} \right]
$$
 (A.11)

*N*2*h* introduces non-linearity into the elastic distribution of stress. If *h* = 1, the value for linear elasticity, [A.6] and [A.11] revert to the standard equations for yield in a frictional material. Typical values for *h* in sand like material would be 0.6 – 0.8.

For a c' – phi material the failure does not occur at a constant stress ratio but can be made to seem so if all stresses are raised by $c \cot \phi$.

[A.3] now becomes
$$
\frac{\sigma_r + c \cot \phi}{\sigma_c + c \cot \phi} = N
$$
 (A.12)

and working this through, failure on first loading occurs when
\n
$$
\sigma_R = (p_0 + c \cot \phi) \left[\frac{N2h}{N(2h-1)+1} \right] - c \cot \phi
$$
\n(A.13)

The equivalent to [A,B] for the final unions] is:
 $\frac{1}{N} = P_{\text{tot}} \left[\frac{N(2k-1) + N^2}{N(2k-1) + N^2} \right]$

N2b introduces non-linearity incording is:

N2b introduces in final interest calculated interest interest interest in If there is no cohesion then [A.13] and [A.6] are the same. If the material is linear elastic, *h* = 1 and [A.13] reverts to the familiar Mohr-Coulomb expression for first yield. Similarly, the expression for first yield in unloading in a c'-phi material is obtained by taking equation [A.8] and [A.9] and using the argument that the failure stress ratio is given by

$$
\frac{\sigma_c + c \cot \phi}{\sigma_r + c \cot \phi} = N \tag{A.14}
$$

This leads to the following expression for the yielding stress in unloading:

$$
\sigma_{RU} = \left[\frac{p_{mx}(N(2h-1)+1) - c \cot \phi (N^2 - N)}{N(2h-1) + N^2} \right]
$$
 (A.15)

4.3.7 Example

A typical result of the curve fitting method applied to a test is given in fig 4.3. This particular test shows some cohesion. There is almost no contraction data because the membrane ruptures, but the single point that is plotted matches the field curve reasonably well, and would make a plausible limit for the elastic contraction transition.

The list of parameters in the top left hand corner includes the Janbu exponent of how stiffness varies with stress level at yield strain.

5 ANALYSES FOR STRENGTH, DRAINED CONTRACTION

5.1 Withers et al (1989)

Withers, Howie, Hughes and Robertson (1989) is an analysis developed for the unloading of a cone pressuremeter in sand but is applicable to the unloading phase of any pressuremeter test in purely frictional material.

The solution is based on the Hughes et al (1977) analysis for the expansion of a self-boring
pressuremeter in sand. During <u>expansion</u>, given a low disturbance insertion, effective radia
stress is related to circumferenti pressuremeter in sand. During expansion, given a low disturbance insertion, effective radial stress is related to circumferential strain by the following:

$$
P' = \sigma'_{ho} \left[\frac{2}{1+N} \right] \left[\left(\frac{G}{\sigma_{ho}} \right) (1+n) \left(\frac{1+N}{1-N} \right) \varepsilon + \left(\frac{1-n}{2} \right) \right] \left[\frac{1-N}{1+n} \right] \tag{5.1}
$$

where

P' is the effective radial stress at the cavity wall

N is $(1 - \sin \varphi')/(1 + \sin \varphi')$

 φ ' is the peak angle of internal friction

n is $(1 - \sin v)/(1 + \sin v)$

 υ is the angle of dilation of the soil

G is the shear modulus

 σ' _{ho} is the effective insitu horizontal stress

By incorporating Rowe's stress dilatancy theorem (1962) and by knowing or estimating constant volume friction angle, the loading gradient can be turned into values for the peak angles of internal friction and dilation:

$$
\sin \phi' = S/[1 + (S - 1) \sin \phi'_{\text{cv}} \qquad [5.2]
$$

$$
\sin v = S + (S - 1) \sin \phi'_{cv}
$$
 [5.3]

The final unloading starts with an elastic phase which ends when the effective radial stress is

$$
P' = NP
$$
 [5.4]

where P' _e is the maximum pressure reached during expansion.

The cavity strain at the onset of reverse plasticity will be

$$
\varepsilon = \varepsilon_{\rm e} - \left[(1 - N) P'_{\rm e} / 2G \right] \tag{5.5}
$$

where ε_e is the maximum strain reached. The solution for the plastic contraction is

$$
\varepsilon = \varepsilon_{e} - [(1 - N)P'_{e}/2G]
$$
\n[5.5]

\nIm strain reached. The solution for the plastic contraction

\n
$$
P' = [NP'_{e}] \left\{ \frac{[2G/P'_{e}][\varepsilon_{e} - \varepsilon][1 + nN]}{[(1 - N)(1 + N)n] - [(1 - N)/(1 + N)n]} \right\} \left[\frac{n[N^{2-1}]}{nN^{2} + N} \right]
$$
\n[5.6]

of the straight line portion will have a gradient S where If $\log P'/P'$ _e is plotted against $\log[(\varepsilon - \varepsilon)/(1 + \varepsilon)]$ the slope

$$
S = n(N^2 - 1)/(nN^2 + N)
$$
 [5.7]

Hence
$$
N = [(SN_{cv} + 1)/(1-S)]^{0.5}
$$
 [5.8]

in an analogous way to the loading solution, the contraction gradient can be turned into

values for the peak angles of internal friction and dilation using $N = nN_{cv}$.

It is unlikely that the ultimate slope will include the last few points – in general, data for stress levels less than the effective insitu horizontal stress should be ignored. The exponent in [5.6] includes square terms which makes it less sensitive than the equivalent exponent for the loading [5.1].

APPENDIX E SAMPLE CALCULATION OF A LINE OF DATA

What is described in some detail in this appendix are the steps necessary to convert the raw data output from the pressuremeter into engineering units.

In order to convert pressuremeter signals into calibrated data the following steps are taken:

A. The raw data is in units of volts, and needs to be corrected for zero offsets and scaled using the sensitivities quoted in the calibration data. The calibrations for this sample test are presented as follows:-

INSTRUMENT CALIBRATIONS:F05T2 DEPTH: 32.1M DATE: 20 Jan 12

The line of raw data reads from left to right. The units are volts:-

The first operation is to deduct the zero offsets. These are the figures found in the first column of the calibration information, but quoted here in volts. The columns for Sin and Cos disappear at this stage, as they are not transferred to the calibrated data file:

This result [1] can now be scaled. The information for this is found in the second column of calibration data, and is expressed as millivolts per millimetre to calculate displacement, and as millivolts per Mega Pascal to calculate pressure. As before, the results of the calculations are quoted in volts:

At this point in the procedure, a choice has to be made about which total pressure cell or combination of cells to use in producing the calibrated data. The difference between the cells is because cell A is read at the beginning of a data scan and cell B at the end. The time taken to make the scan allows some pressure change to occur in the probe. In this example both cells are used so the value of pressure carried forward is $(6.3621 + 6.2948 / 2 =$ 6.3285MPa.

B. The data is now in engineering units which reflect what is taking place inside the membrane. The remaining corrections are introduced to give a better representation of what is taking place at the point where the membrane bears on the borehole wall.

The displacement data is adjusted for the instrument displacements due to the pressure being applied to it. This is expressed as a linear movement in millimetres per Giga Pascal of pressure being applied, and is found in the 5th column of the calibration details:

C. The displacement data calculated so far is the movement measured by the arms to the inside of the membrane. The figures quoted in the calibrated data listings are the movement of the outside of the protective sheath. This is derived from the internal movement by assuming that the cross-section area of the membrane is a constant. A full explanation of this and the derivation of the equation used is discussed in the appendix on calibration technique.

 $t = 0.5334$ mm

Because the membrane can be assumed to have the same thickness at all points on the cross-section the technique employed is to calculate a scale factor from the average displacement:

D. The result, using displacements from [8] and the average total pressure quoted in kPa:

	LINE ARM 1 ARM 2 ARM 3 ARM 4 ARM 5 ARM 6 TPC			
	258 9.5083 10.3783 8.9768 8.3688 9.5755 9.2646 6328.5 [9]			

In practice the errors introduced by rounding-off calculations may result in a small difference in the final figure. This is the line of data seen in the calibrated data file that is passed from the logging program to the analysis program.

E. However the conversion to data ready for analysis is not yet complete. The column for pressure is the pressure *inside* the membrane. What is required is the pressure on the *outside* of the membrane where it bears against the borehole wall. Before using the calibrated data file, therefore, the analysis program corrects the pressure data for the influence of the membrane, using the data in the calibrations for membrane correction. It is separately calculated for each arm position, although in practice an average correction value tends to be used. The correction figure is the sum of the zero figure (column 3 in the calibrations) plus the increased stiffness with strain (column 4):-

This is the total membrane correction at each arm position and is now deducted from the total pressure cell readings. In this example because an average membrane correction has been used, the calculation is 6328.5kPa – 287.0kPa giving 6041.5kPa.

When the calibrated data is taken from the Analysis program the format differs from the PRN file produced by the logging program (see D, above). The analysis output gives the average radial displacement of opposing pairs of arms, together with a column of corrected pressure readings for each arm pair, and the uncorrected pressure:

APPENDIX F REFERENCES

BELLOTTI, R., GHIONNA, V., JAMIOLKOWSKI, M., ROBERTSON, P. and PETERSON, R. (1989).

"Interpretation of moduli from self-boring pressuremeter tests in sand". *Géotechnique* Vol.XXXIX, no.2, pp.269-292.

BOLTON M.D. (1986)

"The strength and dilatency of sands." *Géotechnique* Vol. **36**, No.1, pp 65-78.

BOLTON M.D. and WHITTLE R.W. (1999)

"A non-linear elastic/perfectly plastic analysis for plane strain undrained expansion tests." *Géotechnique* Vol. **49**, No.1, pp 133-141.

CARTER, .I. P., BOOKER, J. R. & YEUNG, S. K. (1986).

"Cavity expansion in cohesive frictional soils". *Géotechnique* **36**, No. 3,.pp 349-358

CLARKE, B.G., CARTER, J.P. and WROTH, C.P. (l979).

"In Situ Determination of Consolidation Characteristics of Saturated Clays". *Design Parameters in Geotechnical Engineering*, VII ECSMFE, Brighton, Vol. 2, , pp 207- 211

ERVIN, M.C., BURMAN, B.C. and HUGHES, J.M.O.(1980).

"The use of a high capacity pressuremeter for design of foundations in medium strength rock". Int. Conf. on Structural Foundations on Rock, Sydney.

FAHEY, M. and CARTER, J.P. (1993)

A finite element study of the pressuremeter test in sand using a nonlinear elastic plastic model. Can. Geotech. J. 30, No. 2, 348–362.

FAHEY, M. and JEWELL, R.J. (1990)

Effect of Pressuremeter Compliance on Measurement of Shear Modulus. Paper submitted to The Third International Symposium on Pressuremeters, Oxford University 2 - 6 April 1990

GHIONNA, V., JAMIOLKOWSKI, M., LANCELLOTTA, R. & MANASSERO, M (1989).

Limit Pressure of Pressuremeter Tests. Proc. of 12th ICSMFE, Rio De Janeiro.

GIBSON, R.E. and ANDERSON, W.F. (1961)

In situ measurement of soil properties with the pressuremeter, Civil Engineering and Public Works Review, Vol. 56, No. 658 May pp 6l5-6l8 .

HAWKINS, P.G., MAIR, R.J., MATHIESON, W.G. and MUIR WOOD, D. (1990)

Pressuremeter measurement of total horizontal stress in stiff clay, Proc. ISP.3 Oxford.

HOULSBY, G., CLARKE, B. and WROTH, C.P. (1986).

"Analysis of the unloading of a pressuremeter in sand". Proc. of the 2nd International Symposium on The Pressuremeter and its Marine Applications pp 245-262.

HUGHES, J.M.O. (1973).

An instrument for in situ measurement in soft clays, PhD Thesis, University of Cambridge

HUGHES,J.M.O., ERVIN, M.C. (1980)

Development of a High Pressure Pressuremeter for determining the engineering properties of soft to medium strength rocks.Proc. 3rd Aus.-NZ Conf. Geomechanics, Brisbane, pp.292- 296.

HUGHES, J.M.O., WROTH, C.P. and WINDLE, D. (1977)

Pressuremeter tests in sands, *Géotechnique* **4**, pp 455-477

JARDINE, R.J. (1991)

Discussing 'Strain-dependent moduli and pressuremeter tests' . *Géotechnique* **41***,* No. 4*.*,pp 621-624

JARDINE, R.J. (1992)

Nonlinear stiffness parameters from undrained pressuremeter tests. *Can. Geotech*. **29**, pp 436-447

JEFFERIES, M.G. (1988)

Determination of horizontal geostatic stress in clay with self-bored pressuremeter. *Can. Geotech*. **25** (3), pp 559-573

LADANYI, B. (1972)

An engineering theory of creep of frozen soils. *Can. Geotech*. **9**: pp 63-80.

LADANYI, B. & JOHNSTON, G.H. (1973).

Evaluation of in situ creep properties of frozen soils with the pressuremeter. *Proc. 2nd Int. Conf on Permafrost,* Yakutsk: pp 310-318.

LADD, C.C., FOOTT, R., ISHIHARA, K., SCHLOSSER, F. AND POULOS, H.G. (1977)

Stress-deformation and strength characteristics: state of the art report. *Proc.9th Int. Conf. Soil Mech., Tokyo*, **2**, pp 421-494

MARSLAND, A. and RANDOLPH, M.F. (1977).

Comparison of the Results from Pressuremeter Tests and Large Insitu Plate Tests in London Clay. *Géotechnique* **27** No. 2 pp 2l7-243.

MAIR, R.J. and WOOD, D.M. (1987)

Pressuremeter Testing. Methods and Interpretation. Construction Industry Research and Information Association Project 335. Publ. Butterworths, London. ISBN 0-408-02434-8

MANASSERO, M. (1989)

Stress-Strain Relationships from Drained Self Boring Pressuremeter Tests in Sand. *Géotechnique* **39**, No.2.

MAYNE, P.W., and KULHAWY, F.H., (1982)

Ko-OCR Relationships in Soil, Journal of the Geotechnical Engineering Division, ASCE, Vol 108, No. GT6, June, pp. 851-872.

MUIR WOOD, D. (1990)

Strain dependent soil moduli and pressuremeter tests. *Géotechnique*, **40**, pp 509-512.

NEWMAN, R.L., CHAPMAN, T.J.P. and SIMPSON, B. (1991)

"Evaluation of pile behaviour from pressuremeter tests". *Proc. Xth European Conference on Soil Mechanics and Foundation Engineering, Florence*, May 1991

PALMER, A.C. (1972)

Undrained plane-strain expansion of a cylindrical cavity in clay: a simple interpretation of the pressuremeter test, *Géotechnique* **22** No. 3 pp 45l-457.

RANDOLPH, M.F. and WROTH, C.P. (1978)

"An analytical solution for the consolidation around a driven pile". *Int. J. Numer. Anal. Methods in Geomech*. **3**, pp 217-229

ROBERTSON, P.K. and HUGHES, J.M.O. (1985)

"Determination of Properties of Sand from Self-Boring Pressuremeter Tests ". The Pressuremeter and Its Marine Applications, Second International Symposium.

ROWE, P.W. (1962)

"The Stress Dilatancy Relation for Static Equilibrium of an Assembly of Particles in Contact". Proceedings of the Royal Society. Vol. 269, Series A, pp 500-527.

SAGASETA, C. and HOULSBY, G.T (1988)

Elastic-plastic incompressible flow around an infinite cone. Penetration Testing 1988, ISOPT-1, De Ruiter (ed.), Balkema Rotterdam, pp 933-938.

SKEMPTON, A.W. (1957)

Discussion: Further data on the c/p ratio in normally consolidated clays.

Proc Inst. Civ. Eng., **7**, pp 305 -307

WHITTLE, R.W. and DALTON, J.C.P. (1990)

Discussing 'Experience with the self boring rock pressuremeter'. *Ground Engineering*, Jan/Feb, pp 30-32.

WHITTLE R.W (1993)

Discussing 'The assessment of in situ stress and stiffness at seven overconsolidated clay and weak rock sites'. *Ground Engineering*, Sept 1993, pp 19-20.

WHITTLE R.W (1999)

Using non-linear elasticity to obtain the engineering properties of clay. *Ground Engineering*, May, vol. 32, no.5, pp 30-34.

WHITTLE R.W and LIU LIAN (2013)

A method for describing the stress and strain dependency of stiffness in sand. Proc. ISP6, Paris, 2013

WITHERS, N.J., HOWIE, J., HUGHES, J.M.O. and ROBERTSON, P.K. (1989)

Performance and Analysis of Cone Pressuremeter Tests in Sands. Géotechnique 39, No. 3, pp 433-454.

WROTH, C.P. (1984)

"The Interpretation of In Situ Soil Tests". Twenty Fourth Rankine Lecture, *Géotechnique* **34**, No. 4, pp 449-489

A303 STONEHENGE GROUND INVESTIGATION

Results of pressuremeter testing carried out by Cambridge Insitu Ltd

AECOM project reference: 60547200 Structural Soils reference 733442 Cambridge Insitu reference: CIR1417/18 Original report date: July 2018 Version: 1.0

Volume 2 of 2

DATA FOR BOREHOLE SBP604 AND CALIBRATIONS

CAMBRIDGE INSITU LTD Little Eversden Cambridge ENGLAND CB23 1HE

Tel: +44 1223 262361 Fax: +44 1223 263947 Email: cam@cambridge-insitu.com **The Contract of State**

Test Name SBP604	Internal Ref.	Depth (mBGL)	Date	Max Press. (kPa)	HPD Probe	Oper.	Transducer calibration	Membrane calibration	Stiffness calibration
Test 1	S604T1	18.25	01 -Jun-18	5094	Wally	RWW	23-May-18	Z2305T28	Z2305T18
Test 2	S604T2	21.10	01 -Jun-18	5001	Wally	RWW	23-May-18	Z2305T28	Z2305T18
Test 3	S604T3	25.05	04 -Jun-18	6411	Wally	RWW	23-May-18	Z2305T28	Z2305T18
Test 4	S604T4	27.25	04 -Jun-18	6264	Wally	RWW	23-May-18	Z2305T28	Z2305T18
Test 5	S604T5	30.75	04-Jun-18	7286	Wally	RWW	23-May-18	Z2305T28	Z2305T18
Test 6	S604T6	34.05	05 -Jun-18	7331	Wally	RWW	23-May-18	W0606T1	W0506T1
Test 7	S604T7	37.20	05-Jun-18	7890	Wally	RWW	23-May-18	W0606T1	W0506T1

Table 2.1 Tests included

Notes:

- 1. Depth is metres below ground level to the centre point of the expanding membrane. For the HPD the membrane is 0.6m long, so ±0.3m of the quoted depth is loaded during the test.
- 2. 'Max Press' is the maximum pressure reached during the test.
- 3. Probe One probe was used for all tests, a 95mm diameter High Pressure Dilatometer (HPD) known as 'Wally'.
- 4. The probe has a calibration for its transducers, and additional calibrations for the membrane being used. The transducer calibrations are only carried out occasionally, the membrane calibrations are performed every time a membrane is changed.
- 5. 'Oper.' Is the operator. The tests were carried out by Robert Whittle of Cambridge Insitu Ltd.

The remainder of this volume is laid out as follows:

Immediately following this introduction is a section contained modulus data for all the tests plotted in various ways.

The analysed data are then given, separated by test.

After presenting the test data there is a short section with calibration data for the probe. The test data are presented in approximately the following order:

Plots from the analysis program WINSITU:

- 1. A Results Summary Sheet
- 2. A plot of total pressure against cavity strain, using the output from the average of all displacement followers.
- 3. A plot of Total pressure/Radial displacement showing the slope identified as the initial shear modulus. Where plasticity is evident, the apparent yield stress and the cavity reference pressure inferred from this yield stress (Marsland & Randolph 1977, Hawkins 1990).
- 4. For drained expansion tests a log-log plot of current cavity strain against effective radial stress quoting the gradient (Hughes et al, 1977). This can be used to derive a peak friction angle and dilation angle if the constant volume friction angle is known (or estimated).
- 5. For drained tests a log-log plot using *contraction* data of current cavity strain against effective radial stress quoting the gradient (Withers et al, 1989). This can be used to derive a peak friction angle and dilation angle if the constant volume friction angle is known (or estimated).
- 6. Plots on axes of Radial displacement/Total Pressure showing enlarged views of unload/reload cycles and quoting shear modulus G.
- 7. Plots on axes of Ln[current cavity shear strain]/Ln[Total Pressure] showing loop reloading paths and quoting the gradient and intercept for each loop (Bolton & Whittle, 1999).
- 8. A plot on axes of secant shear modulus/Log[Shear strain] showing the decay of stiffness against strain curves derived from fitting a power law function to reloading data, all cycles. Individual data points obtained from applying Palmer (1972) directly to reloading data are also shown.
- 9. Where plasticity is evident, for drained tests, a plot on axes of Average Cavity Strain/Total pressure showing the results of curve fitting the field curve with the best set of parameters using a non-linear elastic/perfectly plastic solution (Carter et al 1986, *modified*).

Plots taken from the data collection software package WINLOG:

- 10. From WINLOG On axes of Radial Displacement/Total Pressure showing average displacement.
- 11. From WINLOG On axes of Radial Displacement/Total Pressure showing all displacement sensors (six curves)
- 12. From WINLOG On axes of Radial Displacement/Total Pressure showing the average radial displacement for opposing pairs of arms (three curves)
- 13. From WINLOG On axes of Radial Displacement/Total Pressure showing the average radial displacement for odd numbered arms and even numbered arms (two curves)

Because the information presented here comes from a variety of sources it is not possible to number the pages.

Winsitu colour coding

Plots from the analysis program WINSITU use a colour coding scheme to distinguish between different kinds of data. The options are these:

When a particular plot displays one colour only then this is arbitrary and the colour has no significance. When more than one colour is shown then the meaning is indicated above.

Fig 2.1 All the field curves

LOOP DATA

(TAKEN FROM WINSITU and WINLOG FILES)

TEST DATA

(TAKEN FROM WINSITU and WINLOG FILES)

A303 Stonehenge Pressuremeter Testing SBP604 Test $1 -$ SUMMARY OF RESULTS [File made with WinSitu Version 3.9.1.1] [DETAILS OF TEST] Project : 60547200
Site : A303 Stonehenge Site : A303 Stonehenge Borehole : SBP604 Test name : SBP604 Test 1 Test date : 1 Jun 18 Test depth : 18.25 Metres Water table : 22.5 Metres Ambient PWP : 0.0 kPa Material : Chalk Probe : 95mm High Pressure Dilatometer Diameter : 97.0 mm Data analysed using average arm displacement curve A non-linear analysis of the rebound cycles has been carried out The file includes results from a curve fitting analysis Analysed by RWW on 6 Jun 18 Remarks: Pocket 17 to 19.35. Drilled with water only, many problems. [RESULTS FOR CAVITY REFERENCE PRESSURE]
Strain Origin (mm) : Strain Origin (mm) : "Arm ave=3.39" Po from Marsland & Randolph (kPa) : "Arm ave=743.9"
Best estimate of Po (kPa) : "Arm ave=616.0" Best estimate of Po (kPa) : [UNDRAINED STRENGTH PARAMETERS] Undrained yield stress (kPa) : "Arm ave=2928.7" [DRAINED ANALYSIS OF SANDS] [Hughes et al 1977] Constant volume friction angle $(°)$: 28.0
Angle of internal friction $(°)$: "Arm ave=36.9" Angle of internal friction (°) : "Arm ave=36.9" Dilation angle (°) $\qquad \qquad : \qquad "Arm ave=10.4"$ Gradient of log-log plot : "Arm ave=0.443" [Withers et al 1989] Angle of internal friction (°) : "Arm ave=39.7"
Dilation angle (°) : "Arm ave=14.0" Dilation angle (°) $\begin{array}{ccc} \text{P} & \text{P} & \text{P} \\ \text{Gradient of } & \text{P} & \text{P} \end{array}$ = $\begin{array}{ccc} \text{P} & \text{P} & \text{P} \\ \text{P} & \text{P} & \text{P} \end{array}$ = $\begin{array}{ccc} \text{P} & \text{P} & \text{P} \\ \text{P} & \text{P} & \text{P} \end{array}$ Gradient of log-log plot [LINEAR INTERPRETATION OF SHEAR MODULUS G] Initial slope shear modulus (MPa) :"Arm ave=129.2" Axis Loop Value Mean Strain Mean Pc dE dPc No (MPa) (%) (kPa) (%) (kPa) Arm ave 1 206.9 -0.818 447 0.035 73 Arm ave 2 360.7 -0.438 756 0.042 150 Arm ave 3 741.6 0.146 1637 0.061 449 Arm ave 4 1069.6 1.184 3249 0.061 650 Arm ave 5 900.8 1.890 2603 0.131 1179 [UNDRAINED NON LINEAR INTERPRETATION OF SECANT SHEAR MODULUS] Axis Loop Intercept Alpha Gradient No (MPa) (MPa) Arm ave 1 139.024 132.120 0.950 Arm ave 2 202.326 189.219 0.935 Arm ave 3 232.664 196.114 0.843 Arm ave 4 269.729 219.198 0.813 Arm ave 5 193.493 146.644 0.758 [PARAMETERS USED FOR DRAINED CURVE MODELLING] {Axis is Arm ave} Strain Origin (mm) : 3.39
Po (kPa) : 616 Po (kPa) : 616 Cohesion (kPa) : 58 Angle of peak friction (deg) : 36.9 Angle of peak dilation (deg) : 10.4 Total yield stress (kPa) $\qquad \qquad ; \qquad 1295$
Total limit stress (kPa) $\qquad \qquad ; \qquad 22688$ Total limit stress (kPa) G at first yield (MPa) : 435.1 Non-linear exponent : 0.758 Janbu exponent : 0.333 Correlation : 0.890 Ambient pore water pressure (kPa) : 0
Residual friction angle (deg) : 28 Residual friction angle (deg) : 28.0 Poisson's ratio $\qquad \qquad : \quad 0.33$ CIR1417/18

٦

A303 Stonehenge Pressuremeter Testing

A303 Stonehenge **Pressuremeter** Testing SBP604 Test 2 - SUMMARY OF RESULTS [File made with WinSitu Version 3.9.1.1] [DETAILS OF TEST] Project : 60547200
Site : A303 Stonehenge Site : A303 Stonehenge Borehole : SBP604 Test name : SBP604 Test 2 Test date : 1 Jun 18 Test depth : 21.10 Metres Water table : 22.5 Metres Ambient PWP : 0.0 kPa Material : Chalk Probe : 95mm High Pressure Dilatometer Diameter : 97.0 mm Data analysed using average arm displacement curve A non-linear analysis of the rebound cycles has been carried out The file includes results from a curve fitting analysis Analysed by RWW on 6 Jun 18 Remarks: Pocket drilled with air mist. Small data loss betw een 2.6 and 3.2MPa, unexplained. [RESULTS FOR CAVITY REFERENCE PRESSURE] Strain Origin (mm) : "Arm ave=5.58" Po from Marsland & Randolph (kPa) : "Arm ave=728.2" Best estimate of Po (kPa) : "Arm ave=612.0" [UNDRAINED STRENGTH PARAMETERS] Undrained yield stress (kPa) : "Arm ave=3022.9" [DRAINED ANALYSIS OF SANDS] [Hughes et al 1977] Constant volume friction angle (°) : 28.0
Angle of internal friction (°) : "Arm ave=30.7" Angle of internal friction (°) : "Arm ave=30.7" Dilation angle (°) $\qquad \qquad : \qquad \text{''Arm ave=3.1''}$ Gradient of log-log plot : "Arm ave=0.356" [Withers et al 1989] Angle of internal friction (°) : "Arm ave=32.9" Dilation angle (°) : "Arm ave=5.7" Gradient of log-log plot : "Arm ave=-2.035" [LINEAR INTERPRETATION OF SHEAR MODULUS G] Initial slope shear modulus (MPa) :"Arm ave=114.0" Axis Loop Value Mean Strain Mean Pc dE dPc No (MPa) (%) (kPa) (%) (kPa) Arm ave 1 406.7 -0.250 831 0.058 234 Arm ave 2 693.2 0.215 1630 0.064 444 Arm ave 3 769.8 1.749 3206 0.108 835 Arm ave 4 660.3 3.774 2657 0.180 1191 [UNDRAINED NON LINEAR INTERPRETATION OF SECANT SHEAR MODULUS] Axis Loop Intercept Alpha Gradient No (MPa) (MPa) Arm ave 1 191.319 172.786 0.903 Arm ave 2 258.417 222.471 0.861 Arm ave 3 176.273 136.672 0.775 Arm ave 4 130.912 95.133 0.727 [PARAMETERS USED FOR DRAINED CURVE MODELLING] {Axis is Arm ave} Strain Origin (mm) : 5.58 Po (kPa) : 612 Cohesion (kPa) : 22 Angle of peak friction (deg) : 30.7 Angle of peak dilation (deg) : 3.1 Total yield stress (kPa) $\qquad \qquad : \qquad 1176$ Total limit stress (kPa) : 13881 G at first yield (MPa) $\begin{array}{ccc} \n\text{G at first yield (MPa)} \\
\text{Non-linear exponent} \\
\text{S34.0}\n\end{array}$ Non-linear exponent : 0.727 Janbu exponent : 0.138 Correlation : 0.881 Ambient pore water pressure (kPa) : 0
Residual friction angle (deg) : 28.0 Residual friction angle (deg) : 28.0 Poisson's ratio in the set of the s

A303 Stonehenge **Pressuremeter Testing**

CIR1417/18

CIR1417/18
A303 Stonehenge Pressuremeter Testing SBP604 Test 3 - SUMMARY OF RESULTS [File made with WinSitu Version 3.9.1.1] [DETAILS OF TEST] Project : 60547200
Site : A303 Stonehenge Site : A303 Stonehenge Borehole : SBP604 Test name : SBP604 Test 3 Test date : 4 Jun 18 Test depth : 25.05 Metres Water table : 22.5 Metres Ambient PWP : 25.0 kPa Material : Chalk Probe : 95mm High Pressure Dilatometer Diameter : 97.0 mm Data analysed using average arm displacement curve A non-linear analysis of the rebound cycles has been carried out The file includes results from a curve fitting analysis Analysed by RWW on 6 Jun 18 Remarks: Pocket 23 to 26m [RESULTS FOR CAVITY REFERENCE PRESSURE] Strain Origin (mm) : "Arm ave=4.26" Po from Marsland & Randolph (kPa) : "Arm ave=758.9" Best estimate of Po (kPa) $\qquad \qquad : \qquad$ "Arm ave=727.0" [UNDRAINED STRENGTH PARAMETERS] Undrained yield stress (kPa) : "Arm ave=3785.5" [DRAINED ANALYSIS OF SANDS] [Hughes et al 1977] Constant volume friction angle (°) : 28.0 Angle of internal friction (°) : "Arm ave=33.5" Dilation angle (°) : "Arm ave=6.4" Gradient of log-log plot : "Arm ave=0.395" [Withers et al 1989] Angle of internal friction (°) : "Arm ave=41.2" Dilation angle (°) : "Arm ave=15.9" Gradient of log-log plot : "Arm ave=-2.374" [LINEAR INTERPRETATION OF SHEAR MODULUS G] Initial slope shear modulus (MPa) :"Arm ave=230.6" Axis Loop Value Mean Strain Mean Pc dE dPc

No (MPa) (%) (kPa) (%) (kPa) No (MPa) (%) (kPa) (%) (kPa) Arm ave 1 1011.8 -0.125 1310 0.036 360 Arm ave 2 1203.9 0.224 2545 0.057 686 Arm ave 3 1164.4 0.625 3709 0.084 979 Arm ave 4 974.0 1.489 3341 0.169 1649 [UNDRAINED NON LINEAR INTERPRETATION OF SECANT SHEAR MODULUS] Axis Loop Intercept Alpha Gradient No (MPa) (MPa) Arm ave 1 591.865 553.333 0.935 Arm ave 2 357.033 299.337 0.838 Arm ave 3 351.365 291.729 0.830 Arm ave 4 355.437 296.273 0.834 [PARAMETERS USED FOR DRAINED CURVE MODELLING] {Axis is Arm ave} Strain Origin (mm) $\qquad \qquad : \qquad 4.26$
Po (kPa) $\qquad \qquad : \qquad 727$ Po (kPa) : 727 Cohesion (kPa) : 166 Angle of peak friction (deg) : 33.5 Angle of peak dilation (deg) : 6.4 Total yield stress (kPa) $\qquad \qquad$: 1441 Total limit stress (kPa) : 27006 G at first yield (MPa) : 991.9 Non-linear exponent : 0.830 Janbu exponent : 0.027 Correlation : 0.372 Ambient pore water pressure (kPa) : 25 Residual friction angle (deg) : 28.0 Poisson's ratio $\qquad \qquad : \qquad 0.33$

A303 Stonehenge Pressuremeter Testing

A303 Stonehenge Pressuremeter Testing

CIR1417/18

CIR1417/18

A303 Stonehenge Pressuremeter Testing SBP604 Test 4 - SUMMARY OF RESULTS [File made with WinSitu Version 3.9.1.1] [DETAILS OF TEST] Project : 60547200
Site : A303 Stonehenge Site : A303 Stonehenge Borehole : SBP604 Test name : SBP604 Test 4 Test date : 4 Jun 18 Test depth : 27.25 Metres Water table : 22.5 Metres Ambient PWP : 46.6 kPa Material : Chalk Probe : 95mm High Pressure Dilatometer Diameter : 97.0 mm Data analysed using average arm displacement curve A non-linear analysis of the rebound cycles has been carried out The file includes results from a curve fitting analysis Analysed by RWW on 6 Jun 18 Remarks: Pocket 26 to 28m. Full recovery. Chalk is slightly dirty grey and crumbly. Initial pressure setting too high, no data between 200 and 1000kPa. Includes a balance point check during final unload. [RESULTS FOR CAVITY REFERENCE PRESSURE] Strain Origin (mm) : "Arm ave=3.85"
Po from Marsland & Randolph (kPa) : "Arm ave=642.0"
Best estimate of Po (kPa) : "Arm ave=622.0" Po from Marsland & Randolph (kPa) : "Arm ave=642.0"
Best estimate of Po (kPa) : "Arm ave=622.0" Best estimate of Po (kPa) [UNDRAINED STRENGTH PARAMETERS] Undrained yield stress (kPa) : "Arm ave=3340.7" [DRAINED ANALYSIS OF SANDS] [Hughes et al 1977] Constant volume friction angle $(°)$: 28.0
Angle of internal friction $(°)$: "Arm ave=29.9" Angle of internal friction (°) : "Arm ave=29.9" Dilation angle (°) $\qquad \qquad : \qquad \text{''Arm ave=2.1''}$ Gradient of log-log plot : "Arm ave=0.345" [Withers et al 1989] Angle of internal friction (°) : "Arm ave=38.0"
Dilation angle (°) : "Arm ave=11.8" Dilation angle (°) $\qquad \qquad : \qquad "Arm ave=11.8"$ Gradient of log-log plot : "Arm ave=-2.257" [LINEAR INTERPRETATION OF SHEAR MODULUS G] Initial slope shear modulus (MPa) :"Arm ave=147.9" Axis Loop Value Mean Strain Mean Pc dE dPc No (MPa) (%) (kPa) (%) (kPa) Arm ave 1 818.1 0.058 1556 0.051 414 Arm ave 2 1024.7 0.884 3180 0.096 985 Arm ave 3 1031.7 2.427 3979 0.083 858 Arm ave 4 956.8 3.765 2930 0.118 1131 [UNDRAINED NON LINEAR INTERPRETATION OF SECANT SHEAR MODULUS] Axis Loop Intercept Alpha Gradient No (MPa) (MPa) Arm ave 1 582.116 564.047 0.969 Arm ave 2 210.642 161.864 0.768 Arm ave 3 171.110 128.443 0.751 Arm ave 4 198.591 150.607 0.758 [PARAMETERS USED FOR DRAINED CURVE MODELLING] {Axis is Arm ave} Strain Origin (mm) : 3.85
Po (kPa) : 622 Po (kPa) : 622 Cohesion (kPa) : 46 Angle of peak friction (deg) : 29.9 Angle of peak dilation (deg) : 2.1 Total yield stress (kPa) $\qquad \qquad$: 1122 Total limit stress (kPa) : 15805 G at first yield (MPa) : 1036.3 Non-linear exponent : 0.768 Janbu exponent : -0.016 Correlation : 0.004 Ambient pore water pressure (kPa) : 47 Residual friction angle (deg) : 28.0 Poisson's ratio $\qquad \qquad : \quad 0.33$

CIR1417/18

A303 Stonehenge **Pressuremeter Testing**

A303 Stonehenge **Pressuremeter** Testing SBP604 Test 5 - SUMMARY OF RESULTS [File made with WinSitu Version 3.9.1.1] [DETAILS OF TEST] Project : 60547200
Site : A303 Stonehenge Site : A303 Stonehenge Borehole : SBP604 Test name : SBP604 Test 5 Test date : 4 Jun 18 Test depth : 30.75 Metres Water table : 22.5 Metres Ambient PWP : 80.9 kPa Material : Chalk Probe : 95mm High Pressure Dilatometer Diameter : 97.0 mm Data analysed using average arm displacement curve A non-linear analysis of the rebound cycles has been carried out The file includes results from a curve fitting analysis Analysed by RWW on 7 Jun 18 Remarks: Core run nominally 29 to 32, but many problems with blocking off. [RESULTS FOR CAVITY REFERENCE PRESSURE]
Strain Origin (mm) :
Po from Marsland & Randolph (kPa) : Strain Origin (mm) : "Arm ave=4.38" Po from Marsland & Randolph (kPa) : "Arm ave=746.6"
Best estimate of Po (kPa) : "Arm ave=743.0" Best estimate of Po (kPa) [UNDRAINED STRENGTH PARAMETERS] Undrained yield stress (kPa) : "Arm ave=3663.4" [DRAINED ANALYSIS OF SANDS] [Hughes et al 1977] Constant volume friction angle $(°)$: 28.0
Angle of internal friction $(°)$: "Arm ave=33.6" Angle of internal friction (°) : "Arm ave=33.6" Dilation angle (°) : "Arm ave=6.6" Gradient of log-log plot : "Arm ave=0.397" [Withers et al 1989] Angle of internal friction (°) : "Arm ave=33.4" Dilation angle (°) : "Arm ave=6.3" Gradient of log-log plot : "Arm ave=-2.059" [LINEAR INTERPRETATION OF SHEAR MODULUS G] Initial slope shear modulus (MPa) :"Arm ave=171.9" Axis Loop Value Mean Strain Mean Pc dE dPc No (MPa) (%) (kPa) (%) (kPa) Arm ave 1 744.4 -0.109 1700 0.042 311 Arm ave 2 1073.8 0.511 3310 0.068 735 Arm ave 3 1100.8 1.366 4887 0.108 1193 Arm ave 4 968.9 2.607 3619 0.156 1514 [UNDRAINED NON LINEAR INTERPRETATION OF SECANT SHEAR MODULUS] Axis Loop Intercept Alpha Gradient No (MPa) (MPa) Arm ave 1 670.613 668.041 0.996 Arm ave 2 614.573 570.812 0.929 Arm ave 3 459.206 403.056 0.878 Arm ave 4 172.027 124.533 0.724 [PARAMETERS USED FOR DRAINED CURVE MODELLING] {Axis is Arm ave} Strain Origin (mm) : 4.38
Po (kPa) : 743 Po (kPa) : 743 Cohesion (kPa) $\qquad \qquad : \qquad 98$
Angle of peak friction (deg) $\qquad \qquad : \qquad 33.6$ Angle of peak friction (deg) : 33.6 Angle of peak dilation (deg) $\qquad \qquad : \qquad 6.6$ Total yield stress (kPa) : 1528 Total limit stress (kPa) : 26328 G at first yield (MPa) $\begin{array}{ccc} \text{G at first yield} & \text{(MPa)} & \text{}: & 947.7 \\ \text{Non-linear exponent} & \text{}: & 0.724 \end{array}$ Non-linear exponent : 0.724 Janbu exponent : 0.009 Correlation : 0.025 Ambient pore water pressure (kPa) : 81
Residual friction angle (deg) : 28.0 Residual friction angle (deg) : 28.0 Poisson's ratio in the set of the s

A303 Stonehenge Pressuremeter Testing

CIR1417/18

A303 Stonehenge Pressuremeter Testing SBP604 Test 6 - SUMMARY OF RESULTS [File made with WinSitu Version 3.9.1.1] [DETAILS OF TEST] Project : 60547200
Site : A303 Stonehenge Site : A303 Stonehenge Borehole : SBP604 Test name : SBP604 Test 6 Test date : 5 Jun 18 Test depth : 34.05 Metres Water table : 22.5 Metres Ambient PWP : 113.3 kPa Material : Chalk Probe : 95mm High Pressure Dilatometer Diameter : 97.0 mm Data analysed using average arm displacement curve A non-linear analysis of the rebound cycles has been carried out The file includes results from a curve fitting analysis Analysed by RWW on 7 Jun 18 Remarks: Test ends with membrane rupturing lower end [RESULTS FOR CAVITY REFERENCE PRESSURE]
Strain Origin (mm) : Strain Origin (mm) : "Arm ave=2.87" Po from Marsland & Randolph (kPa) : "Arm ave=861.0"
Best estimate of Po (kPa) : "Arm ave=833.0" Best estimate of Po (kPa) [UNDRAINED STRENGTH PARAMETERS] Undrained yield stress (kPa) : "Arm ave=3671.1" [DRAINED ANALYSIS OF SANDS] [Hughes et al 1977] Constant volume friction angle (°) : 28.0 Angle of internal friction (°) : "Arm ave=38.8" Dilation angle (°) : "Arm ave=12.9" Gradient of log-log plot : "Arm ave=0.471" [LINEAR INTERPRETATION OF SHEAR MODULUS G] Initial slope shear modulus (MPa) :"Arm ave=266.2" Axis Loop Value Mean-Strain Mean-Pc dE dPc
No (MPa) (%) (kPa) (%) (kP
Armave 1 1031.7 0.098 1876 0.037 379 (%) (kPa) (%) (kPa)
0.098 1876 0.037 379 Arm ave 1 1031.7 0.098 1876 0.037 379 Arm ave 2 1350.4 0.502 3274 0.060 811 Arm ave 3 1341.3 1.209 4662 0.088 1182 [UNDRAINED NON LINEAR INTERPRETATION OF SECANT SHEAR MODULUS] Axis Loop Intercept Alpha Gradient No (MPa) (MPa) Arm ave 1 213.411 173.706 0.814 Arm ave 2 312.978 252.510 0.807 Arm ave 3 356.687 289.798 0.812 [PARAMETERS USED FOR DRAINED CURVE MODELLING] {Axis is Arm ave} Strain Origin (mm) $\qquad \qquad : \qquad 2.87$

Po (kPa) $\qquad \qquad : \qquad 833$ Po (kPa) : 833 Cohesion (kPa) : 566 Angle of peak friction (deg) : 38.8 Angle of peak dilation (deg) : 12.9 Total yield stress (kPa) : 2118 Total limit stress (kPa) : 38144
G at first vield (MPa) : 453.0 G at first yield (MPa) $\begin{array}{ccc} \text{53.0} \\ \text{Non-linear exponent} \end{array}$: 453.0 Non-linear exponent : 0.812
Janbu exponent : 0.452 Janbu exponent : 0.452 Correlation Ambient pore water pressure (kPa) : 113 Residual friction angle (deg) : 28.0 Poisson's ratio $\qquad \qquad : \qquad 0.33$

A303 Stonehenge Pressuremeter Testing

A303 Stonehenge **Pressuremeter Testing**

CIR1417/18

A303 Stonehenge Pressuremeter Testing SBP604 Test 7 - SUMMARY OF RESULTS [File made with WinSitu Version 3.9.1.1] [DETAILS OF TEST] Project : 60547200
Site : A303 Stonehenge Site : A303 Stonehenge Borehole : SBP604 Test name : SBP604 Test 7 Test date : 5 Jun 18 Test depth : 37.20 Metres Water table : 22.5 Metres Ambient PWP : 144.2 kPa Material : Chalk Probe : 95mm High Pressure Dilatometer Diameter : 97.0 mm Data analysed using average arm displacement curve A non-linear analysis of the rebound cycles has been carried out The file includes results from a curve fitting analysis Analysed by RWW on 7 Jun 18 Remarks: [RESULTS FOR CAVITY REFERENCE PRESSURE] Strain Origin (mm) : "Arm ave=4.60" Po from Marsland & Randolph (kPa) : "Arm ave=1112.8" Best estimate of Po (kPa) : "Arm ave=993.0" [UNDRAINED STRENGTH PARAMETERS] Undrained yield stress (kPa) : "Arm ave=3311.2" [DRAINED ANALYSIS OF SANDS] [Hughes et al 1977] Constant volume friction angle (°) : 28.0 Angle of internal friction (°) : "Arm ave=38.0" Dilation angle (°) : "Arm ave=11.9" Gradient of log-log plot : "Arm ave=0.459" [Withers et al 1989] Angle of internal friction (°) : "Arm ave=29.0" Dilation angle (°) : "Arm ave=1.1" Gradient of log-log plot : "Arm ave=-1.828" [LINEAR INTERPRETATION OF SHEAR MODULUS G] Initial slope shear modulus (MPa) :"Arm ave=306.4" Axis Lope Suedi Modulus (And) (Alue Mean Strain Mean Pc dE dPc
Axis Loop Value Mean Strain Mean Pc dE dPc
No (MPa) (%) (kPa) (%) (kPa) No (MPa) (%) (kPa) (%) (kPa) Arm ave 1 1158.0 -0.121 1740 0.029 338 Arm ave 2 1371.0 0.259 3377 0.066 906 Arm ave 3 1481.0 0.651 5073 0.102 1511 Arm ave 4 1471.2 1.230 4096 0.112 1646 [UNDRAINED NON LINEAR INTERPRETATION OF SECANT SHEAR MODULUS] Axis Loop Intercept Alpha Gradient No (MPa) (MPa) Arm ave 1 543.307 504.909 0.929 Arm ave 2 533.473 466.978 0.875 Arm ave 3 309.867 240.215 0.775 Arm ave 4 344.905 268.535 0.779 [PARAMETERS USED FOR DRAINED CURVE MODELLING] {Axis is Arm ave} Strain Origin (mm) $\qquad \qquad : \qquad 4.60$
Po (kPa) $\qquad \qquad : \qquad 993$ Po (kPa) : 993 Cohesion (kPa) : 248 Angle of peak friction (deg) : 38.0 Angle of peak dilation (deg) : 11.9 Total yield stress (kPa) $\qquad \qquad$: 2110 Total limit stress (kPa) : 46760 G at first yield (MPa) : 952.6 Non-linear exponent : 0.779 Janbu exponent $\qquad \qquad : \qquad 0.165$ Correlation : 0.873 Ambient pore water pressure (kPa) : 144 Residual friction angle (deg) : 28.0 Poisson's ratio $\qquad \qquad : \qquad 0.33$

A303 Stonehenge Pressuremeter Testing

CIR1417/18

CALIBRATION DATA

A303 Stonehenge **Pressuremeter Testing**

A303 Stonehenge **Pressuremeter Testing**

Pressure Cells

 -2064.6 -2341.3 -2080.9 **Intercept -2055.2 mV -2331.0 mV -2061.3 mV Slope 140.7 mV/mm 139.6 mV/mm 126.4 mV/mm**

 -923.7 100.5 -1206.7 101.1 -1035.9 101.1 -1206.3 101.4 -1488.9 101.1 -1291.5 102.4 -1491.5 102.2 -1771.2 102.0 -1550.4 104.3 -1779.0 101.5 -2056.0 102.2 -1814.1 105.5

Pressure Cells

Depth Azimuth Dip Aperture m deg deg mm 7.31 177.87 73.33 0.00 8.67 75.86 75.83 0.00 11.26 179.03 75.08 0.00 13.21 275.32 17.74 0.00 13.56 143.81 4.57 0.00 13.67 208.62 11.31 0.00 14.82 165.57 9.09 0.00 15.28 90.00 81.03 0.00 15.97 0.00 0.00 0.00 16.08 207.50 40.92 0.00 16.21 83.73 29.25 0.00 17.01 329.05 16.48 0.00 17.97 300.91 39.20 0.00 18.35 285.69 18.51 0.00 18.98 122.07 36.60 0.00 19.26 356.22 23.75 0.00 19.57 119.44 35.32 0.00 20.15 324.93 50.16 0.00 20.79 175.98 11.31 0.00 20.99 342.02 4.57 0.00 21.69 240.98 22.87 0.00 23.25 0.00 0.00 0.00 24.23 180.71 23.75 0.00 24.85 51.44 36.28 0.00 27.66 337.61 27.76 0.00 30.91 145.70 9.09 0.00

Page 1

Page 3

Page 6

S Wave

60.0

60.0

S Wave

S Wave

Page 4

Page 7

S Wave

S Wave

S Wave

S Wave

61.0

S Wave

S Wave

Page 10

S Wave

P Wave

P Wave

S Wave

S Wave

32.24 188.70 52.42 0.00 32.62 186.46 10.29 0.00 33.65 334.23 0.79 0.00 33.75 123.13 3.93 0.00 33.84 156.43 1.79 0.00 34.61 104.66 5.15 0.00 34.68 109.73 3.60 0.00 35.11 326.82 38.04 0.00 35.94 209.47 10.01 0.00

P Wave

P Wave

P Wave

S Wave

S Wave

S Wave

S Wave

45.40 184.18 62.50 0.00 47.10 67.42 6.98 0.00

Page 5

Page 10

ROBERTSON GEOLOGGING TECHNOLOGY

Depth: 2.00 m Date: 02 May 2018 Time: 10:31:41 File: "C:\Client Data\Structural Soils - Stonehenge (Visit 2)\3ACS\R620_3ACS_020518.LOG"

Depth Azimuth Dip Aperture m deg deg mm 12.07 118.85 79.71 0.00 15.21 0.00 0.00 0.00 19.94 109.91 77.67 0.00 23.22 65.19 66.04 0.00 25.79 103.17 38.12 0.00 26.64 86.04 81.92 0.00 27.04 65.14 37.86 0.00 27.69 138.60 79.67 0.00 28.12 294.32 63.51 0.00 30.65 0.00 0.00 0.00 31.52 273.91 85.05 0.00 33.52 144.54 76.76 0.00 34.52 195.22 78.40 0.00 35.12 44.37 81.25 0.00 38.62 252.29 0.48 0.00 42.17 68.67 81.63 0.00 44.56 15.58 79.96 0.00 48.41 141.99 81.99 0.00 51.62 175.94 35.75 0.00 52.47 171.94 78.50 0.00 52.85 38.82 31.34 0.00 53.61 0.78 16.79 0.00 54.22 117.74 82.72 0.00 58.71 357.96 32.52 0.00 60.13 78.34 58.84 0.00

S Wave

S Wave

S Wave

S Wave

S Wave

S Wave

P Wave

P Wave

S Wave

S Wave

 \Box

Page 1

Page 4

S Wave

S Wave

 \Box

Π

S Wave

P Wave

P Wave

S Wave

S Wave

P Wave

P Wave

S Wave

S Wave

PUMPING TEST FACTUAL REPORT Test 1 of 3 – Cluster W623

Stuart Well Ltd

Pumping Test Report No: SWC6161-PT-W623

A303 Amesbury to Berwick Down Ground Investigation – Pumping Tests (test 1 of 3)

For:

Structural Soils Ltd The Old School Silthouse Lane Bedminster BS3 4EB

Contact:

Michael Addinall Senior Geotechnical Engineer

By:

Stuart Well Ltd Hargham Road Shropham Norfolk NR17 1DT

Contact:

Daniel Brooks Contract Manager

Contents

1. Introduction

In April 2018 Stuart Wells Ltd was appointed by Structural Soils Ltd to undertake a pumping test for the A303 Amesbury to Berwick Down Ground Investigation project.

To aid design of the A303 Amesbury to Berwick Down tunnelling and shaft sinking civil works, a series of 3 pumping tests were undertaken along an approximate 1.5km section of the future tunnel alignment. Each test is sited in a specific ground investigation (GI) zone of the ground investigation package to better understand the chalk. The testing can be summarised as follows.

GI Zone: South of alignment – test 1

- A single pumping well (W623) and 5no monitoring wells
- Primary purpose of the pumping test in this GI Zone is to better understand the hydrogeology of the chalk ridge.

GI Zone: Tunnel alignment west of Stonehenge Bottom – test 2

- A single pumping well (W601) and 7no monitoring wells
- Primary purpose of the pumping test in this GI Zone is to better understand the hydrogeology of the phosphatic chalk at this location

GI Zone: Tunnel alignment west of Stonehenge Bottom – test 3

- A single pumping well (W617) and 6no monitoring wells
- Primary purpose of the pumping test in this GI Zone is to better understand the hydrogeology of the dry valley. The thickness of superficial and de-structured chalk and faulting.

This factual report details the activities and the results of the testing carried out at W623.

Stuart Well Ltd Pumping Test Report No: SWC6161-PT-W623 A303 Amesbury to Berwick Down Ground Investigation – Pumping Tests (test 1 of 3) Page **4** of **13** Figure 1: Site Location Map

2. Summary of Ground Conditions

The ground conditions at W623 is summarised as follows as indicated by the borehole log undertaken by Structural Soils Ltd.

Table 1: Summary of geology

3. Field Work

The programme of works undertaken at site can be summarised as follows:

Table 2: Programme of works

Equipment used during testing is summarised as follows:

- • A 45kW electrical submersible borehole pump was utilised for the testing after proving suitable during the equipment test on 6th June 2018.
- A series of 5.5 to 11kW electrical submersible drainage pumps were utilised as a boost system pump capable of pushing the discharge water to the discharge point located 1km distance from the pumping well
- A duty and standby 150kVA generator with automatic changeover panel were used to power the borehole pump and a series of duty and standby with automatic changeover panel were used to power the boost pumps
- Electronic Dataloggers were used at each well record continuous water level readings for the duration of the testing period. Data cable on each datalogger permitted the use of a Bluetooth datalogger/transmitter to send data throughout testing by email.
- Manual water level readings were recorded using a Manual Dip Tape

• Flow rate was monitored using a series of 2no electronic flow meters each with telemetry permitting remote monitoring of flow rate and a v-notch tank was used before the boost pumps as a back up to the flow meters if the flow meters should fail at any time.

The layout of the wells is shown in figure 2, and the well installation details provided in table 7.

4. Results

4.1. Background monitoring

Before undertaking the pumping test, the water level was monitored for a period of 7 days from 29th May to 6th June 2018 to observe any natural fluctuations in the water table. The pre-test monitoring shows that the groundwater at this location is dropping with a drop in water level observed at all wells on between 0.27 to 0.33m over a period of 7 days and 15 hours. This gives an estimated drop in water level of between 0.043m to 0.035m per day. We speculate that this is due to seasonal variation however interpretation is out of the scope of this report.

See as follows a summary of the data.

Table 3: Background monitoring data

4.2. Step Test

A series of 5no steps pumping at 10l/s, 15l/s, 20l/s, 25l/s and 30l/s were undertaken at W623 on 07/06/2018. Each step was for a period of 100 minutes each.

Following completion of the step tests, the flow rate of 25l/s was selected as the most suitable flow rate for the constant drawdown test flow rate.

Table 4: Summary of step test results

4.3. Constant Rate Test

The result of the constant rate test can be summarised as follows pumping at a flow rate of 25l/s for a period of 7 days from 13:00 on 12th June to 13:00 on 19th June 2018.

Table 5: Summary of constant rate test results

The results showing the response of the water table relative to the pumping rate, time of pumping and the radial distance away from the pumping well are presented in figures 3, 4 and 5. The full data set (table8) is presented in excel format along with the report.

Yours faithfully,

Daniel Brooks **David Wright CGeol** For & behalf of **Stuart Well Services Limited** For & behalf of **Stuart Well Services Limited**

Contracts Manager **Director & Principal Groundwater Engineer**
For & behalf of **Stuart Well Services Limited** For & behalf of **Stuart Well Services Limited**

Figure 2: Well location plan

Table 6: Well specification

Stuart Well Ltd Pumping Test Report No: SWC6161-PT-W623 A303 Amesbury to Berwick Down Ground Investigation – Pumping Tests (test 1 of 3) Page **9** of **13**

Figure 3: Time-water level graph

Stuart Well Ltd Pumping Test Report No: SWC6161-PT-W623 A303 Amesbury to Berwick Down Ground Investigation – Pumping Tests (test 1 of 3) Page **10** of **13**

Figure 4: Time-drawdown graph

Stuart Well Ltd Pumping Test Report No: SWC6161-PT-W623 A303 Amesbury to Berwick Down Ground Investigation – Pumping Tests (test 1 of 3) Page **11** of **13**

Figure 5: Semi-log distance drawdown graph

Stuart Well Ltd Pumping Test Report No: SWC6161-PT-W623 A303 Amesbury to Berwick Down Ground Investigation – Pumping Tests (test 1 of 3) Page **12** of **13**

Table 7: Table of Pump Test Data See electronic data.

SWC6161 Stonehenge - Structural Soils - pre test water levels

7

Stuart Wells Limited

SWC6161 Stonehenge - Structural Soils - pre test water levels

Stuart Wells Limited

SWC6161 Stonehenge - Structural Soils - pre test water levels

SWC6161 Stonehenge - step tests

er / Comment

Stuart Wells Limited

SWC6161 Stonehenge - Structural Soils - pre test water levels

SWC6161 Stonehenge recovery test

Weather / Comments:

人家

 $1+0.45m$

Monitoring Well 624 SWC6161 Stonehenge 7 day constant rate testing

Glenn Hughes

eather / Comments:

18.626

Glenn Hughes

 2627

 2627

Weather / Comments:

 \cdot)!

F

SWC6161 Stonehenge recovery test

SWC6161 Stonehenge recovery test

SWC6161 Stonehenge recovery test

 $T_{19/6}$

 $1300:15$

Glenn Hagher

 σ

PUMPING TEST FACTUAL REPORT Test 2 of 3 – Cluster W601

Stuart Well Ltd

Pumping Test Report No: SWC6161-PT-W601

A303 Amesbury to Berwick Down Ground Investigation – Pumping Tests (test 2 of 3)

For:

Structural Soils Ltd The Old School Silthouse Lane Bedminster BS3 4EB

Contact:

Michael Addinall Senior Geotechnical Engineer

By:

Stuart Well Ltd Hargham Road Shropham Norfolk NR17 1DT

Contact:

Daniel Brooks Contract Manager

Contents

1. Introduction

In April 2018 Stuart Wells Ltd was appointed by Structural Soils Ltd to undertake a pumping test for the A303 Amesbury to Berwick Down Ground Investigation project.

To aid design of the A303 Amesbury to Berwick Down tunnelling and shaft sinking civil works, a series of 3 pumping tests were undertaken along an approximate 1.5km section of the future tunnel alignment. Each test is sited in a specific ground investigation (GI) zone of the ground investigation package to better understand the chalk. The testing can be summarised as follows.

GI Zone: South of alignment – test 1

- A single pumping well (W623) and 5no monitoring wells
- Primary purpose of the pumping test in this GI Zone is to better understand the hydrogeology of the chalk ridge.

GI Zone: Tunnel alignment west of Stonehenge Bottom – test 2

- A single pumping well (W601) and 7no monitoring wells
- Primary purpose of the pumping test in this GI Zone is to better understand the hydrogeology of the phosphatic chalk at this location

GI Zone: Tunnel alignment west of Stonehenge Bottom – test 3

- A single pumping well (W617) and 6no monitoring wells
- Primary purpose of the pumping test in this GI Zone is to better understand the hydrogeology of the dry valley. The thickness of superficial and de-structured chalk and faulting.

This factual report details the activities and the results of the testing carried out at W601.

Stuart Well Ltd Pumping Test Report No: SWC6161-PT-W601 A303 Amesbury to Berwick Down Ground Investigation – Pumping Tests (test 2 of 3) Page **4** of **14** Figure 1: Site Location Map

2. Summary of Ground Conditions

The ground conditions at W601 is summarised as follows as indicated by the borehole log undertaken by Structural Soils Ltd.

Table 1: Summary of geology

3. Field Work

The programme of works undertaken at site can be summarised as follows:

Table 2: Programme of works

Equipment used during testing is summarised as follows:

- • A 45kW electrical submersible borehole pump was utilised for the testing after proving suitable during the equipment test on $27th$ June 2018.
- A series of 5.5 to 11kW electrical submersible drainage pumps were utilised as a boost system pump capable of pushing the discharge water to the discharge point located 1km distance from the pumping well
- A duty and standby 150kVA generator with automatic changeover panel were used to power the borehole pump and a series of duty and standby with automatic changeover panel were used to power the boost pumps
- Electronic Dataloggers were used at each well record continuous water level readings for the duration of the testing period. Data cable on each datalogger permitted the use of a Bluetooth datalogger/transmitter to send data throughout testing by email.
- Manual water level readings were recorded using a Manual Dip Tape

• Flow rate was monitored using a series of 2no electronic flow meters each with telemetry permitting remote monitoring of flow rate and a v-notch tank was used before the boost pumps as a back up to the flow meters if the flow meters should fail at any time.

The layout of the wells is shown in figure 2, and the well installation details provided in table 7.

4. Results

4.1. Background monitoring

Before undertaking the pumping test, the water level was monitored from 14th to 25th June 2018 to observe any natural fluctuations in the water table. The pre-test monitoring shows that the groundwater at this location is dropping at an estimated drop of between 0.057m to 0.08m per day. We speculate that this is due to seasonal variation however interpretation is out of the scope of this report.

See as follows a summary of the data.

Table 3: Background monitoring data

4.2. Step Test

A series of 5no steps pumping at 15l/s, 19.5l/s, 23l/s, 26.5l/s and 30l/s were undertaken at W601 on 03/07/2018. Each step was for a period of 100 minutes each.

Following completion of the step tests, the flow rate of 25l/s was selected as the most suitable flow rate for the constant drawdown test flow rate.

Stuart Well Ltd

Pumping Test Report No: SWC6161-PT-W601

A303 Amesbury to Berwick Down Ground Investigation – Pumping Tests (test 2 of 3) Page **6** of **14**

Table 4: Summary of step test results

4.3. Constant Rate Test

The result of the constant rate test can be summarised as follows pumping at a flow rate of 23.3l/s for a period of 7 days from 10:00 on 10th June to 11:00 on 17th June 2018.

Table 5: Summary of constant rate test results

The results showing the response of the water table relative to the pumping rate, time of pumping and the radial distance away from the pumping well are presented in figures 3, 4 and 5. The full data set (table8) is presented in excel format along with the report.

Yours faithfully,

Daniel Brooks **David Wright CGeol** Contracts Manager Contracts Manager
For & behalf of Stuart Well Services Limited For & behalf of Stuart Well Services Limited For & behalf of **Stuart Well Services Limited** For & behalf of **Stuart Well Services Limited**

Figure 2: Well location plan

Table 6: Well specification

Figure 3: Time-water level graph

Stuart Well Ltd Pumping Test Report No: SWC6161-PT-W601 A303 Amesbury to Berwick Down Ground Investigation – Pumping Tests (test 2 of 3) Page **10** of **14**

Figure 4: Time-drawdown graph (step test)

Stuart Well Ltd Pumping Test Report No: SWC6161-PT-W601 A303 Amesbury to Berwick Down Ground Investigation – Pumping Tests (test 2 of 3) Page **11** of **14**

Figure 5: Time-drawdown graph (constant rate test)

Stuart Well Ltd Pumping Test Report No: SWC6161-PT-W601 A303 Amesbury to Berwick Down Ground Investigation – Pumping Tests (test 2 of 3) Page **12** of **14**

Figure 6: Semi-log distance drawdown graph

Stuart Well Ltd Pumping Test Report No: SWC6161-PT-W601 A303 Amesbury to Berwick Down Ground Investigation – Pumping Tests (test 2 of 3) Page **13** of **14**

Table 7: Table of Pump Test Data See electronic data.

eather / Comments:

SWC6161 Stonehenge 7 day constant rate testing

Iv

Comm

Stuart We Services Ltd

SWC6161 Stonehenge 7 day constant rate testing

 $\ddot{}$

Stuart We Services Ltd March

 $26 - 100$

DATA LOGGER **CEIVOM**

SWC6161 Stonehenge recovery test

 26.095

FOR SAFETY

SWC6161 Stonehenge - Step Tests

Step 4

Step 5

 15.40 24.645 $14.00 - 24.460$ $15.4127.645$ $14.01 - 27.400$ $15.42.27.650$ 14.02-24.465 $15.43.27.655$ $14.03 - 24.465$ $15.44 - 27.655$ 14.04-24.470 $14.05 - 24.440$ $15.45 - 27.660$ $15.46.2766$ $14.06 - 24.445$ $14.07 - 24.448$ $15.47 - 27.665$ $14.08 - 24.480$ $15.48.27.670$ $14.09 - 24.480$ $15.49.27.640$ 14-10-24.485 $15.50 - 27.640$ $15.52 - 24.645$ $14.12 - 24.490$ $15.59 - 24.685$ $14.14.24.495$ $15.56 - 27.690$ $14.16 - 24.480500$ $15.58 - 27.690$ 14.18 27.500 $14.20 - 24.505$ $16.00 - 27.695$ $16.05 - 24.410$ $14.25 - 24.51$ $16.10 - 27.720$ $14.30 - 24.525$ $16.15 - 22.730$ $14.35 - 24.535$ $16.20 - 24.440$ $14.40 - 24.545$ $16.25 - 24.450$ $14.45 - 24.555$ $14.5021.585$ $16.30 - 27.160$ $14.55 - 24525$ $16.35 - 24.740$ $16.40 - 24.780$ $15.00 - 24.580$ $16.50 - 27.800$ $15.10 - 24.595$ $17.00 - 27.815$ $1520 - 2760$ $17.10 - 27.830$ $15.30 - 24.625$ $17.20 - 27.850$ $1540 - 24645$

 $\sqrt{2}$

Stuart We Services Ltd

۰,

SWC6161 Stonehenge - step tests RECOVERY.

LO GOER REINSTALL = 15:43 HRS WL = 28.375

Stuart We Services Ltd

SWC6161 Stonehenge - Step Tests

Weather / Comments:

I

Stuart We Services Ltd

SWC6161 Stonehenge recovery test

Stuart We Services Ltd

SWC6161 Stonehenge - Step Tests

A303 STONEHENGE - GROUND INVESTIGATION

SWC6161 Stonehenge - Step Tests

Stuart We Services Ltd

SWC6161 Stonehenge recovery test

 $\ddot{\mathcal{C}}$

SWC6161 Stonehenge - Step Tests

Weather / Comments:

 $18 - 10$

SWC6161 Stonehenge recovery test

 $\frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{2} \right)^{2} \left(\frac$

SWC6161 Stonehenge - Step Tests

 910.200

Ż

Stuart Well Services Ltd

SWC6161 Stonehenge 7 day constant rate testing

۰,

SWC6161 Stonehenge recovery test

SWC6161 Stonehenge Pre-test water levels

PUMPING TEST FACTUAL REPORT Test 3 of 3 – Cluster W601

Stuart Well Ltd

Pumping Test Report No: SWC6161-PT-W617

A303 Amesbury to Berwick Down Ground Investigation – Pumping Tests (test 3 of 3)

For:

Structural Soils Ltd The Old School Silthouse Lane Bedminster BS3 4EB

Contact:

Michael Addinall Senior Geotechnical Engineer

By:

Stuart Well Ltd Hargham Road Shropham Norfolk NR17 1DT

Contact:

Daniel Brooks Contract Manager

Contents

1. Introduction

In April 2018 Stuart Wells Ltd was appointed by Structural Soils Ltd to undertake a pumping test for the A303 Amesbury to Berwick Down Ground Investigation project.

To aid design of the A303 Amesbury to Berwick Down tunnelling and shaft sinking civil works, a series of 3 pumping tests were undertaken along an approximate 1.5km section of the future tunnel alignment. Each test is sited in a specific ground investigation (GI) zone of the ground investigation package to better understand the chalk. The testing can be summarised as follows.

GI Zone: South of alignment – test 1

- A single pumping well (W623) and 5no monitoring wells
- Primary purpose of the pumping test in this GI Zone is to better understand the hydrogeology of the chalk ridge.

GI Zone: Tunnel alignment west of Stonehenge Bottom – test 2

- A single pumping well (W601) and 7no monitoring wells
- Primary purpose of the pumping test in this GI Zone is to better understand the hydrogeology of the phosphatic chalk at this location

GI Zone: Tunnel alignment west of Stonehenge Bottom – test 3

- A single pumping well (W617) and 6no monitoring wells
- Primary purpose of the pumping test in this GI Zone is to better understand the hydrogeology of the dry valley. The thickness of superficial and de-structured chalk and faulting.

This factual report details the activities and the results of the testing carried out at W617.

Stuart Well Ltd Pumping Test Report No: SWC6161-PT-W617 A303 Amesbury to Berwick Down Ground Investigation – Pumping Tests (test 3 of 3) Page **4** of **14** Figure 1: Site Location Map

2. Summary of Ground Conditions

The ground conditions at W617 is summarised as follows as indicated by the borehole log undertaken by Structural Soils Ltd.

Table 1: Summary of geology

3. Field Work

The programme of works undertaken at site can be summarised as follows:

Table 2: Programme of works

Equipment used during testing is summarised as follows:

- • A 7.5kW electrical submersible borehole pump was utilised for the testing after proving suitable during the equipment test on 25th July 2018.
- A series of 5.5 to 11kW electrical submersible drainage pumps were utilised as a boost system pump capable of pushing the discharge water to the discharge point located 1km distance from the pumping well
- A duty and standby 150kVA generator with automatic changeover panel were used to power the borehole pump and a series of duty and standby with automatic changeover panel were used to power the boost pumps
- Electronic Dataloggers were used at each well record continuous water level readings for the duration of the testing period. Data cable on each datalogger permitted the use of a Bluetooth datalogger/transmitter to send data throughout testing by email.
- Manual water level readings were recorded using a Manual Dip Tape
- Flow rate was monitored using a series of 2no electronic flow meters each with telemetry permitting remote monitoring of flow rate and a v-notch tank was used before the boost pumps as a back up to the flow meters if the flow meters should fail at any time.

The layout of the wells is shown in figure 2, and the well installation details provided in table 7.

4. Results

4.1. Background monitoring

Before undertaking the pumping test, the water level was monitored from 13th to 23rd July 2018 to observe any natural fluctuations in the water table. The pre-test monitoring shows that the groundwater at this location is dropping at an estimated drop of between 0.012m to 0.024m per day. We speculate that this is due to seasonal variation however interpretation is out of the scope of this report.

See as follows a summary of the data.

Table 3: Background monitoring data

4.2. Step Test

A series of 5no steps pumping at 2.0l/s, 3.0l/s, 5.0l/s, 6.0l/s and 7.0l/s were undertaken at W617 on 26/07/2018. Each step was for a period of 100 minutes each.

Following completion of the step tests, the flow rate of 5.8l/s was selected as the most suitable flow rate for the constant drawdown test flow rate.

Table 4: Summary of step test results

4.3. Constant Rate Test

The result of the constant rate test can be summarised as follows pumping at a flow rate of 5.8l/s for a period of 7 days from 10:00 on 27th July to 10:00 on 3rd August 2018.

Table 5: Summary of constant rate test results

The results showing the response of the water table relative to the pumping rate, time of pumping and the radial distance away from the pumping well are presented in figures 3, 4 and 5. The full data set (table8) is presented in excel format along with the report.

Yours faithfully,

Daniel Brooks **Daniel Brooks** David Wright CGeol For & behalf of **Stuart Well Services Limited** For & behalf of **Stuart Well Services Limited**

Contracts Manager **Director & Principal Groundwater Engineer**
For & behalf of **Stuart Well Services Limited** For & behalf of **Stuart Well Services Limited**

Figure 2: Well location plan

Table 6: Well specification

Figure 3: Time-water level graph

Stuart Well Ltd Pumping Test Report No: SWC6161-PT-W617 A303 Amesbury to Berwick Down Ground Investigation – Pumping Tests (test 3 of 3) Page **10** of **14**

Figure 4: Time-drawdown graph (step test)

Stuart Well Ltd Pumping Test Report No: SWC6161-PT-W617 A303 Amesbury to Berwick Down Ground Investigation – Pumping Tests (test 3 of 3) Page **11** of **14**

Figure 5: Time -drawdown graph (constant rate test)

Stuart Well Ltd Pumping Test Report No: SWC6161 -PT -W617 A303 Amesbury to Berwick Down Ground Investigation – Pumping Tests (test 3 of 3) Page **12** of **14**

 $y = -0.261\ln(x) + 1.4511$ $R^2 = 0.7091$

Figure 6: Semi-log distance drawdown graph

Stuart Well Ltd Pumping Test Report No: SWC6161-PT-W617 A303 Amesbury to Berwick Down Ground Investigation – Pumping Tests (test 3 of 3) Page **13** of **14**

Table 7: Table of Pump Test Data See electronic data.

Stuart Wells Limited

PACE 1
3RD CLUSTER -

SWC6161 Stonehenge Pre-test water levels

A303 STONEHENGE - GROUND INVESTIGATION

OUND INVESTIGATION
PRE TEST WHATER LEVELS.

SWC6161 Stonehenge - step tests

 \mathbf{I}

SWC6161 Stonehenge - step tests

 $A = 1$

STEP TEST

 $\left($

Stuart Well Services Ltd STEP TEST

SWC6161 Stonehenge - Wildwig Christan Nate Testing

SWC6161 Stonehenge recovery test

V

 $m_{0k_{1,1}}$

SWC6161 Stonehenge - step tests

SWC6161 Stonehenge recovery test

SWC6161 Stonehenge - step tests

SWC6161 Stonehenge recovery test

 *

SWC6161 Stonehenge - 7 Day Constant Rate Testing

STEP TEST

SWC6161 Stonehenge recovery test

 $|-\hspace{-.07em}|$ $|m$ to $|0 \rangle$

Zum to Zom Stuart Well Services Ltd

 sn to $1hr$

10 m to 100 min SWC6161 Stonehenge - step tests

n

SWC6161 Stonehenge recovery test

SWC6161 Stonehenge - step tests

 $\left(\frac{1}{2} \right)$

SWC6161 Stonehenge - 7 Day Constant Rate Testing

SWC6161 Stonehenge - 7 Day Constant Rate Testing

Stuart We Services Ltd

 $P11.$

SWC6161 Stonehenge recovery test

Stuart Wells Limited

WASTER
QUALITY.

SWC6161 Stonehenge Fre test water levels

You may re-use this information (not including logos) free of charge in any format or medium, under the terms of the Open Government Licence. To view this licence:

visit <u>www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/</u>
write to the Information Policy Team, The National Archives, Kew, London TW9 4DU, or email psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk.
Mapping (where present): © Crown

You are permitted to use this data solely to enable you to respond to, or interact with, the organisation that provided you with the data.
You are not permitted to copy, sub-licence, distribute or sell any of this data to

This document is also available on our website at www.nationalhighways.co.uk For an accessible version of this publication please call 0300 123 5000 and we will help you.

If you have any enquiries about this publication email info@highwaysengland.co.uk or call 0300 123 5000*. Please quote the National Highways publications code **PR35/22** National Highways creative job number **BRS17_0027**

*Calls to 03 numbers cost no more than a national rate call to an 01 or 02 number and must count towards any inclusive minutes in the same way as 01 and 02 calls. These rules apply to calls from any type of line including mobile, BT, other fixed line or payphone. Calls may be recorded or monitored.
Printed on paper from well-managed forests and other controlled sources when issued d National Highways Limited registered in England and Wales number 09346363