# Foundation Settlement Determination: A Simplified Approach

[1]O.O. Adewoyin, M. Omeje, E.S. Joel and O.T. Kayode
Department of Physics, College of Science and Technology, Covenant University, Ota, Nigeria

**Abstract:** The heterogeneous nature of the subsurface requires the use of factual information to deal with rather than empirical or generalized equations. Therefore, there is need to determine the actual rate of possible settlement in the soil before structures are built on it. This information will help to determining the type of foundation design and the kind of reinforcement that will be necessary in constructions. This study presents a simplified and a faster approach to determining foundation settlement in the soil using real field data acquired from seismic refraction techniques and cone penetration tests. This approach was also able to determine the depth of settlement of each strata of soil. The rate of settlement for the four profiles was found to vary between 0.019 and 0.035 m. The results obtained revealed the different depthof possible settlement.

**Key words:** Heterogeneous, settlement, foundation, seismic, technique

## INTRODUCTION

The problem of foundation settlement due to dynamic load has attracted the attention of researchers, since the 60s (Prakash *et al.*, 2014). Determination of the level of settlement of foundation in soil layer is one of the major challenges confronting the building industry as this may be one of the factors contributing to some of the building collapses rampant in the country of late (Amadi *et al.*, 2012; Oyedele *et al.*, 2012). Since, the subsurface is not homogeneous, it may be difficult for engineers to access the condition of the subsurface with traditional geotechnical techniques because of their limitations. Efforts have been made by early researchers to determine the rate of settlement of a foundation. These methods are mainly theoretical and as such may be difficult and not be apply to all cases. Choobbasti *et al.* (2010) confirmed the possibility of numerically evaluating the bearing capacity and settlement of ring footing. Kuo examined the settlement of footing founded on two-layered soil profile. Also, Shahnazari *et al.* (2014) showed that it is possible to predict the settlement of shallow foundations on cohesionless soils. In this study, both seismic refraction method and cone penetrometer test were combined. Seismic refraction methodis a geophysical method of investigating the subsurface condition and this method uses the surface-sourced seismic waves for its operation (Altindag, 2012; Reynolds, 1998). The cone penetrometer test (Dutch cone test) on the other hand is a geotechnical test that is used to determine the engineering properties of the subsurface and assessing the subsurface stratigraphy (Hunt, 2005; Soupios *et al.*, 2005).

Foundation settlement assessment requires that detailed information on the soil profile, pore water regime, influence of fills, loads from other foundations, excavation and changes in groundwater table are well established (Akintorinwa and Adesoji, 2009; Das, 2011). This process may be cumbersome and take a lot of time. Therefore, it will be of great advantage if engineers can easily determine the rate of settlement possible by soil layers so as to inform their decision on the type and the kind of materials required for foundations and the depth at which foundations must be erected.

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

**Location of the study area:** The study area is located at Eti-Osa local government in the South-Eastern part of Lagos State. It lies between latitudes $6^{0}30^{1}37^{11}$and $6°30'18''$N and longitude $3°36'3''$ and $3°35'34''$E in South Western Nigeria. This area is in the zone of coastal creeks and lagoons developed by barrier beaches associated with sand deposition. It is situated in the Nigeria sector of the Benin-basin and near the Eastern margin of the basin. The geological formation of the study area is composed of sediments that are typical of the marine environments which is an intercalation of sand and clay. These sediments also grade into one another and vary widely in both lateral extent and thickness (Adepelumi *et al.*, 2009; Adepelumi and Olorunfemi, 2000).

**Theory:** The seismic refraction method readily gives both P and S wave velocities. These velocities are required to compute the following engineering properties such as the

---

**Corresponding Author:** O.O. Adewoyin, Department of Physics, College of Science and Technology, Covenant University, Ota, Nigeria

dry density, shear modulus, Young's modulus and the poisson's ratio. These quantities make the determination of the bearing potential of the subsurface possible. The dry density is related to the p-wave velocity by the relation:

$$\gamma = \gamma_0 + 0.002V_p \qquad (1)$$

and the unit is kN/m$^3$. $\lambda_0 = 16$ for loose, sandy and clayey soil (Atat *et al.*, 2013; Tezcan *et al.*, 2009). The shear modulus on the other hand relates with shear wave velocity as expressed in Eq. 2:

$$\mu = \frac{\gamma V_s^2}{g} \qquad (2)$$

where, g is the acceleration due to gravity and it is equal to 9.8 m/sec. Equation for the Young's modulus and poisson's ratio are expressed in Eq. 3 and 4, respectively:

$$E = 2\mu(1 + \sigma) \qquad (3)$$

And:

$$\alpha = \left( \frac{\alpha - 2}{2(\alpha - 1)} \right) \qquad (4)$$

where, $\alpha = [(\alpha\text{-}2)/2(\alpha\text{-}1)]$ and the relationship between $V_p$ and $V_s$ is given in Eq. 5 as:

$$V_p \approx 1.7V_s \qquad (5)$$

In the same vein the results of the cone penetrometer test provides information on the bearing capacity ($q_f$) which is given as:

$$q_f = 2.7 \times q_c \qquad (6)$$

where, $q_c$ is the cone penetration resistance. Thus, the average bearing capacity is given by:

$$_\alpha q_f = \frac{\sum_{n=1}^{i} q_f}{n} \qquad (7)$$

In Eq. 7, n is the number of 0.25 m division present in a stratum of soil (Tezcan *et al.*, 2009):

$$H = V_s t \qquad (8)$$

where, H is the profile depth parameter and t is an unknown time parameter. Thus, which is the depth of settlement is given by:



Fig. 1: Base map of the site, indicating the seismic profiles and CPT points

$$d = \frac{_\alpha q_f}{E} \times V_s t \qquad (9)$$

## Data acquisition and processing

**Seismic refraction method:** In this study, a total of four seismic profiles were surveyed and the data acquired. A 24-Channel ABEM Terraloc MK 6 seismogram was used for the data acquisition. The profile varied in length between 50 and 100 m as a result of accessibility (Egwuonwu and Osazuwa, 2011; Bery and Saad, 2012). About 2 m geophone spacing was adopted for better coverage of the refractor surface, multiple shots were taken at each shot point along the profile with the aid of a 15 kg sledge hammer and the resulting shots were stacked so as to produce clearer images of the subsurface. For the purpose of this study, the seismic survey was conducted in a rectangular shape across the site (Fig. 1). The seismicshots were taken in this order at 2 m before the first geophones, between the sixth and the seventh geophones, between the twelveth and the thirteenth geophones, between the eighteenth and nineteenth geophones and 2 m after the 24 geophones, respectively.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The data acquired were interpreted with the use of seisImager software package (Moustafa *et al.*, 2013) which produced 2D images of the subsurface area surveyed. The 2D image gives information on the number of layers, the thickness of each layer and the p-wave velocity of each layer (Fig. 2 and 3).

**Cone penetrometer test:** A 2.5 ton Shell and Auger cone penetrometer was used for the test, four Cone Penetrometer Tests (CPTs) were conducted and each one terminated at the point at which the anchors of the equipment were pulling out of the ground. This technique tests the subsurface at an interval of 0.25 m and also provides information on the bearing capacity of soil layer at this interval. In this study, each CPT was conducted along the seismic profile so as to easily validate the

Fig. 2: 2D seismic refraction sections at the site, indicating the number of layers, their velocities and the depth of investigation for profile 1; traverse 1 greenvile; scale = 1/901



Fig. 3: 2D seismic refraction sections at the Site, indicating the number of layers, their velocities and the depth of investigation for profile 2; traverse 2 greenvile. $V_s$; scale = 1/901



Fig. 4: Result of one of the cone penetrometer test carried out at the site for test 1; (2.5 ton penetrometer test log test no 1); dround water level: surface level



Fig. 5: Result of one of the cone penetrometer test carried out at the site for test 2; (2.5 ton penetrometer test log test no 2); dround water level: surface level

results obtained (Fig. 1). The data acquired were plotted and the graphs are presented in Fig. 4 and 5. From the graphs, we can obtain information on the depth of penetration and the allowable bearing capacity. In this research, only the first layers provided by the seismic refraction method were considered because they correlated with depth of investigation provided by the

CPT method. Also, it will be much easier to compare the responses of the geologic formation within this layer for the methods of investigation. The result in this first layer provides information on the average bearing capacity, the Young's modulus, Poisson's ratio, the dry density and shear modulus using Eq. 1-8. Some of the results are shown in Table 1.

In the four seismic profiles surveyed in the study area, the seismic refraction method revealed two geologic layers. The depth of investigation of the first layer was correlated with the depth of penetration of the CPTs. The velocity of the first layer ranges between 373 and 554 m/sec. Also, the shear wave velocity ranges between 219.41 and 325.94 m/sec. The variation in the velocities observed showed that the subsurface is heterogeneous in the studied site. The depth of coverage of the seismic refraction method ranges between 7.0 and 8.7 m.

The variation in the depth of penetration showed the variation in the responses of the geologic formation of the site to the passage of elastic energy. The dry density $\gamma$ ranges between 16.746 and 17.108 kN/m$^3$, also the Poisson's ratio of the different seismic profiles ranges between 0.235444 and 0.235456. The variation in the Poisson's ratio indicate variability in the level of compression of the studied site. The shear modulus of the four profiles ranges between 0.081 and 0.147 GPa, the Young's modulus on the other hand varies between 0.202 and 0.365. It was observed that the Young's modulus is greater than the shear modulus by a factor of 2.48.

The shear and the Young's modulus are measures of the strength of the study site. The average allowable bearing capacity afd for each profile was obtained by using Eq. 7. The values ranges between 2247 and 4882 KN/m$^2$, these variation indicates the differences in the bearing capacity of each profile surveyed. This also goes

Table 1: Summary of elastic moduli, average bearing capacity and the depth of settlement for each profile

| Profiles | $V_p$ (m/sec) | $V_s$ (m/sec) | Depth (m) | $\gamma$ (kN/m³) | $\sigma$ | $\mu$ (GPa) | E (GPa) | $_aq_c$ (kN/m²) | d (m) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| S1 | 498 | 292.94 | 7.6 | 16.996 | 0.235453 | 0.147 | 0.365 | 2376 | 0.019 |
| S2 | 554 | 325.88 | 8.7 | 17.108 | 0.235456 | 0.117 | 0.455 | 4882 | 0.035 |
| S3 | 460 | 270.59 | 7.9 | 16.920 | 0.235444 | 0.125 | 0.310 | 3940 | 0.034 |
| S4 | 373 | 219.41 | 7.0 | 16.746 | 0.235456 | 0.081 | 0.202 | 2247 | 0.024 |

further to show that because of the heterogeneity of the soil formation, a construction site not be subjected to similar condition if adequate test has not been conducted to characterize the site. The depth of settlement of each soil profile is presented in Table 1 as calculated with Eq. 9, the depth of settlement was observed to vary across the site. The depth of settlement ranges between 0.019 and 0.035 m, this may be as a result of various degrees of sorting and the time of may deposit of the geologic formation that compose the near surface layer. It was observed in S2 and S3 that the depth of settlement is high, this may as a result of the fact that the formation that constituted greater resistance to the test equipment was found at depth greater than 7 m to the subsurface (Fig. 1 and 2) whereas, the subsurface material for S1 and S4 poses much resistance to the cone of the penetrometer at a depth of about 6 m to the subsurface. This shows that the thickness of a profile does not guarantee, its resistance or its rate of settlement but the nature of the geologic formation such as the rate of sorting and the degree of saturation of the subsurface materials (Atat *et al.*, 2013).

## CONCLUSION

Seismic refraction and cone penetrometer method of investigation have been used to characterize the site in the study area in order to develop a simplified method of determining the rate of settlement of geomaterial for the purpose of construction. Four profiles were surveyed along which a CPT each was conducted. The first layer of the seismic refraction method was considered which coincided with the depth of penetration of the CPTs. Some existing mathematical theories were used together with some empirical relations. The result showed variation in the responses of the geologic formation of different soil profile to the two methods of investigation. It also shows that the rate of settlement in soil varies in response to the condition of the geologic formation. The rate of settlement for the four profiles varied between 0.019 and 0.035 m. This approach can also be used to determine the rate of settlement of different subsurface layers in order to determine, its aggregate rate of settlement.

## REFERENCES

Adepelumi, A., B.D. Ako, T.R. Ajayi, O. Afolabi and E.J. Omotoso, 2009. Delineation of saltwater intrusion into the freshwater aquifer of Lekki Peninsula, Lagos, Nigeria. Environ. Geol., 56: 927-933.

Adepelumi, A.A. and M.O. Olorunfemi, 2000. Engineering geological and geophysical investigation of the reclaimed Lekki Peninsula, Lagos, South West Nigeria. Bull. Eng. Geol. Environ., 58: 125-132.

Akintorinwa, O.J. and J.I. Adesoji, 2009. Application of geophysical and geotechnical investigations in engineering site evaluation. Int. J. Phys. Sci., 4: 443-454.

Altindag, R., 2012. Correlation between P-wave velocity and some mechanical properties for sedimentary rocks. J. South. Afr. Inst. Min. Metall., 112: 229-237.

Amadi, A.N., C.J. Eze, C.O. Igwe, I.A. Okunlola and N.O. Okoye, 2012. Architect's and geologist's view on the causes of building failures in Nigeria. Mod. Appl. Sci., 6: 31-38.

Atat, J.G., I.O. Akpabio and N.J. George, 2013. Allowable bearing capacity for shallow foundation in eket local government area, Akwa Ibom State, Southern Nigeria. Int. J. Geosci., 4: 1491-1500.

Bery, A.A. and R. Saad, 2012. Correlation of seismic P-wave velocities with engineering parameters (N value and rock quality) for tropical environmental study. Int. J. Geosci., 3: 749-757.

Choobbasti, A.J., S. Hesami, A. Najafi, S. Pirzadeh, F. Farrokhzad and A. Zahmatkesh, 2010. Numerical evaluation of bearing capacity and settlement of ring footing; case study of Kazeroon cooling towers. Int. J. Res. Rev. Applied Sci., 2010: 263-271.

Das, B.M., 2011. Principles of Foundation Engineering. 7th Ed., Cengage Learning, Boston, Massachusetts, ISBN-13: 978-0495668107, pp: 617-623.

Egwuonwu, G.N. and I.B. Osazuwa, 2011. Geophysical and Geotechnical invetsigation of the origin of structural instabilities shown on some low rise buildings in Zaira, North-Western Nigeria. Pac. J. Sci. Technol., 12: 534-546.

Hunt, R.E., 2005. Geotechnical Engineering Investigation Handbook. 2nd Edn., Taylor & Francis, New York, USA., ISBN-13: 978-0-8493-2182-5, Pages: 1019.

Moustafa, S.S., E.H. Ibrahim, E. Elawadi, M. Metwaly and A.N. Agami, 2013. Seismic refraction and resistivity imaging for assessment of groundwater seepage under a Dam site Southwest of Saudi Arabia. Int. J. Phys. Sci., 7: 6230-6239.

Oyedele, K.F., S. Oladele and C. Onoh, 2012. Geo-Assessment of subsurface conditions in Magodo Book Estate, Lagos, Nigeria. Int. J. Adv. Sci. Techn. Res., 4: 731-741.

Prakash, S., V.K. Puri and S. Kumar, 2014. Seismic settlement of shallow foundations. Proceedings of the 10th US National Conference on Earthquake Engineering Frontiers of Earthquake Engineering, July 21-25, 2014, Earthquake Engineering Research Institute, Anchorage, Alaska, pp: 1-11.

Reynolds, J.M., 1998. An Introduction to Applied and Environmental Geophysics. Wiley, New York.

Shahnazari, H., M.A. Shahin and M.A. Tutunchian, 2014. Evolutionary-based approaches for settlement prediction of shallow foundations on cohesionless soils. Int. J. Civil Eng., 12: 55-64.

Soupios, P.M., C.B. Papazachos, G. Vargemezis and I. Fikos, 2005. Application of seismic methods for geotechnical site characterization. Proceedings of the International Workshop on Geoenvironment and Geotechnics (GEOENV05), September 12-14, 2005, Milos Conference Center, Heliotopos Conferences, George Eliopoulos, Milos, Greece, pp: 163-171.

Tezcan, S.S., Z. Ozdemir and A. Keceli, 2009. Seismic technique to determine the allowable bearing pressure for shallow foundations in soils and rocks. Acta Geophys., 57: 400-412