

**NUMERICAL ANALYSIS OF INTERACTION
BETWEEN TWIN TUNNELS AND TUNNEL
FOUNDATION SYSTEMS UNDER STATIC AND
SEISMIC CONDITIONS**

JISHNU R B



**DEPARTMENT OF CIVIL ENGINEERING
INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY DELHI
SEPTEMBER 2020**

© Indian Institute of Technology Delhi (IITD), New Delhi, 2020

**NUMERICAL ANALYSIS OF INTERACTION
BETWEEN TWIN TUNNELS AND TUNNEL
FOUNDATION SYSTEMS UNDER STATIC AND
SEISMIC CONDITIONS**

by

JISHNU R B

DEPARTMENT OF CIVIL ENGINEERING

Submitted

In Fulfilment of the Requirements of the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

to the



INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY DELHI

SEPTEMBER 2020

CERTIFICATE

This is to certify that the thesis entitled “**Numerical Analysis of Interaction between Twin Tunnels and Tunnel-Foundation Systems under Static and Seismic Conditions**” being submitted by **Mr. Jishnu R B** is worthy of consideration for the award of the degree of **Doctor of Philosophy**. This thesis has been prepared under my supervision and guidance in conformity with the rules and regulations of Indian Institute of Technology Delhi and is a record of the original bonafide research work. The results presented in this thesis have not been submitted in part or full to any other universities or institutes for the award of any other degree or diploma.

Dr. R. Ayothiraman

Professor

Department of Civil Engineering

Indian Institute of Technology Delhi

New Delhi-110016

INDIA

Date.

Place: NEW DELHI

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

It is a great honour to have been guided by **Prof. R. Ayothiraman**. Had he not given me that opportunity or head space to work, this dissertation would not have been possible. More than being a mentor, he gave me a lot of mental strength and confidence, when my going got tough. His technical guidance and expertise on the subject have always helped move in the correct direction. This Ph.D. thesis is entirely his boon and I have no words to express my gratitude.

I would like to thank **Prof. N. K. Garg**, Head of the Department of Civil Engineering, IIT Delhi for providing all necessary facilities and support.

I am grateful to my SRC members: **Prof. A. K. Gosain (Chairman)**, **Prof G.V. Ramana** and **Prof. M. K. Singha**, for their valuable inputs and suggestions for improving the research outcomes.

I would like to acknowledge the **Science and Engineering Research Board (SERB)**, Department of Science and Technology, India for their funding to the project (No: EMR/2015/001874).

I am obliged to my friends in IIT Delhi, **Dr. Raghavendra Sahu**, **Mr. Ashwinth** and **Mr. Vinay** for their help in the institute.

I did this research for my father, (Late) **Mr. V. Ramabhadran Nair** who was pursuing his Doctoral degree, 25 years ago. His dreams got fizzled out, when he met with a gory accident and lost his life. This Ph.D. thesis is a fulfilment of his dream. His memories never let me back down from pursuing the research. This thesis is an offering to him. I have no words to express my gratitude to my mother **Mrs. L. Ushakumari** for her love and warmth, that made me stronger and helped me advance. As a mother she was always worried whether I would manage my professional and academic demands, alike. She wanted nothing but my good health. During tough

times, my sister **Ms. Jyolsna U. B.** has kept me sane. Her phone calls to ensure my well-being, was a great switch off way from arduous demands. Thank you, my brother-in-law **Mr. Rahul R. L.**, for being so lovely and making me feel ‘wanted and needed’. He has always ensured the happiness of my family.

My love and gratitude to my parents-in-law **Dr. P. R. Sreemahadevan Pillai** and **Dr. A.V. Hema Nalini**. Being academicians, they knew the value of my work and gave me confidence to cling on, during tough times.

Mr. Arun S. and **Mr. Sagar S.** are two people I turn to, when I am happy or sad. This thesis would have been impossible if not for **Mr. Arun S.** Him, being an expert in finite element methods helped me overcome hurdles in the research work, whenever I came across any. Some of my colleagues have been exceptional supports. Whenever I would go sceptical about my work-life-research balance, my friend **Mr. Shishir Trivedi** would motivate me. Thank you for keeping me calm. I am extremely grateful to **Mr. Lalit Chhabra** (Managing Director, Geodata, India) for giving me a no-objection certificate to commence this research work. He wanted me to grow professionally.

I am out of words to describe the contribution of the love of my life, **Dr. Siddhi S**, in this Ph.D. thesis. Although I was busy with office and research work, her unconditional love, care and support never faded throughout our six years of togetherness. Her involvement in my thesis and research papers to make my works more presentable cannot be thanked enough. I thank her for being patient and supportive.

Jishnu R B

ABSTRACT

Due to the increased transportation demands and less utilizable space on the ground, metro transportation by underground means has become the preferred alternative in many developing economies. The capital city of India, New Delhi is no exception. But in congested cities like New Delhi, it becomes important to quantify the construction stage interactions between infrastructure facilities and metros. Another issue at hand is the high seismicity of New Delhi. Thus it becomes imperative that seismic interactions also need to be incorporated. Finally as an engineer, it also becomes important to ensure the safety of tunnel liner against static and seismic loads irrespective of ground conditions (liquefiable or non-liquefiable).

In this study, an attempt was made to capture the aforementioned interactions for the geotechnical/site-specific seismic conditions in New Delhi. Hence studies were subdivided in to twin-tunnel interactions, tunnel-shallow foundation interactions, tunnel-pile foundation interactions and behaviour of tunnels in liquefiable soils. After extensive numerical studies performed for geotechnical conditions in New Delhi, a pillar width of ' $2D$ ' between twin tunnels was deemed safe against static and seismic interactions (Here ' D ' represents tunnel diameter). However, it was clear that cumulative strains induced on the tunnel liner during seismic activity caused serviceability issues. A critical observation during the course of this study was the manifestation of earthquake energy as amplified spectral responses around the pillar, especially for shallow tunnels (cover depth $< 2D$). Thus it could be safely concluded that, any ground response analysis should include the presence of underground cavities (if present) for a realistic surface response. After performing tunnel foundation interaction studies, it was clear that, tunnel liners should be designed for additional safety factors, by incorporating the presence of foundations, if foundations were allowed to undergo maximum permissible settlements. The trend of safety factors with cover depth revealed an evident decrease of the same, as improvement of

soil modulus happens with depth, especially for Gibson soil profiles. Load displacement curves of the footing under varying construction sequence of the tunnel were observed and trends were understood. Volume loss phenomenon during the course of tunnel construction evidently resulted in the bearing capacity loss, when the effects of tunnel construction on existing foundations were considered. The reverse problem revealed the stiffening of soil deposits due to un-load reload phenomena, that occurs during tunnel construction. It was observed that, foundations constructed around the pillar of the tunnel were subjected to amplified spectral responses, resulting in high zonal factors. Tunnel- pile-foundation interaction studies revealed an evident “zone of large pile displacements” where tunnels were constructed near pile foundations. These zones were observed at 45° with respect to the tunnel springing line. Any pile constructed at an offset ratio of less than 1.0 was subjected to high pile displacements, where ground improvement was unavoidable. On the similar lines a safe offset ratio (beyond which more than 80% of load carrying capacity of piles are assured) of 2.5 have been identified. For any pile constructed at a safe clearance (i.e. pile tip to tunnel crown distance) of more than $0.5D$, tunnel liner was found to be safe against safety and serviceability issues. Like it was observed for shallow foundations, piles constructed around the pillar were found to be subjected to amplified seismic responses. For tunnels constructed in liquefiable soils, especially at shallow cover depths, thrust increments on the tunnel should be given importance in design. Uplift was also observed as a serious problem in these cases for tunnels. The thrust increments on tunnels in liquefiable soils were identified due to the load-transfer phenomena between liquefied soil pockets and tunnel liner. While increasing the tunnel cover depth was suggested to be an option, considering practicality, ground improvement by grouting was suggested as a method to encounter these problems. All the mentioned studies regarding interactions and the behaviour of tunnels in liquefiable soils finally resulted in simplified design suggestions which could be easily incorporated to the design of underground structures, especially in New Delhi and in other places with similar geotechnical profiles.

सार

बढ़ती परिवहन मांगों और भूमिगत मेट्रो द्वारा भूमिगत परिवहन पर कम उपयोग करने के कारण कई विकासशील अर्थव्यवस्थाओं में पसंदीदा विकल्प बन गया है। इनमें भारत की राजधानी, नई दिल्ली कोई अपवाद नहीं है। लेकिन नई दिल्ली जैसे भीड़भाड़ वाले शहरों में बुनियादी सुविधाओं और महानगरों के बीच निर्माण चरण की बातचीत को निर्धारित करना महत्वपूर्ण हो जाता है। एक और मुद्दा नई दिल्ली की उच्च भूकंपीय है। इस प्रकार यह अनिवार्य हो जाता है कि भूकंपीय बातचीत को भी शामिल करने की आवश्यकता है। अंत में एक इंजीनियर के रूप में यह महत्वपूर्ण हो जाता है कि ज़मीन की स्थिति के बावजूद स्थैतिक और भूकंपीय भार के खिलाफ सुरंग लाइनर की सुरक्षा सुनिश्चित की जाए (तरलीकृत या गैर द्रवीभूत)। इस अध्ययन में, नई दिल्ली में भू-तकनीकी / साइट-विशिष्ट स्थितियों के लिए पूर्वोक्त बातचीत को पकड़ने का प्रयास किया गया था। इसलिए अध्ययनों को जुड़वां सुरंगों की बातचीत, सुरंग उथले नींव की बातचीत, सुरंग ढेर नींव की बातचीत और सुरंगों के व्यवहार के द्रवीभूत जमाव में विभाजित किया गया था। नई दिल्ली में भू-तकनीकी स्थितियों के लिए व्यापक संख्यात्मक अध्ययन के बाद, जुड़वां सुरंगों के बीच $2D$ की एक स्तंभ चौड़ाई को स्थैतिक और भूकंपीय बातचीत के खिलाफ सुरक्षित माना गया था (यहाँ (D) सुरंग व्यास का प्रतिनिधित्व करता है)। हालांकि, यह स्पष्ट था कि भूकंपीय गतिविधि के दौरान टनल लाइनर पर संचयी तनाव प्रेरित होता है, जो सेवाक्षमता के मुद्दों का कारण बनता है। इस अध्ययन के दौरान एक महत्वपूर्ण अवलोकन भूकंप ऊर्जा का प्रकटीकरण था, जो स्तंभ के चारों ओर प्रवर्धित वर्णक्रमीय प्रतिक्रियाओं के रूप में था, विशेष रूप से उथले सुरंगों के लिए (कवर गहराई $< 2D$)। इस प्रकार यह सुरक्षित रूप से निष्कर्ष निकाला जाएगा कि, किसी भी जमीनी प्रतिक्रिया विश्लेषण में यथार्थवादी वास्तविक प्रतिक्रिया के लिए भूमिगत गुहाओं की उपस्थिति (यदि मौजूद है) शामिल होनी चाहिए। सुरंग फाउंडेशन इंटरैक्शन अध्ययन करने के बाद, यह स्पष्ट था कि, नींव की उपस्थिति को शामिल करके अतिरिक्त सुरक्षा कारकों के लिए सुरंग लाइनरों को डिज़ाइन किया जाना चाहिए, यदि नींव को अधिकतम अनुमेय बस्तियों से गुजरने की अनुमति दी गई थी। सुरंग के अलग-अलग निर्माण अनुक्रम के तहत फुटिंग के लोड विस्थापन

घटना देखा गया था और रुझानों को समझा गया था। सुरंग निर्माण के दौरान आयतन हानि की घटना के परिणामस्वरूप क्षमता में कमी आई, जहाँ मौजूदा नींवों पर सुरंग निर्माण के प्रभावों पर विचार किया गया। सुरंग निर्माण के दौरान होने वाली अनलोड-पुनः लोड होने वाली घटनाओं के कारण उल्टी समस्या ने मिट्टी के जमाव को सख्त कर दिया। यह देखा गया कि सुरंग के स्तंभ के चारों ओर निर्मित नींव प्रवर्धित वर्णक्रमीय प्रतिक्रियाओं के अधीन थे, जिसके परिणामस्वरूप उच्च आंचलिक कारक थे। टनल-पाइल फाउंडेशन इंटरैक्शन अध्ययनों से एक स्पष्ट "बड़े ढेर विस्थापन के क्षेत्र" का पता चला जहां ढेर नींव के पास सुरंगों का निर्माण किया गया था। ये जोन 45° में सुरंग वसंत लाइन के संबंध में देखे गए थे। 1.0 से कम के ऑफसेट अनुपात में निर्मित किसी भी ढेर को उच्च ढेर विस्थापन के अधीन किया गया था, जहां जमीनी सुधार अपरिहार्य था। इसी तरह की तर्ज पर 2.5 की एक सुरक्षित ऑफसेट अनुपात (जिसके अलावा 80% से अधिक भार वहन करने वाले बवासीर की क्षमता का आश्वासन दिया गया है) की पहचान की गई है। $0.5D$ से अधिक सुरक्षित क्लीयरेंस (पाइल टिप से टनल क्राउन) पर निर्मित किसी भी ढेर के लिए, टनल लाइनर को सुरक्षा और सेवाक्षमता के मुद्दों के खिलाफ सुरक्षित पाया गया था। जैसे कि यह उथले नींव के लिए देखा गया था, स्तंभ के चारों ओर निर्मित ढेरों को भूकंपीय प्रतिक्रियाओं के अधीन पाया गया था। तरलीकृत मृदा में निर्मित सुरंगों के लिए, विशेष रूप से उथले आवरण की गहराई पर, सुरंग पर जोर वृद्धि को डिजाइन में महत्व दिया जाना चाहिए। सुरंगों के लिए इन मामलों में उत्थान को एक गंभीर समस्या के रूप में भी देखा गया। तरलीकृत मिट्टी में सुरंगों पर जोर वृद्धि की पहचान तरलीकृत मिट्टी की जेब और सुरंग लाइनर के बीच लोड ट्रांसफर घटना के कारण की गई थी। टनल कवर की गहराई को बढ़ाने के लिए एक विकल्प होने का सुझाव दिया गया था, व्यावहारिकता पर विचार करते हुए, इन समस्याओं का सामना करने के लिए ग्राउटिंग द्वारा ग्राउंड सुधार का सुझाव दिया गया था। तरलीकृत मृदा में सुरंगों के आदान-प्रदान और व्यवहार के संबंध में सभी उल्लिखित अध्ययनों के परिणामस्वरूप अंत में तरलीकृत डिजाइन सुझाव प्राप्त होते हैं जिन्हें आसानी से भूमिगत संरचनाओं के डिजाइन में शामिल किया जा सकता है, विशेष रूप से नई दिल्ली और अन्य जगहों पर समान भू-तकनीकी प्रोफाइल के साथ।

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CERTIFICATE	i
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
ABSTRACT	v
TABLE OF CONTENTS	vii
LIST OF FIGURES.....	xi
LIST OF TABLES.....	xv
ABBREVIATIONS	xvii
CHAPTER 1 - INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Introduction	3
1.2 The Need for the Present Study	9
1.3 Research Objectives	10
1.4 Organization of the Thesis.....	10
CHAPTER 2 - REVIEW OF LITERATURE.....	15
2.1 Preamble.....	17
2.1.1 Cut and cover tunnels	18
2.1.2 Mined tunnelling techniques	18
2.2 Studies on Interaction between Twin Tunnels	21
2.2.1 Construction stage interactions between twin tunnels.....	21
2.2.2 Seismic studies on tunnels.....	25
2.2.3 Studies on twin tunnel interaction under seismic loads.....	31
2.3 Studies on Interaction between Tunnel-Shallow Foundation Systems.....	33
2.3.1 Construction stage interactions between tunnel-shallow foundation systems.....	33
2.3.2 Seismic interactions between tunnel-shallow foundation systems.....	38
2.4 Studies on Interaction between Tunnel-Pile Foundation Systems	40
2.4.1 Static interactions between tunnel-pile foundation systems - Type-1 problems	41
2.4.2 Static interactions between tunnel-pile foundation systems - Type-2 problems	47
2.5 Studies on Tunnels in Liquefiable Soils	49
2.5.1 Experimental methods	49
2.4.1 Numerical methods.....	50
2.6 Gap Areas and Flowchart of the Study.....	52
CHAPTER 3 - SELECTION OF PARAMETERS AND MODELLING TECHNIQUES....	57
3.1 Introduction	59
3.2 Geotechnical Idealizations of Field Logs and Selection of Constitutive Models.....	59
3.2.1 Geotechnical idealization of field logs	59

3.2.2 Selection of constitutive models	62
3.3 Geotechnical Requirements for <i>EPB</i> Tunnelling.....	65
3.3.1 Computational approach for face pressures for <i>EPB</i> tunnels.....	66
3.3.2 Computational approach for grout pressure/volume loss for <i>EPB</i> tunnels	84
3.4 Structural Parameters and Behaviour of Tunnel Segments.....	86
3.4.1 Idealization of tunnel segments and joints	86
3.4.2 Effect of jack loads on tunnel ring actions under varying confinement.....	91
3.5 Generation of Artificial Ground Motion for New Delhi Region	99
3.5.1 Methodology	99
3.5.2 Theory and formulations	99
3.6 Concluding Remark	101
CHAPTER 4 - STATIC AND SEISMIC INTERACTION BETWEEN METRO TWIN TUNNELS.....	103
4.1 Introduction.....	105
4.2 Geotechnical, Tunnel Parameters and Mesh domain	105
4.3 Application of Conventional Seismic Design Procedures for Delhi Metro Tunnels	109
4.4 Free-Field Analysis.....	113
4.5 Ground Response to Tunnelling and Pillar Width Stability.....	114
4.6 Interaction Between Tunnels During Second Tunnel Excavation	117
4.7 Application of Conventional Seismic Methods	120
4.8 Full Dynamic Analysis for Delhi Metro Tunnels	124
4.8.1 Seismic liner forces.....	124
4.8.2 Seismic strains on tunnel liner	126
4.8.3 Surface spectral responses	127
4.9 Concluding Remark	130
CHAPTER 5 - STATIC AND SEISMIC INTERACTION BETWEEN TUNNELS AND SHALLOW FOUNDATION SYSTEMS	133
5.1 Introduction.....	135
5.2 Ground Profile, Foundation/Tunnel/Seismic Parameters and Mesh Domain	135
5.2.1 Ground profile and tunnel/seismic parameters	136
5.2.2 Foundation parameters.....	137
5.2.3 Mesh domain.....	141
5.3 Foundation Behaviour Over Cavity - Validation	142
5.4 Tunnel-Foundation Interaction Behaviour under Static Condition.....	143
5.4.1 Structural impact on foundations due to tunnelling	143
5.4.2 Design requirements for tunnel lining incorporating the presence of footing	145

5.5 Behaviour of Load Displacement Curves for Type-1 and 2 Problems.....	148
5.5.1 Classical load-displacement curves for Type-1/2 problems - Theory	148
5.5.2 Concept of critical width	152
5.5.3 Permissible settlement for footings	153
5.6 Tunnel Foundation Interaction Behaviour under Seismic Conditions	154
5.6.1 Free-field behaviour of soil deposits	155
5.6.2 Footing only problem	157
5.6.3 Seismic-tunnel-foundation interaction	159
5.7 Concluding Remark.....	164
CHAPTER 6 - STATIC AND SEISMIC INTERACTION BETWEEN TUNNELS AND PILE FOUNDATION SYSTEMS.....	167
6.1 Introduction	169
6.2 Foundation Parameters	169
6.3 Problem Geometry	171
6.3.1 Type-1 problems.....	171
6.3.2 Type-2 problems.....	173
6.3.3 Seismic loading problems.....	174
6.4 Mesh Domain	175
6.5 Tunnel Pile Interaction Validation	176
6.5.1 Validation against the numerical solution	176
6.5.2 Validation against field problem	177
6.6 Tunnel Pile Interaction Behaviour under Static Conditions	178
6.6.1 Unloaded individual pile	179
6.6.2 Vertically/laterally loaded pile	183
6.6.3 Type-2 problem	187
6.7 Tunnel Pile Interaction Behaviour under Seismic Conditions	190
6.7.1 Pile foundations under seismic loading.....	190
6.7.2 Tunnel pile foundation systems under seismic loading.....	195
6.8 Concluding Remark.....	197
CHAPTER 7 - STUDY OF METRO TUNNELS IN LIQUEFIABLE SOILS	199
7.1 Introduction	199
7.2 Ground Profile, Tunnel/Seismic Parameters and Mesh Domain.....	201
7.3 Static Tunnel Excavation Analysis.....	202
7.4 Liquefaction Analysis by Simplified Methods.....	204
7.5 Seismic Analysis for Twin Tunnels	209
7.6 Concluding Remark.....	216

CHAPTER 8 - SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS.....	217
8.1 Summary of the Work Done	219
8.2 Conclusions.....	219
8.2.1 Static and seismic interaction between twin tunnels.....	219
8.2.2 Static and seismic interaction between tunnel-shallow foundation systems.....	220
8.2.3 Static and seismic interaction between tunnel-pile foundation systems	220
8.2.4 Study of metro twin tunnels in liquefiable soils.....	221
8.2.5 Comparison with the literature.....	221
8.3 Novelty of the Present Work.....	223
8.4 Limitations of Present Study	224
8.5 Suggestions for Future Work	224
REFERENCES.....	227
APPENDIX.....	257
APPENDIX-A.....	259
APPENDIX-B.....	275
LIST OF PUBLICATIONS	321
BRIEF CURRICULUM VITAE.....	323

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1.1	Underground/Elevated Metro Activity across Indian Cities.....	4
Figure 1.2	Location of Underground Metro Networks in India and Corresponding Seismic Zones.....	5
Figure 1.3	Details of Metro Networks in New Delhi and Sites where <i>UHRS</i> have been Reported.....	7
Figure 2.1	Tunnel Induced Building Failures.....	17
Figure 2.2	Methods for the Construction of Cut and Cover Tunnels.....	18
Figure 2.3	Various Tunnelling Methods.....	19
Figure 2.4	Volume Loss.....	20
Figure 2.5	Seismic Deformation Trends on Tunnels.....	26
Figure 2.6	Possible Static Interactions between Tunnel Foundation Systems.....	33
Figure 2.7	Interaction of Pile Foundation Systems under Tunnelling for Type-1 Problem...	40
Figure 2.8	Zone of Influences for Type-1 Problem.....	42
Figure 2.9	Flow Chart of the Study.....	55
Figure 3.1	Cover Depth Ratio.....	67
Figure 3.2	Non-Dimensional Face Pressure Factor Trends at Varying Cover Depths and Friction Angles using Different Methods.....	71
Figure 3.3	Mobilisation Coefficients at Varying Cover Depths and Friction Angles using Different Methods.....	72
Figure 3.4	Non-Dimensional Face Pressure Factor Trends at Varying Cover Depths and Undrained Cohesion Using Different Methods.....	73
Figure 3.5	Mobilized Pressure Coefficients at Varying Cover Depths and Undrained Cohesion using Different Methods.....	75
Figure 3.6	Results of Numerical Analyses for Effective Stress Problems.....	76
Figure 3.7	Effect of Arching on Face Stability Trends using Finite Element Approaches...	80
Figure 3.8	Results of Numerical Analyses for Total Stress Problems.....	81
Figure 3.9	Volume Loss Simulations by Various Approaches.....	85
Figure 3.10	Segment Joint Idealization.....	88
Figure 3.11	Application of Various Indirect Methods for Three-Dimensional Analysis.....	90

Figure 3.12	Comparison of Three-Dimensional Tunnel Model Between Plate and Embedded Plate Cases.....	94
Figure 3.13	Study on The Tunnel Ring Actions Incorporating Jack Forces.....	96
Figure 3.14	Comparison of Tunnel Liner Forces for Cover Depth =1.0D in the Presence/ Absence of Jack Forces.....	97
Figure 3.15	Artificial Ground Motion Generation for New Delhi.....	101
Figure 4.1	Tunnel Face Behaviour.....	107
Figure 4.2	Mesh Size Dependency on Peak Ground Acceleration for Full Dynamic Analysis.....	109
Figure 4.3	Quasi-Static Validations.....	110
Figure 4.4	Free Field Responses.....	112
Figure 4.5	Static Tunnel Excavation Responses.....	115
Figure 4.6	Geotechnical Stability of Tunnel Pillar using Strength Factor Method.....	117
Figure 4.7	Static Interaction Study in Two-Dimensions.....	118
Figure 4.8	Static Interaction Study in Three-Dimensions.....	119
Figure 4.9	Two-Dimensional Conventional Seismic Analyses Studies.....	121
Figure 4.10	Three-Dimensional Pseudo-Static Studies.....	123
Figure 4.11	Liner Behaviour on Full Dynamic Analysis.....	125
Figure 4.12	Cumulative Strains on Tunnel Liner for Varying Confinements.....	127
Figure 4.13	Two-Dimensional Spectral Response Studies.....	128
Figure 4.14	Accumulation of Maximum Acceleration Energy around the Pillar at C=1.0D.....	129
Figure 5.1	Tunnel-Shallow Foundation Validation and Input Parameters.....	137
Figure 5.2	Typical Mesh Domain Considered for 3D/2D Analysis.....	141
Figure 5.3	Tunnel-Shallow Foundation Static Interaction Studies.....	144
Figure 5.4	Footing Deformation Behaviour for Tunnel-Foundation Interaction Problems.....	149
Figure 5.5	Effect of Embedment Ratio for Foundations at Constant Cover Depth.....	150
Figure 5.6	Effect of Tunnel Cover Depth for Foundations at Constant Embedment Ratios.....	150
Figure 5.7	Type-1 Problem Foundation Behaviour.....	151
Figure 5.8	Effect of Footing Width on Load Settlement Behaviour for Type-1 Problem....	152

Figure 5.9	Seismic Behaviour of Footing Under Seismic Loads.....	156
Figure 5.10	Tunnel Foundation Interaction Under Seismic Loads.....	162
Figure 5.11	Spectral Studies for Tunnel Foundation Interaction Studies.....	164
Figure 6.1	Soil Pile Interaction Modelling for Embedded Pile Beam Rows.....	170
Figure 6.2	Tunnel Pile Interaction Problem Definition.....	173
Figure 6.3	Tunnel Pile Interaction Problem Validation.....	177
Figure 6.4	Vertical Settlement Behaviour of Zero Loaded Pile.....	180
Figure 6.5	Lateral Settlement Behaviour of Zero Loaded Pile.....	182
Figure 6.6	Vertical and Lateral Load Reduction Ratio at Different Tunnel Cover Depths..	185
Figure 6.7	Vertical Settlement and Lateral Displacement Trends with <i>EPB</i> Drive for a Loaded and Unloaded Pile.....	186
Figure 6.8	Allowable Load on Pile Group and Tunnel Liner Behaviour for Type -2 Problem.....	188
Figure 6.9	Study on Pile Groups Subjected to Seismic Loading.....	191
Figure 6.10	Spectral Studies and Pile Forces on Pile Groups Subjected to Seismic Loading.....	193
Figure 6.11	Tunnel Pile Interaction Behaviour under Seismic Loads.....	194
Figure 6.12	Accumulation of Earthquake Energy at Tunnel Pillar.....	196
Figure 7.1	Static Twin Tunnel Excavation Analysis.....	204
Figure 7.2	Simplified Cyclic Stress Ratio Analysis.....	205
Figure 7.3	Excess Pore Pressure Ratio Plots and Zones of Liquefaction.....	209
Figure 7.4	Excess Pore Pressure Ratio Contours with Cohesion (Measured at $C=1.0D$)....	210
Figure 7.5	Pore Pressure Build up Studies.....	211
Figure 7.6	Tunnel Uplift Studies.....	212
Figure 7.7	Normal Thrust Increment Studies on Tunnel Liner.....	214
Figure 7.8	Row of Interlocking Jet Grout Column at Quincux Pattern as Possible Liquefaction Mitigation.....	215

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.1	Organization of The Thesis.....	13
Table 2.1	Location of Inflexion Point as per Various Literature.....	35
Table 3.1	Geotechnical Profiles Considered for the Study.....	61
Table 3.2	Geotechnical Parameters used for the Study on Face Stability.....	68
Table 3.3	Computation of Rotational Stiffness Ratio from Janssen Approach.....	89
Table 3.4	Typical <i>EPB</i> Parameters used in New Delhi.....	92
Table 3.5	Parameters Assumed for Validation of Tunnel Elements.....	95
Table 4.1	Computation of Pseudo-Static Coefficients for Delhi Metro Tunnels at Varying Cover Depths.....	110
Table 4.2	Computation of Quasi-Static Displacements for Delhi Metro Tunnels at Varying Cover Depths.....	111
Table 4.3	Properties of <i>EPB</i> Shield.....	114
Table 4.4	Comparison of Maximum Settlement Magnitudes with Literature.....	116
Table 4.5	Thrust Increment Computation at Varying Cover Depths using Conventional Seismic Methods.....	122
Table 5.1	Computed Face Pressure at Different Cover Depths.....	137
Table 5.2	Foundation Geometries Considered for Three-Dimensional Analyses.....	139
Table 5.3	Possible Embedment Ratios Considered in this Study for Varying Cover Depths.....	139
Table 5.4	Safety factors for Thrust and Moments at Different Tunnel Cover Depths.....	147
Table 5.5	Critical Width Computations for Different Embedment Ratios and Cover Depths.....	153
Table 5.6	Computation of Zonal Factors at Different Cover Depths for Type-1/2 Problems.....	161
Table 6.1	Vertical and Lateral Load Ratio Variation with Cover Depths.....	184
Table 7.1	Simplified Cyclic Stress Ratio Analysis.....	206
Table 7.2	Computation of Cyclic Resistance Ratio.....	207
Table 7.3	Computation of Liquefaction Induced Settlements.....	208
Table 7.4	Final Uplift Response for Twin Tunnels for Critical Cases.....	213
Table 7.5	Thrust Increment Observed for Tunnels at Varying Cover Depths.....	215

ABBREVIATIONS

A_{exc}	Extra Excavated Area
A_{tunnel}	Tunnel Area
B	Shallow Foundation/Pile Cap Width
BR	Bed Rock Depth
C	Cover Depth
C_u	Undrained Cohesion of the Soil
C/D_{min}	Minimum Cover Depth Ratio
CL	Critical Influence Line
Cro	At Tunnel Crown Location
D	Diameter/Dimension of Tunnel
D_f	Depth of Footing
DBE	Design Basis Earthquake
DMRC	Delhi Metro Rail Corporation
EPB	Earth Pressure Balancing
EQ	Equivalent Joint System ($\eta = 0.65$)
FD	Tunnel Face Displacement
FF	Free Field Case
F.E.M	Finite Element Method
FOS	Factor of Safety for Tunnel Liner
FP	Face Pressure of the Tunnel
FSL	Factor of Safety Against Liquefaction
GOI	Government of India
GNCTD	Government of National Capital Territory of Delhi
H	Depth up to the Tunnel Springing Line
Inv	At Tunnel Invert Location
L	Foundation Placed Over Left Tunnel
L_p	Length of the Pile
LT	Left tunnel

M	Tunnel Liner Moment
M2D	Tunnel Liner Moment (from Two-Dimensional Analyses)
MC	Mohr-Coulomb
MCC	Modified Cam Clay
MCE	Maximum Credible Earthquake
MRTS	Mass Rapid Transport System
N	Tunnel Liner Thrust
Nicr	Increment of Tunnel Liner Thrust in Percentage
NATM	New Austrian Tunnelling Methods
NBC	Bearing Capacity Under Normal Condition
NMT	Norwegian Method of Tunnelling
NJ	No Joints Considered ($\eta = 1.0$)
NL	Normal Influence Line
N2D	Tunnel Liner Normal Thrust (from Two Dimensional Analysis)
P	Foundation Placed Over Twin Tunnel Pillar
PR	Concrete Poisson's Ratio
P1, P2, P3	Profile -1, 2, 3
PEBC	Bearing Capacity Under Seismic Condition
PGA	Peak Ground Acceleration
PW	Pillar Width
PSHA	Probabilistic Seismic Hazard Analysis
R	Foundation Placed Over Right Tunnel
RT	Right tunnel
S	Foundation Settlement
S_{lat}	Lateral Settlement for Pile
S_{per}	Permissible Vertical/ Lateral Displacement for Pile
Spr	At Tunnel Springing Liner Location
SF	Safety Factor
T	Time in Seconds
T1, T2	Type-1, Type-2
TBM	Tunnel Boring Machine

V_l	Volume Loss in Percentage
UHRS	Uniform Hazard Response Spectra
X	Offset Distance of Pile from Tunnel
Z	Zonal factor
ZPA	Zero Period Acceleration