

# Contents

Acknowledgments / Danksagung / Agradecimientos .....	I
Contents.....	III
Kurzfassung .....	VII
Abstract.....	IX
List of symbols .....	XI
1 Introduction.....	1
1.1 Motivation .....	1
1.2 Thesis layout.....	3
2 Literature review.....	5
2.1 Dyke breaching mechanisms .....	5
2.1.1 Erosion and piping processes .....	7
2.1.2 Failure mechanisms during overflow .....	10
2.2 Basic information about unsaturated soil mechanics .....	13
2.2.1 Mechanical behavior .....	16
2.2.2 Groundwater flow behavior .....	25
2.3 Physical modeling with a geotechnical centrifuge.....	43
2.3.1 Principles .....	44
2.3.2 General scaling factors.....	47
2.3.3 Types of centrifuge facilities .....	48
2.3.4 Drum centrifuge facility at ETH Zurich .....	50
2.3.5 Digital image processing .....	52
2.3.6 Previous research on dyke behavior .....	56
2.4 Full-scale case studies.....	69
2.5 Numerical modeling .....	79
2.5.1 Groundwater flow modeling.....	80
2.5.2 Previous research on numerical simulation of groundwater flow .....	83
2.6 Summary and open questions.....	85
3 Overflow field test .....	87
3.1 Experiment layout .....	89
3.2 Overflowing process .....	94
3.2.1 Record of activities.....	94

3.2.2	Detailed description of each phase.....	95
3.2.3	Measurements during the overflow experiment .....	113
3.2.4	Investigation after the experiment .....	117
3.3	Experiment evaluation and modeling .....	120
3.3.1	Initial simulation.....	120
3.3.2	Image processing analyses .....	121
3.3.3	Soils .....	126
3.3.4	Ground model .....	129
3.3.5	Modeling of the overflow experiment .....	135
4	Physical modeling.....	143
4.1	Scaling factors for hydraulic problems.....	143
4.1.1	Approaches to the formulation of scaling factors .....	143
4.1.2	Laminar flow.....	145
4.1.3	Turbulent flow .....	146
4.1.4	Superficial flow, dyke breaching and erosion.....	148
4.1.5	Unsaturated flow .....	151
4.1.6	Effects of scaling the grain size on the scaling of flow .....	152
4.2	Instrumentation.....	154
4.2.1	New semi-circular strongbox .....	154
4.2.2	Water level control system .....	160
4.2.3	Water pressure and suction measurement .....	162
4.2.4	Volumetric water content measurement .....	169
4.2.5	Photographic monitoring .....	177
4.2.6	Tool plate .....	178
4.3	Model preparation .....	181
4.3.1	Perth sand.....	181
4.3.2	Procedure for model preparation .....	197
4.3.3	Slopes shaping system .....	200
4.3.4	Construction & installation challenges .....	201
4.3.5	Additional activities.....	204
4.4	Cross sections and testing program.....	210
4.5	Analysis of the results .....	215
4.5.1	Homogeneous dyke .....	216

4.5.2	Dyke with toe filter.....	231
4.5.3	Dyke with a cut-off wall.....	239
4.5.4	Dyke with a cut-off wall and a toe filter .....	252
4.5.5	General assessment .....	262
5	Numerical modeling.....	265
5.1	Boundary conditions .....	265
5.2	Soil properties.....	267
5.3	Results.....	269
5.3.1	Homogeneous dyke .....	269
5.3.2	Dyke with toe filter.....	272
5.3.3	Dyke with a cut-off wall.....	275
5.3.4	Dyke with a cut-off wall and toe filter .....	278
5.3.5	Slope stability.....	282
5.3.6	Effect of the protective measures on the flow pattern .....	289
5.3.7	Effect of scaling the permeability.....	294
6	Conclusions and recommendations.....	295
6.1	Field test.....	295
6.2	Physical modeling.....	295
6.3	Numerical modeling .....	297
6.4	General.....	298
6.5	Recommendations for future research .....	298
7	References.....	301
Appendix 1	Detailed results of the centrifuge tests .....	319
A1.1	Homogeneous dyke, slope gradient = 1:2.0 .....	320
A1.2	Homogeneous dyke, slope gradient = 1:2.5 .....	325
A1.3	Homogeneous dyke, slope gradient = 1:3.0 .....	329
A1.4	Dyke with a toe filter, slope gradient = 1:2.0.....	333
A1.5	Dyke with a toe filter, slope gradient = 1:2.5.....	338
A1.6	Dyke with a toe filter, slope gradient = 1:3.0.....	342
A1.7	Dyke with a cut-off wall, slope gradient = 1:2.0 .....	346
A1.8	Dyke with a cut-off wall, slope gradient = 1:2.5 .....	351
A1.9	Dyke with a cut-off wall, slope gradient = 1:3.0 .....	355
A1.10	Dyke with a cut-off wall and a toe filter, slope gradient = 1:2.0.....	360

## Contents

---

A1.11	Dyke with a cut-off wall and a toe filter, slope gradient = 1:2.5.....	365
A1.12	Dyke with a cut-off wall and a toe filter, slope gradient = 1:3.0.....	369
Appendix 2	Comparison between field test and numerical modeling for model calibration 373	
Appendix 3	Comparison of the numerical analyses with increased ( $nk_{sat} = 33.3k_{sat}$ ) permeability 377	
Appendix 4	Oedometer tests on unsaturated Perth sand.....	383
A4.1	Matric suction = 0.96 kPa, $e = 0.516$ .....	383
A4.2	Matric suction = 1.95 kPa, $e = 0.523$ .....	384
A4.3	Matric suction = 3.30 kPa, $e = 0.520$ .....	385
A4.4	Matric suction = 4.39 kPa, $e = 0.516$ .....	386
A4.5	Matric suction = 5.67 kPa, $e = 0.520$ .....	387
A4.6	Matric suction = 7.01 kPa, $e = 0.520$ .....	388
A4.7	Matric suction = 8.98 kPa, $e = 0.514$ .....	389
A4.8	Matric suction = 11.32 kPa, $e = 0.504$ .....	390
A4.9	Matric suction = 5.65 kPa, $e = 0.522$ .....	391
A4.10	Matric suction = 1.08 kPa, $e = 0.521$ .....	392
A4.11	Matric suction = 2.35 kPa, $e = 0.527$ .....	393
Appendix 5	Triaxial tests on unsaturated Perth sand.....	395
A5.1	Drained test .....	396
A5.2	Undrained test .....	400
Appendix 6	Matlab routines .....	405
A6.1	Matlab routine to create HD videos from three cameras.....	405
A6.2	Matlab routine for taking the hysteretic behavior of the SWRC into account.....	407