

Effect of ballast retaining walls on the lateral resistance of railway tracks

Aela, P.; Jia, W. L.; Jing, G. Q.

DOI

[10.1177/0954409720930170](https://doi.org/10.1177/0954409720930170)

Publication date

2020

Document Version

Accepted author manuscript

Published in

Proceedings of the Institution of Mechanical Engineers, Part F: Journal of Rail and Rapid Transit

Citation (APA)

Aela, P., Jia, W. L., & Jing, G. Q. (2020). Effect of ballast retaining walls on the lateral resistance of railway tracks. *Proceedings of the Institution of Mechanical Engineers, Part F: Journal of Rail and Rapid Transit*, 235 (2021)(4), 416-424. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0954409720930170>

Important note

To cite this publication, please use the final published version (if applicable).
Please check the document version above.

Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download, forward or distribute the text or part of it, without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license such as Creative Commons.

Takedown policy

Please contact us and provide details if you believe this document breaches copyrights.
We will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Effect of ballast sides retaining walls on the lateral resistance of railway tracks

^aP. Aela, ^bW.L. Jia, ^aG.Q. Jing a,

^aSchool of Civil Engineering, Beijing Jiaotong University, Beijing 100044, China

^bFaculty of Civil Engineering and Geosciences, Delft University of Technology, Delft 2628CN, Netherlands

Abstract

In this study, the application of the retaining wall was proposed as a solution in order to reduce the lateral displacement of the ballast layer, particularly in sharp curves and bridges. In this regard, a series of single tie push tests were performed on panels with the shoulder ballast width of 300 mm, 400 mm, 500 mm with and without the presence of L-shape and T-shape retaining walls. Overall, it was proven that the application of the L-shape wall led to a 15.8% increase in the lateral resistance, and T-shape walls have a higher impact on the stability of the track. On the other hand, the shoulder width of 400 mm was proposed as optimum width for ballasted tracks with the presence of retaining walls.

Keywords

Retaining wall, STPT, Lateral resistance, Overturning, Shoulder ballast width.

1. Introduction

The lateral movement of the ballast railway tracks, particularly in continuously welded rails (CWR) due to the train movement or temperature changes, is one of the factors influencing the track buckling in the sharp curves [1], [2]. As reported by Kish, A [3], the deflection of a curve with 291 m radius is 40 % greater than that of the straight line. In contrast to the statement of the AREMA standard [4] about disregard of railroad surcharge influence on ballast retaining wall, passing the train through railway bridges with a sharp curve causes serious problems due to the lack of space to adequately provide lateral stability for track movement. On the other hand, the ballast layer movement would decline on account of the friction between sleepers and ballast particles [3]. The combination of aforementioned factors causes ballast aggregates spreading

28 laterally due to inadequate confining pressure [5], misalignment and train derailments in
29 consequence.

30 To meet above-mentioned challenges, modifications to the ballast layer geometry such as
31 increment of shoulder width and decline in the shoulder slope is one of the methods which
32 increases the dead load of the structure, leading to the additional deflection by passing trains
33 particularly in long bridges [6](Fig. 1(a)). Existing research recognizes the critical role played by
34 ballast layer components (crib, shoulder, and base) on the lateral resistance of railway tracks [7-
35 13]. In order to evaluate the influence of ballast shoulder width on the lateral resistance of the
36 track, experimental tests have been performed by the ERRI Committee [14]. Accordingly, “the
37 effect of the shoulder width on lateral resistance was negligible” that can be attributed to the lack
38 of the enclosure of the ballast shoulder for movement. To inhibit the lateral movement of ballasted
39 tracks, other alternatives were recommended by researchers such as a mixture of ballast-
40 bituminous [15, 16], and using scrap tires in retaining walls [17, 18]. A major problem with the
41 bitumen stabilized ballast is that the higher stiffness of the ballast layer leads to intensifying
42 vibrations on bridges. Alternatively, using scrap tires would be required more space for long-term
43 performance of tires retaining walls on a bridge. The use of geogrid in the ballast layer is another
44 solution to improve the shear strength of ballasted tracks [19, 20]. The application of various types
45 of retaining walls has been proposed to stabilize earth structures [21]. Reclaimed railway sleepers,
46 Gabion, stone block, are examples of different types of retaining wall used in railway tracks (Fig.
47 1(b-d)).

48





49

50 **Fig. 1** (a) Using a gradual slope in shoulder ballast zone [22], (b) Reclaimed railway sleepers retaining wall
51 [23] , (c) Gabion gravity structure [24], (d) Stone block walls [25]

52 Up to now, far too little attention has been paid to the performance of retaining walls on
53 ballasted railway bridges, particularly in sharp curves as illustrated in Fig. 2. Although the
54 application of concrete retaining wall is more costly than ballast layer reinforcement methods, less
55 weight and space occupancy with high strength are particular advantages of concrete retaining
56 walls utilization in confining ballast particles on railway bridges. In general, retaining walls are
57 categorized as gravity and non-gravity walls. Considering the low ballast height and bridge
58 structure, the use of concrete retaining walls, illustrated in Fig. 3, could be practical alternatives to
59 deal with the lateral displacement of railway tracks on bridges. The selection of a suitable retaining
60 wall is affected by several factors such as cost, safety, available clearance to the boundary fence,
61 foundation conditions, maintenance, and appearance [26]. Among all these retaining walls, due to
62 the sufficient stability and less weight of cantilever walls in comparison with other types, cantilever
63 walls with and without the toe, have been considered to conduct experimental tests in the present
64 research.


65



66

67 **Fig. 2** Side view of ballasted track on a bridge with (a) partial damage (b) complete collapse of retaining walls.

68



69

70 **Fig. 3** Most common types of concrete retaining walls [27].


71 The focus of this research is the application of the retaining wall with the density of 2400
 72 kg/m^3 in ballasted tracks to evaluate the stability of the aforementioned retaining walls against the
 73 lateral displacement of sleepers. According to the definition of the stability stated by Das, B. M
 74 [28], possible overturning, sliding and bearing capacity of retaining walls should be taken into

75 consideration. In this regard, a series of single tie push tests (STPT) were implemented on different
76 condition of the ballast layer to examine the lateral resistance of different shape of retaining walls.

77 **2. Ballast panel specifications**

78 **1.1. Ballast and concrete properties**

79 Ballast gradation plays the main role in the stability and safety of the track [29]. Thus far,
80 previous studies suggested that the average and maximum particle size in high-speed railway
81 tracks should be in the range of 36-41 mm and 53 mm, respectively [30]. Fig. 4(a) shows the
82 particle size distribution selected according to China National Standard TBT 2140. To construct
83 retaining walls, C40 concrete with the density and compressive strength of 2550 kg/m³, and 40
84 MPa was used, respectively.



85


86

Fig. 4 (a) Ballast particle size distribution, (b) Repose angle of ballast.

87

88 **1.2. Test plan and methodology**

89 In this study, firstly, single tie push tests were conducted on a ballast panel with three shoulder
90 widths of 300, 400 and 500 mm in order to compare with the results of ballast lateral resistance in
91 case of with and without retaining wall. It is noteworthy that many researchers proposed the width
92 of 500 mm as an appropriate size for the shoulder width [7], [31]. The geometrical conditions of
93 the ballast panels are depicted in Fig. 5.



94


95

Fig. 5 Ballast sections used in STPTs.

96 In order to evaluate the effect of the dimensions of the heel and toe, all retaining walls have
 97 the same thickness, width, and height of 60 mm, 490 mm, and 400 mm, respectively. Although the
 98 use of steel bars for ballast retaining walls was recommended by RailCorp [32], L400 unreinforced
 99 walls are widely used in China railway system. Consequently, the variation of the length of walls
 100 from 400 to 600 mm was considered in this study. On the other hand, the stability of the
 101 aforementioned walls against sliding and overturning was assessed according to AREMA standard
 102 [33] (Fig. 6). As shown in Fig. 4(b), since the repose angle of ballast is about 38.3° , coefficient of
 103 active earth pressure (k_a) is calculated as follows:

$$k_a = \frac{1 - \sin \phi}{1 + \sin \phi} = \frac{1 - 0.62}{1 + 0.62} = 0.234 \quad (1)$$

104 To calculate the resistance force against sliding, the friction coefficient of concrete to concrete
 105 surface equals 0.53 according to the results presented by Zhao, W [34]. As depicted in Table 1,
 106 the applied retaining walls are stable against sliding and overturning due to the high safety factor
 107 (SF > 1.5).



108

109

Fig. 6 Stability requirements of retaining walls [35].

110

Table 1 Stability of walls against sliding and overturning.

Wall	W_w	W_b	P_a	F_s	SF	M_r	M_o	SF
L400	59.976	133.28	31.92	102.42	3.20	33.55	4.25	7.88
L500	67.473	166.6	31.92	124.05	3.88	51.92	4.25	12.19
L600	74.97	199.92	31.92	145.69	4.56	74.37	4.25	17.47

111 W_w : Weight of wall, W_b : Weight of ballast, P_a : Active pressure, F_h : Resistance force against sliding,112 M_r : Restoring moment, M_o : Overturning moment, **SF**: Safety factor

113 After placing retaining walls, ballast was compacted in three layers by a vibrating compactor
114 with the weight and frequency of 80 kg and 67 Hz to achieve a ballast layer with the length, width,
115 height, and density of 10 m, 3.6 m, 0.35 m, and 1700 kg/m³, respectively. In the next step, mono-
116 block sleepers were placed on the ballast bed. It should be noted that in case of using retaining
117 walls, one side of the ballast layer was limited by the retaining wall, the space between sleeper
118 ends and walls was corresponding to the shoulder width. The lateral force was applied by a
119 hydraulic jack with the maximum capacity of 10 tons and the loading increment rate of 0.5 mm/min
120 and recorded by the data logger INV3018A at each 0.5 mm of sleeper lateral displacement which
121 was considered as the lateral resistance of the retaining wall. In all STPTs, the sleeper maximum
122 lateral displacement **was limited to 10 mm**. For each test condition, STPT was repeated 3 times to
123 ensure the accuracy of results. In order to measure sleeper movement and consequential ballast
124 lateral displacement, LVDTs with an accuracy of 0.001 mm and measuring the course of 30 mm
125 attached to the top and down of the sidewall as well as the sleeper end (Fig. 7). It is noteworthy
126 that displacement of the wall along the length is approximately equal as reported by Ahn, IS [36],
127 consequently only one LVDT was installed in each level.

128

129


130

131

132



133



134



135

Fig. 7 (a) Different shape of retaining walls, (b) Test panel, (c) Loading jack, (d, e) LVDTs installation.

136

3. Experimental results and discussion

137

138

139

140

141

142

In this section, the impact of the presence of the retaining wall, shoulder ballast width, and different shapes of walls (L shape and T shape) is evaluated by single tie push tests. The deformation behavior was further investigated to figure out the interaction between the wall and shoulder ballast subjected to lateral force. Since mechanical properties of walls are the same, only the shape of retaining walls affects the ballast lateral resistance. The results are described as follows.

143

3.1 Ballast lateral resistance with and without retaining wall

144

145

146

147

148

149

150

151

152

As shown in Fig. 7, for panels with SW= 300 and 500 mm, the resistance of the sleeper is approximately equal up to the displacement of 2 mm. Overall, there is little difference between the resistance of ballast track with and without walls that it can be attributed to the applied static loading instead of dynamic loading in the real state. It can be assumed that the retaining wall resists against lateral load after 2 mm displacement of the sleeper, so that lateral resistance of panels with SW 300 and 500 increased by 8% and 3% in case of using retaining walls. By contrast, growth in lateral resistance of W-SW400 was considerable, so that the ultimate resistance increased by 15.8 % in comparison with NW-SW400. Therefore, the application of retaining wall for ballast track with the shoulder width of 400 mm is efficient among the above-mentioned panels.

153

3.2 Influence of shoulder ballast width on lateral resistance

154

155

156

157


158

159

160

161

Fig. 8 shows the resistance of the retaining walls for panels with shoulder ballast width of 300, 400, 500 mm. The increment of shoulder width led to the rise of lateral resistance so that the resistance of the panel with a shoulder width of 500 mm was about 22 % and 4 % higher than that of panels with the shoulder width of 300 mm, and 400 mm, respectively. Therefore, due to the insignificant difference between resistance of panels with SW400 and SW500, 400 mm is optimum shoulder width in ballast tracks. In addition, a high proportion of the growth in resistance occurred up to the displacement of 2 mm. On the other hand, in case of using the retaining wall, maximum resistance occurred earlier, particularly for panel with SW = 500 mm.



162

163

Fig. 8 Lateral resistance of L400 with different shoulder width.

164

NW: No retaining wall, W: With the presence of retaining wall

165

3.3 Influence of walls shape on the deformation of retaining walls

166

167

168

169

170

171

172

173


174

175


176

In order to determine the overturning of the walls, firstly the lateral displacement of the top and bottom of walls was recorded. Eventually, the ratio of relative displacement to the wall height was considered as the degree of the wall rotation. As shown in Fig. 9, due to the static load applied on the sleeper, the higher length of retaining wall, the lower overturning in L-shape walls, so that the rotation decreased from 0.145° to 0.015° for panel with L600-SW500 instead of L400-SW500. Also, approximately equal rotation occurred with the replacement of L600 with T-shape walls. On the other hand, changes in the lateral displacement of various retaining walls were the same as overturning. It indicates that overturning has a direct relation with the horizontal force applied by the sleeper. Therefore, the use of T200 fulfils the appropriate resistance against ballast movement so that the rotation was 8 times lower than the rotation of L400 for panels with the same shoulder ballast width.

177



178



179

Fig. 9 Overturning and sliding of retaining walls.

180

4. Conclusion

181

182

183

184

185

186

187

The single tie push tests conducted in the present study could help to realize that the lateral displacement of a ballasted track with the presence of the retaining wall. In this study, shoulder ballast width, and shape of the retaining wall were considered as effective parameters on ballast lateral resistance. Due to the rotation of the wall, the displacement of the top of the wall can differ substantially from the displacement of the bottom of the wall. In this regard, the application of the T-shape wall reduced overturning significantly and provided higher stability against lateral movement. It was found that the application of retaining walls play a very important role in the

188 permanent displacements of the ballast layer, so that lateral resistance reached the maximum value
189 in an earlier period. Therefore, the replacement of the shoulder ballast with retaining walls could
190 be a practical solution for sharp curves or railway bridges owing to the reduction in the width of
191 the ballast bed. For further studies, the deformation of the ballast layer with and without the
192 presence of the retaining wall under cyclic dynamic loading is recommended.

193 **Acknowledgments**

194 Financial support of this study was provided by the Natural Science Foundation of China
195 (Grant No. 51578051). This support is gratefully acknowledged.

196

- 198 1. Montalbán Domingo, L., et al., *Design of a new high lateral resistance sleeper and*
199 *performance comparison with conventional sleepers in a curved railway track by means*
200 *of finite element models*. Latin American Journal of Solids and Structures, 2014. **11**(7): p.
201 1238-1250.
- 202 2. Esmaeili, M., R. Nouri, and K. Yousefian, *Experimental comparison of the lateral*
203 *resistance of tracks with steel slag ballast and limestone ballast materials*. Proceedings of
204 the Institution of Mechanical Engineers, Part F: Journal of Rail and Rapid Transit, 2017.
205 **231**(2): p. 175-184.
- 206 3. Kish, A., G. Samavedam, and D. Wormley, *Fundamentals of track lateral shift for high-*
207 *speed rail applications*. 2004: National Technical Information Service.
- 208 4. Association), A.A.R.E.a.M.o.W., *Construction Structures and Foundations, part 5,*
209 *chapter 8*. Manual for Railway Engineering, 2014.
- 210 5. Indraratna, B., N.T. Ngo, and C. Rujikiatkamjorn, *Improved Performance of Ballasted Rail*
211 *Tracks Using Plastics and Rubber Inclusions*. Procedia engineering, 2017. **189**: p. 207-
212 214.
- 213 6. Iles, D.C., *Design guide for steel railway bridges*. 2004: Steel Construction Institute
214 Berkshire, UK.
- 215 7. Kabo, E., *A numerical study of the lateral ballast resistance in railway tracks*. Proceedings
216 of the Institution of Mechanical Engineers, Part F: Journal of Rail and Rapid Transit, 2006.
217 **220**(4): p. 425-433.
- 218 8. Le Pen, L. and W. Powrie, *Contribution of base, crib, and shoulder ballast to the lateral*
219 *sliding resistance of railway track: a geotechnical perspective*. Proceedings of the
220 Institution of Mechanical Engineers, Part F: Journal of Rail and Rapid Transit, 2010.
221 **225**(2): p. 113-128.
- 222 9. Lichtberger, B., *The lateral resistance of the track (Part 2)*. European Railway Review,
223 2007.
- 224 10. Pucillo, G.P., et al., *On the lateral stability of the sleeper-ballast system*. Procedia
225 Structural Integrity, 2018. **12**: p. 553-560.
- 226 11. De Iorio, A., et al., *On the ballast–sleeper interaction in the longitudinal and lateral*
227 *directions*. Proceedings of the Institution of Mechanical Engineers, Part F: Journal of Rail
228 and Rapid Transit, 2018. **232**(2): p. 620-631.
- 229 12. Mohammadzadeh, S., M. Esmaeili, and F. Khatibi, *A new field investigation on the lateral*
230 *and longitudinal resistance of ballasted track*. Proceedings of the Institution of Mechanical
231 Engineers, Part F: Journal of Rail and Rapid Transit, 2018. **232**(8): p. 2138-2148.
- 232 13. Iorio, A., et al., *Transverse strength of railway tracks: Part 3. Multiple scenarios test field*.
233 *Frattura ed Integrità Strutturale*, 2014. **30**: p. 593-601.
- 234 14. European Rail Research Institute, C.D., *Improved knowledge of forces in CWR track*
235 *(including switches). Report 2, review of existing experimental work in behaviour of CWR*
236 *track*. 1995, European Rail Research Institute Utrecht.
- 237 15. D'Angelo, G., N. Thom, and D.L. Presti, *Bitumen stabilized ballast: A potential solution*
238 *for railway track-bed*. Construction and Building Materials, 2016. **124**: p. 118-126.
- 239 16. D'Angelo, G., et al., *Use of bitumen stabilised ballast for improving railway trackbed*
240 *conventional maintenance*. Geotechnique, 2017: p. 022.

- 241 17. Sadique Hossain, P.W.J., *USE OF WHOLE TIRS AND FLY ASH IN EARTH RETAINING*
242 *STRUCTURES*. Texas Department of Transportation by the CENTER FOR
243 MULTICISIPLINARY RESEARCH IN TRANSPORTATION TEXAS TECH
244 UNIVERSITY, 2000.
- 245 18. ASFJ SayaÄo, L.V.M., A. C. C. F. Sieira, D. M. S. Gerscovich and V. K. Garga, *Retaining*
246 *Walls Built with Scrap Tires*. Proceedings of the Institution of Civil Engineers Geotechnical
247 Engineering, 2002: p. 1-3.
- 248 19. Liu, S., et al., *Effect of geogrid on railroad ballast particle movement*. Transportation
249 Geotechnics, 2016. **9**: p. 110-122.
- 250 20. Kwan, C.C.J., *Geogrid reinforcement of railway ballast*. 2006, University of Nottingham.
- 251 21. Prieto-Portar, L., *Types of Retaining Walls*. Foundation Engineering, Lecture #23, 2008.
- 252 22. Mahanta, S., *Trekking the longest Railway Bridge in India*.
253 <http://santulanmahanta.blogspot.com/>, 2014.
- 254 23. Services, F.R., *specializes in constructing Retaining Wall Systems for all applications*.
255 <http://www.foxrailroad.com>.
- 256 24. TENSARTECH, *EARTH RETAINING SYSTEMS, bridge abutments, retaining walls and*
257 *steep slopes*. 2013.
- 258 25. Redi-Rock™, C., *Modular Walls*. <http://www.cpm-group.com>, 2016.
- 259 26. Roads, Q.D.o.M., *Road planning and design manual, chapter 22*. 2006.
- 260 27. Vijay, A., *Lateral Earth Pressure*. <https://www.slideshare.net>, 2013.
- 261 28. Das, B., *Principles of foundation engineering, Cengage Learning*. 2011, Stanford, USA.
- 262 29. Indraratna, B., W. Salim, and C. Rujikiatkamjorn, *Advanced rail geotechnology–ballasted*
263 *track*. 2011: CRC press.
- 264 30. Sun, Y., C. Chen, and S. Nimbalkar, *Identification of ballast grading for rail track*. Journal
265 of Rock Mechanics and Geotechnical Engineering, 2017. **9**(5): p. 945-954.
- 266 31. Zakeri, J.A., *Lateral resistance of railway track*, in *Reliability and safety in railway*, I.
267 Xavier Perpinya, Editor. 2012, InTech. p. 357-374.
- 268 32. RailCorp, *Ballast retatining wall*. CV 0115011, 2005. **F2007/32516**.
- 269 33. AREMA, *"American Railway Engineering and Maintenance of Way Association",*
270 *Retaining Walls, Abutments and Piers, Part 5, Chapter 8*. Manual for railway engineering,
271 2015. **Vol. 2**.
- 272 34. Zhao, W. and B. Zhu, *Theoretical model for the bond–slip relationship between ribbed*
273 *steel bars and confined concrete*. Structural Concrete, 2018. **19**(2): p. 548-558.
- 274 35. IR. ERIZAL, M., *DESIGN AND DETAILING OF RETAINING WALLS*. Institut Pertanian
275 Bogor
- 276 36. Ahn, I.-S. and L. Cheng, *Tire derived aggregate for retaining wall backfill under*
277 *earthquake loading*. Construction and Building Materials, 2014. **57**: p. 105-116.