

University of Wollongong - Research Online

Thesis Collection

Title: Analytical and laboratory modelling of granular filters for embankment dams

Author: Mark R Locke

Year: 2001

Repository DOI:

Copyright Warning

You may print or download ONE copy of this document for the purpose of your own research or study. The University does not authorise you to copy, communicate or otherwise make available electronically to any other person any copyright material contained on this site.

You are reminded of the following: This work is copyright. Apart from any use permitted under the Copyright Act 1968, no part of this work may be reproduced by any process, nor may any other exclusive right be exercised, without the permission of the author. Copyright owners are entitled to take legal action against persons who infringe their copyright. A reproduction of material that is protected by copyright may be a copyright infringement. A court may impose penalties and award damages in relation to offences and infringements relating to copyright material.

Higher penalties may apply, and higher damages may be awarded, for offences and infringements involving the conversion of material into digital or electronic form.

Unless otherwise indicated, the views expressed in this thesis are those of the author and do not necessarily represent the views of the University of Wollongong.

Research Online is the open access repository for the University of Wollongong. For further information contact the UOW Library: research-pubs@uow.edu.au

2001

Analytical and laboratory modelling of granular filters for embankment dams

Mark R. Locke
University of Wollongong

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ro.uow.edu.au/theses>

University of Wollongong

Copyright Warning

You may print or download ONE copy of this document for the purpose of your own research or study. The University does not authorise you to copy, communicate or otherwise make available electronically to any other person any copyright material contained on this site.

You are reminded of the following: This work is copyright. Apart from any use permitted under the Copyright Act 1968, no part of this work may be reproduced by any process, nor may any other exclusive right be exercised, without the permission of the author. Copyright owners are entitled to take legal action against persons who infringe their copyright. A reproduction of material that is protected by copyright may be a copyright infringement. A court may impose penalties and award damages in relation to offences and infringements relating to copyright material.

Higher penalties may apply, and higher damages may be awarded, for offences and infringements involving the conversion of material into digital or electronic form.

Unless otherwise indicated, the views expressed in this thesis are those of the author and do not necessarily represent the views of the University of Wollongong.

Recommended Citation

Locke, Mark R., Analytical and laboratory modelling of granular filters for embankment dams, Doctor of Philosophy thesis, University of Wollongong. Faculty of Engineering, University of Wollongong, 2001.
<https://ro.uow.edu.au/theses/1819>

Research Online is the open access institutional repository for the University of Wollongong. For further information contact the UOW Library: research-pubs@uow.edu.au

NOTE

This online version of the thesis may have different page formatting and pagination from the paper copy held in the University of Wollongong Library.

UNIVERSITY OF WOLLONGONG

COPYRIGHT WARNING

You may print or download ONE copy of this document for the purpose of your own research or study. The University does not authorise you to copy, communicate or otherwise make available electronically to any other person any copyright material contained on this site. You are reminded of the following:

Copyright owners are entitled to take legal action against persons who infringe their copyright. A reproduction of material that is protected by copyright may be a copyright infringement. A court may impose penalties and award damages in relation to offences and infringements relating to copyright material. Higher penalties may apply, and higher damages may be awarded, for offences and infringements involving the conversion of material into digital or electronic form.

ANALYTICAL AND LABORATORY MODELLING OF GRANULAR FILTERS FOR EMBANKMENT DAMS

A thesis submitted in fulfillment of the requirements
for the award of the degree

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

from

UNIVERSITY OF WOLLONGONG

By

Mark R. Locke
B.E. (Hons)

FACULTY OF ENGINEERING
2001

DECLARATION

I, Mark Locke, declare that this thesis, submitted in fulfillment of the requirements for the award of Doctor of Philosophy, in the Faculty of Engineering, University of Wollongong, is wholly my own work unless otherwise referenced or acknowledged. The document has not been submitted for qualifications at any other academic institution.

Mark Locke

September 20, 2001

SUMMARY

Granular filters are used in embankment dams to protect the dam core material from internal erosion, while draining seepage water to prevent saturation of the downstream embankment. In this thesis, a mathematical model is developed to describe the time-dependent processes of filtration of non-cohesive base soils, modelling the rate of erosion and transport of particles into the filter. As particles are captured within the filter, they in turn are able to retain progressively finer base soil particles until a self-filtration zone forms that is able to prevent any further erosion. The model predictions are verified with a series of laboratory tests in newly constructed, large scale filtration equipment, the largest of its kind in Australia.

Erosion and filtration of a crack through a cohesive dam core is described by analytical modelling. The processes of erosion of the crack walls, transport of particles through the crack, and capture of the particles within the filter are combined to produce a time-dependent model describing the sealing of a cracked core as a filter cake forms. The model is able to predict crack erosion for various filters and hydraulic conditions, and has been applied to several case studies to identify practical uses of the model.

Extensive laboratory work examining erosion and filtration of cohesive base soils provides an improved understanding of the filtration process. Particles eroded from the walls of a pinhole were shown to be coarser than the original base soil particles, and these coarser particles influence filtration. Based on the experimental data, a new design procedure for broadly graded base soils, called the Reduced PSD method, is developed.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank Prof. Indraratna, my supervisor for this PhD project. For three years, since obtaining the research grant through until correcting this thesis, Prof. Indraratna has had a major role in the research. Constant encouragement to produce more work has kept me on track and seen this project finished on time.

This APA(I) research project has been sponsored by SMEC (Victoria) and the Australian Research Council. I would like to thank SMEC, and Managing Director Phil Cummins, for supporting new research both financially and through their intellectual input to the project. In particular I would like to thank Dr Gamini Adikari, who has acted as a co-supervisor of the project and given a lot of time and energy to ensure the project progressed well.

The assistance and friendship from students and staff in the Faculty of Engineering has been invaluable. Particular mention must go to Ailsa Taylor, who assisted with much of the laboratory work described in this thesis. Alan Grant, Ian Bridge and Ian Laird gave me a lot of assistance in the laboratories, particularly Alan who constructed the large scale filter equipment. He also kept me fit with a few tough games of basketball each week. The administration staff, particularly Pam Burnham and Elaine Rhodes, were always helpful and able to extract assistance from university administration when I could not.

Dr Fernando Delgado Ramos has recently completed a PhD in filter design, at the University of Granada in Spain. He and I have often liaised regarding our complimentary research, and some of the laboratory methods and data in this thesis are based on his work. His collaboration has been a great assistance.

Grateful acknowledgment is made to the various water authorities who have allowed me to use samples of material from their dams, provided staff to collect water samples, given permission to use dam data, performance records and drawings, and to publish this data. These include Melbourne Water, Wimmera-Mallee Water, North East Regional Water Authority, Goulburn-Murray Water, and Hastings Council at Port Macquarie.

My family and friends, both new and old, have provided a lot of support throughout the project. While some people think that my PhD has been about surfing, skiing and conferences in exotic locations, there has been a lot of work and some tough moments. It is amazing how a discussion with friends can clear your mind and help solve problems.

Thankyou all.

What did the fish say when it bumped into a wall? Dam.
(Janet Locke, 2000)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION	13
1.1 Introduction to Granular Filters	13
1.2 The Function of a Granular Filter	16
1.3 Research Aims	20
1.4 Scope of Research and Thesis Structure	21
2. LITERATURE REVIEW	24
2.1 Introduction	24
2.2 Factors Influencing Filtration	27
2.3 Empirical Filter Research	29
2.3.1 Experimental Approaches	29
2.3.2 The No Erosion Filter Test (NEF Test)	31
2.3.3 Effect of Hydraulic Gradient and Flow Direction	34
2.3.4 Grain Size Ratios	35
2.3.5 Filtration of Broadly Graded Materials	38
2.3.6 Internally Unstable Soils	41
2.3.7 Particle Size - Permeability Relations	43
2.4 Filtration of Cohesive Base Materials	45
2.4.1 Concentrated Leaks through Cracks	46
2.4.2 Filtration of Concentrated Leaks through Cracks	51
2.4.3 Erosion of Cohesive Materials	55
2.4.4 Summary of Filters for Cohesive Materials	65
2.5 Analytical Models of Filtration	66
2.5.1 Requirements of Numerical Analysis	66
2.5.2 Filter Void Models	67
2.5.3 Methods to Determine the Constriction Size Distribution	70

2.5.4	Infiltration of Base Soil into Filters - Probabilistic Methods	74
2.6	Particle Transport Models	79
2.7	Comparison of Filter Models	83
2.7.1	Modelling Physico-Chemical Effects	86
2.8	Focus of the Current Research	88
3.	<i>MODELLING FILTRATION OF NON-COHESIVE BASE SOILS</i>	90
3.1	Introduction	90
3.2	Theoretical Development of the Analytical Model	92
3.2.1	Filter Pore Model	92
3.2.2	Constriction Size Distribution	93
3.2.3	Constriction Sizes of Broadly Graded Materials	99
3.2.4	Particle Infiltration Depth	102
3.2.5	Rate of Particle Transport	106
3.2.6	Complete Transport Model	109
3.2.7	Prediction of Change in PSD	112
3.2.8	Change in Element Permeability	113
3.2.9	Change in Element Porosity	114
3.3	Comparison of Model Predictions with Published Research	116
3.3.1	Verification of the Constriction Size Distribution Model	116
3.3.2	Verification of the Infiltration Depth Model	119
3.3.3	Model Verification - Prediction of Internal Stability	121
3.3.4	Model Verification - Broadly Graded Materials	124
3.4	Comparison of Model Predictions with Laboratory Tests	128
3.4.1	Change in Base and Filter PSD	130
3.4.2	Extent of Mass Movement	132
3.5	Model Prediction of Time-Dependent Filter Behaviour	134
3.6	Summary of Modelling	139

4. <i>LABORATORY STUDY OF EROSION AND FILTRATION</i>	143
4.1 Introduction	143
4.2 Laboratory Study of Erosion	145
4.2.1 Test Procedure – Modified Pinhole Erosion Test	145
4.2.2 Measured Erosion Rate of Cohesive Soils	147
4.2.3 Size of Eroded Particles	150
4.3 Relating Erosion Tests to Filtration of Cohesive Soils	155
4.3.1 Correlation of the NEF Boundary with the Erosion Product	155
4.3.2 Correlation of NEF Tests with the Original PSD of the Base Soil	158
4.4 Filtration of Broadly Graded Base Soils –	160
4.5 Size of Particles for Modelling Filtration	168
4.6 Summary of Erosion and NEF Testing	171
5. <i>MODELLING FILTRATION OF COHESIVE SOILS</i>	173
5.1 Introduction	173
5.2 Formation of the Crack	175
5.3 Erosion Due to Concentrated Flow in a Crack	177
5.4 Transport of Loose Particles	180
5.4.1 Minimum Shear Stress for Particle Transport	180
5.4.2 Flow Rate Through a Cracked Core	183
5.5 Particle Capture Within the Filter	188
5.5.1 Physical Capture (Straining) of Particles	188
5.5.2 Physico-Chemical Capture of Fine Particles	192
5.5.3 Deposition within the crack	194
5.6 Formation of a Filter Cake	198
5.7 The Complete Crack Erosion Model	201

5.8	Modelling the NEF Test	203
5.8.1	Theoretical Development	204
5.8.2	Application of the NEF model	209
5.9	Application of the Cohesive Material Model	218
5.9.1	Case Study – Kerferd Dam	219
5.9.2	Effect of Increased Hydraulic Gradient	225
5.9.3	Effect of Crack Width	229
5.9.4	Effect of Erosion Resistance – Critical shear stress τ_c	230
5.9.5	Effect of Particle Deposition Conditions	233
5.9.6	Segregation of Fines	235
5.10	Predicting Erosion of Dam Cores	237
5.11	Summary	240
6.	<i>COMPARISON OF MODELLING AND EMPIRICAL CRITERIA</i>	243
6.1	Introduction	243
6.2	Predictions and Design Criteria for Non-Cohesive Base Soils	245
6.2.1	Well Graded, Non-cohesive Base Soils	246
6.2.2	Broadly Graded, Non-cohesive Base Soils	249
6.2.3	Design Criterion for Non-Cohesive Soils	251
6.3	Predictions and Design Criteria for Cohesive Base Soils	254
6.3.1	Comparison with Critical Filters and NEF Test Results	254
6.3.2	Comparison with the ‘Perfect Filter’ Concept	260
6.4	Recommended Empirical Design Criteria for Granular Filters	265
7.	<i>APPLICATIONS IN PRACTICE</i>	267
7.1	Introduction	267
7.2	Case Study 1 – Cowarra Dam	268
7.2.1	Assessment of Filter 2A and 2A(1) Suitability	269

7.2.2	Filter 2B Material	272
7.2.3	Cracking of the Core Material	275
7.3	Case Study 2 – Wartook Reservoir Embankment	278
7.4	Case Study 3 – Transition Zones in Existing Dams	285
7.5	Case Study 4 – Balderhead Dam	290
8.	CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	298
8.1	Role of Dam Filters	298
8.2	Analytical Modelling of Non-Cohesive Materials	300
8.3	Effect of Cohesive Core Materials	303
8.4	Broadly Graded Materials – The Reduced PSD Method	307
8.5	Recommendations for Improved Filter Design	308
8.6	Future Studies	313
8.7	Summary	315
	REFERENCES	316
	APPENDIX 1 - Procedure for No Erosion Filter Test	323
	APPENDIX 2 - Notation	332

TABLE OF FIGURES

<i>Figure 1.1 - Location of filters within a typical embankment dam</i>	14
<i>Figure 1.2 Stable Base-Filter Interface During Seepage</i>	17
<i>Figure 1.3 Possible Outcomes of Filtration</i>	19
<i>Figure 2.1 Typical Laboratory Apparatus</i>	30
<i>Figure 2.2 NEF Test Apparatus (Sherard and Dunnigan, 1985)</i>	32
<i>Figure 2.3 Bridging Phenomenon at base soil-filter interface (after USACE, 1971)</i>	35
<i>Figure 2.4 Base Particle Size vs Filter Permeability Relationship (Indraratna et al. 1996)</i>	44
<i>Figure 2.5 Concentrated Leak Through a Crack in a Cohesive Core (after Sherard et al. 1984b).</i>	47
<i>Figure 2.6 Tensile Behaviour of Compacted Soil at Varying Moisture Content</i>	49
<i>Figure 2.7 Variation of Floc Size with Water Chemistry (after Vaughan and Soares, 1982)</i>	52
<i>Figure 2.8 Potential energy curves for molecular and colloidal particle interaction (Lee 1968)</i>	57
<i>Figure 2.9 Likelihood of soil dispersion (Sherard et al. 1976b)</i>	58
<i>Figure 2.10 Erosion Rate vs Shear Stress (Arulanandan et al. 1975)</i>	60
<i>Figure 2.11 Predictive chart for critical shear stress from laboratory tests in rotating cylinder apparatus (Arulanandan et al. 1980)</i>	62
<i>Figure 2.12 Rate of change of erosion rate α vs critical shear stress for remoulded soils in rotating cylinder apparatus using distilled water (Arulanandan et al. 1980)</i>	63
<i>Figure 2.13- Layered Filter Model - Kenney et al. (1985)</i>	68
<i>Figure 2.14 Void Channel Model - Indraratna and Vafai (1997)</i>	69
<i>Figure 2.15 Pore Network Model - Witt (1993)</i>	69
<i>Figure 2.16 Cubic Pore Network Model - Schuler (1996)</i>	70
<i>Figure 2.17 Particle packing arrangement for a) most dense and b) least dense states</i>	71
<i>Figure 2.18 Comparison of Filter Void Model (DeMello 1977)</i>	72
<i>Figure 2.19 New Method to Determine CSD - Schuler (1996)</i>	73
<i>Figure 2.20 Infiltration Depth vs % Voids Larger than Particle Size (Schuler, 1996)</i>	77
<i>Figure 2.21 Equilibrium of Particle "Plugging" a Vertical Pore Channel in a) XZ Plane; b) YZ Plane (Indraratna and Vafai, 1997)</i>	80
<i>Figure 2.22 Illustration of (a) base and filter elements and (b) generalised slurry flow through a filter element (Indraratna and Vafai, 1997)</i>	81

Figure 2.23 Predicted infiltration depth into a uniform filter with $D_{15F}=1.3\text{mm}$ and $C_u=2$	85
Figure 2.24 Predicted infiltration depth into a well graded filter with $D_{15F}=1.3\text{mm}$ and $C_u=6$	85
Figure 3.1a) Cubic network pore model (after Schuler 1996); b) Single pore with six constrictions.	93
Figure 3.2 Pore Constriction Size for a) Most Dense and b) Least Dense states.	95
Figure 3.3 a) Pore constriction formed by 4 particles b) Constriction area formed by tangent particles, S_v c) Circle of equivalent area	96
Figure 3.4 Comparison of Constriction Size Distributions at various relative densities.	99
Figure 3.5 a) Fine particles loose between soil skeleton, b) Large particles floating in a matrix of fines.	100
Figure 3.6 Ideal curve and stable and unstable filter gradings	101
Figure 3.7 Infiltration Model – Probability of forward movement and predicted depth of infiltration.	105
Figure 3.8 Illustration of (a) base and filter elements and (b) generalised flow of slurry through a filter element (Indraratna & Vafai, 1997)	109
Figure 3.9 Comparison of calculated CSD with measured CSD of Soria et al.(1993)	117
Figure 3.10 - Comparison of CSD model with measured pore sizes of Wittmann (1979)	118
Figure 3.11 Comparison of Base Particle Infiltration Depth Models - Uniform Sand Filter, $C_u=2$, $D_{15F}=1.3\text{mm}$	120
Figure 3.12 Comparison of Base Particle Infiltration Depth Models for Well Graded Sandy Gravel Filter, $C_u=6$, $D_{15F}=1.3\text{mm}$	121
Figure 3.13 Comparison of Model and Experimental Results: change in PSD After Test - Unstable Material A (Kenney & Lau, 1985)	123
Figure 3.14 Comparison of Model and Experimental Results: change in PSD After Test - Stable Material 3 (Kenney & Lau, 1985)	124
Figure 3.15 PSD of base and filter materials from Lafleur et al. (1989)	125
Figure 3.16 Predicted mass loss during filtration - material B2 protected by various filters	126
Figure 3.17 Predicted mass loss during filtration - material B6 protected by various filters	126
Figure 3.18 Schematic diagram of large-scale filtration apparatus.	129
Figure 3.19 Large scale filter permeameter	129
Figure 3.20 Comparison of predicted PSD and laboratory results for $D_{15F}/d_{85B}=4$	131
Figure 3.21 Comparison of predicted PSD and laboratory results for $D_{15F}/d_{85B}=7$	132

<i>Figure 3.22 Comparison of predicted and measured mass loss during filtration of non-cohesive materials</i>	133
<i>Figure 3.23 Mass passing 10cm from filter interface with time</i>	135
<i>Figure 3.24 Predicted change in flow rate with time</i>	136
<i>Figure 3.25 Change in permeability and porosity of base with time</i>	137
<i>Figure 3.26 Change in permeability and porosity of filter with time</i>	138
<i>Figure 4.1 Schematic of apparatus for the large-scale pinhole test</i>	146
<i>Figure 4.2 Extent of particle aggregation with particle size</i>	153
<i>Figure 4.3 Relation between D_{85EP} of the dispersed erosion product and experimentally determined D_{15bdy}</i>	157
<i>Figure 4.4 Relationship between d_{85} and experimentally determined filter boundary D_{15bdy}</i>	158
<i>Figure 4.5 Relation between fines content and D_{15bdy}</i>	159
<i>Figure 4.6 Results of NEF Tests compared with Sherard and Dunnigan (1985) design criteria.</i>	161
<i>Figure 4.7 Method to assess self-filtration of a soil</i>	163
<i>Figure 4.8 PSD and reduced PSD of material API</i>	163
<i>Figure 4.9 Relationship between D_{15bdy} and $d_{85(Reduced)}$ from the reduced PSD of the original base soil</i>	164
<i>Figure 4.10 NEF boundary against d_{85} of the reduced PSD for soil group 1 materials only</i>	165
<i>Figure 4.11 NEF boundary against d_{85} of the reduced PSD for soil group 2 materials only.</i>	166
<i>Figure 4.12 Relationship between D_{15bdy} and d_{85EP} of the reduced erosion product PSD.</i>	167
<i>Figure 5.1 Process for modelling cracking, erosion and filtration within an embankment dam</i>	174
<i>Figure 5.2 Cracked core discretised into elements</i>	178
<i>Figure 5.3 Predictions of Shield's diagram for incipient particle movement</i>	182
<i>Figure 5.4 Assumed flow paths in filter from exit of cracked core</i>	185
<i>Figure 5.5 Force balance on crack</i>	187
<i>Figure 5.6 Probability of Particle Capture in a Pore Tube (After Rege and Fogler, 1988)</i>	193
<i>Figure 5.7 Action occurring at bottom of base soil specimen during NEF Test (after Sherard and Dunnigan, 1989)</i>	207
<i>Figure 5.8 Forces on base soil at filter interface causing radial erosion</i>	208
<i>Figure 5.9 Particle Size Distribution of materials for NEF simulation</i>	210

Figure 5.10 Extent of pinhole erosion before steady state for NEF laboratory test and model simulation for fine base soils. _____	212
Figure 5.11 Extent of pinhole erosion after test for NEF laboratory test and model simulation for a group 2 base soil _____	213
Figure 5.12 Extent of pinhole erosion before steady state related to ratio $D_{15F}/d_{85B(rep)}$ in NEF simulation _____	214
Figure 5.13 Predicted and measured flow rate changes during NEF test for material API _____	217
Figure 5.14 Predicted and measured flow rate changes during NEF test for Lake Kerferd embankment material. _____	217
Figure 5.15 Dam cross section defining dimensions for modelling data _____	219
Figure 5.16 Cross Section of remedial works at Kerferd Dam _____	222
Figure 5.17 Predicted mass of material eroded from a 1mm crack through Kerferd Dam for various filter sizes _____	225
Figure 5.18 Mass eroded from crack with 1mm initial width, under more severe hydraulic conditions ____	226
Figure 5.19 Increase in crack width due to erosion of 1mm crack under severe hydraulic conditions ____	227
Figure 5.20 Change in flow rate through 1mm crack under severe hydraulic conditions for various filters _____	228
Figure 5.21 Mass eroded from crack with 10mm initial width, under severe hydraulic conditions ____	229
Figure 5.22 Effect of base soil critical shear stress, τ_c , on crack erosion under severe hydraulic conditions ($H=25m$). _____	232
Figure 5.23 Effect of particle deposition conditions on the predicted mass loss from a 1mm crack protected by a filter with $D_{15F}=0.3mm$ _____	234
Figure 5.24 Erosion of a 1mm crack through highly erosive material ($\tau_c=0.05N/m^2$) at low flow rate ____	236
Figure 5.25 Predicted crack erosion for group 1 base soils protected by a filter with $D_{15F}/d_{85B}=10$ ____	239
Figure 5.26 Predicted crack erosion for group 1 base soils protected by a filter with $D_{15F}/d_{85B}=15$ ____	239
Figure 6.1 Particle size distribution of base soil samples _____	246
Figure 6.2 Predicted mass of base soil passing into the filter – Sample 1: $d_{85B}=1mm$, $C_u=6$. _____	247
Figure 6.3 Comparison of predicted mass loss and empirical design criteria – Sample 1: $d_{85B}=1mm$, $C_u=6$. _____	248
Figure 6.4 Predicted mass of base soil passing into the filter – Sample 2: $d_{85B}=1mm$, $C_u=20$. _____	249

<i>Figure 6.5 Comparison of predicted mass loss and empirical design criteria – Sample 2: $d_{85B}=1\text{mm}$, $C_u=20$.</i>	251
<i>Figure 6.6 Mass of erosion before steady state conditions for various base soils</i>	253
<i>Figure 6.7 Critical filter diameter determined through laboratory testing, design criteria, new Reduced PSD method and modelling for group 1 base soils with $d_{85B}<75\mu\text{m}$.</i>	257
<i>Figure 6.8 Critical filter diameter determined through laboratory testing, design criteria, new Reduced PSD method and modelling for group 2 base soils, $d_{85B}>75\mu\text{m}$.</i>	258
<i>Figure 6.9 Maximum Permeability of Safe Filters against Mean Floc Size of the Base Soils Tested</i>	261
<i>Figure 6.10 Comparison of Vaughan and Soares (1982) perfect filter with Sherard and Dunnigan (1985) critical filter</i>	264
<i>Figure 7.1 Typical Cross Section of Cowarra Dam</i>	268
<i>Figure 7.2 Particle Size Distributions of core and proposed F2A and F2B filter zone materials for Cowarra dam</i>	270
<i>Figure 7.4 Predicted change in PSD of sample 2 after prolonged flow</i>	272
<i>Figure 7.5 Time-dependent changes in mass transport and flow rate through F2A – F2B combination.</i>	274
<i>Figure 7.6 Predicted Infiltration of Sample 2 fine filter material into supplied F2B material</i>	275
<i>Figure 7.7 PSD of Cowarra dam core material</i>	276
<i>Figure 7.8 Predicted mass eroded from a 1mm crack through Cowarra Dam core - filter as constructed and coarser filter ($D_{15F}=0.7\text{mm}$)</i>	277
<i>Figure 7.8 Wartook Embankment - typical cross section after remedial works</i>	279
<i>Figure 7.10 PSD of Wartook Embankment materials.</i>	280
<i>Figure 7.11 a) Steady state seepage flow through Wartook Embankment</i>	281
<i>Figure 7.11 Predicted mass loss from Wartook Embankment with and without the F2A fine filter</i>	283
<i>Figure 7.13 Time Rate of Erosion of Wartook Embankment into Rockfill Berm, With and Without the F2A Fine Filter</i>	284
<i>Figure 7.13 Sandy gravel ‘transition zone’ material from an embankment dam</i>	286
<i>Figure 7.14 Change in PSD of transition zone after extended seepage</i>	287
<i>Figure 7.15 Cross Section of the Balderhead Core showing Erosion Damage (Vaughan and Soares, 1982)</i>	291

Figure 7.16 Particle size distribution of Balderhead Dam core and filter materials and Reduced PSD of the core material. _____292

Figure 7.17 Mass Eroded from 10mm crack through Balderhead Dam Core _____295

Figure 7.18 Balderhead Dam - Maximum diameter of particles transported through the crack and minimum diameter of particles retained in the filter cake. _____297

Figure 8.1 Flow chart for empirical filter design procedure _____310

Figure 8.2 Flow chart for simplified analytical filter design procedure _____310

Figure 8.3 Flow chart for detailed analytical filter design procedure _____311

TABLE OF TABLES

<i>Table 2.1 - Summary of Empirical Filter Design Criteria</i>	33
<i>Table 2.2 Cation Exchange Capacity of Clay Minerals</i>	56
<i>Table 3.1 Predicted and measured mass of migrated particles in filter test.</i>	127
<i>Table 4.1 Results of Erosion Tests</i>	149
<i>Table 4.2 Results of erosion tests and NEF tests (particle diameters in μm)</i>	154
<i>Table 4.3 – PSD Multiplier, A, based on Sherard and Dunnigan (1985) Filter Design Criteria</i>	169
<i>Table 5.1 PSD Multiplier, A, based on Sherard and Dunnigan (1985) Filter Design Criteria</i>	189
<i>Table 5.2 Properties of Materials for NEF simulation</i>	210
<i>Table 5.3 Sample of typical data from crack erosion model – Kerferd base soil, $D_{15F}=0.5\text{mm}$</i>	223
<i>Table 5.4 Pinhole Test Classes and Approximate Critical Shear Stress for Erosion</i>	233
<i>Table 5.5 Parameters for comparison of the effects of deposition conditions on filtration model</i>	234
<i>Table 6.1 Empirical design criteria for granular filters</i>	244
<i>Table 6.2 Properties of base soils and corresponding filter design criteria.</i>	245
<i>Table 6.3 NEF Test results compared with model and design criteria</i>	256
<i>Table 6.4 Comparison of model predictions and perfect filter permeability and particle size from various design criteria.</i>	263
<i>Table 6.5 Recommended Filter Design Criteria for base soils with $\tau_c > 0.5\text{N/m}^2$.</i>	266
<i>Table 7.1 NEF Test Results – Cowarra Dam (See Appendix 1 for NEF test procedure)</i>	270
<i>Table 7.2 Flow Rate through cracked core</i>	289
<i>Table 8.1 Revised Filter Design Criteria.</i>	312