IJSRD - International Journal for Scientific Research & Development| Vol. 13, Issue 3, 2025 | ISSN (online): 2321-0613

Influence of Soil Properties on Foundation Performance During Earthquakes

Kunal Deshmukh[1] Ruhel Dev Yadav[2] Mrs. Bhavana Bhonsle[3]
[1,2]Research Scholar [3]Assistant professor
[1,2,3]Department of Civil Engineering
[1,2,3]Bhilai Institute of Technology, Durg, India

Abstract — This paper examines the critical relationship between soil properties and foundation performance during seismic events. Through analysis of case studies and experimental data, we demonstrate that soil characteristics, including composition, density, moisture content, and stratification, significantly influence how foundations respond to earthquake loading. The research highlights that site-specific soil assessment is essential for effective earthquake-resistant design. We present evidence that soil amplification effects can dramatically alter ground motion characteristics and that soil-structure interaction must be carefully considered in foundation design. The findings support the implementation of comprehensive site investigations and soil improvement techniques to enhance foundation resilience during seismic events. This research contributes to improved understanding of geotechnical earthquake engineering principles and provides practical recommendations for more resilient foundation systems in seismically active regions.

Keywords: Soil Properties, Foundation Performance, Earthquakes, Soil Amplification, Liquefaction, Soil-Structure Interaction

I. INTRODUCTION

Earthquakes represent one of nature's most destructive forces, causing widespread damage to infrastructure and posing significant threats to human safety. The performance of building foundations during seismic events is a critical determinant of structural integrity and occupant safety. While structural engineering aspects of earthquake resistance have received considerable attention, the geotechnical components—particularly the influence of soil properties on foundation performance—deserve equally rigorous examination.

Soil, as the medium through which seismic waves propagate before reaching foundations, plays a crucial role in modifying earthquake characteristics and determining foundation response. The complex interaction between soil and foundations during earthquakes involves numerous variables, making it a challenging but essential area of study in geotechnical earthquake engineering.

This paper synthesizes current knowledge regarding how different soil properties influence foundation performance during seismic events. It examines the mechanisms through which soil characteristics alter ground motions, explores soil-structure interaction phenomena, and evaluates strategies for mitigating adverse soil effects on foundations in earthquake-prone regions.

II. BACKGROUND AND LITERATURE REVIEW

A. Historical Perspective

The significance of soil conditions in earthquake damage was documented as early as the 1908 Messina earthquake in Italy, where structures on soft soil suffered significantly more damage than those on rock (Ambraseys, 1988). The 1985 Mexico City earthquake provided stark evidence of soil amplification effects, where resonance in the lake bed deposits resulted in amplified ground motions and catastrophic damage to mid-rise buildings (Seed et al., 1988).

The 1989 Loma Prieta earthquake in San Francisco and the 1995 Kobe earthquake in Japan further highlighted the importance of soil-foundation interaction, with widespread instances of liquefaction-induced foundation failures (Bray et al., 1994; Tokimatsu et al., 1996). These historical events have driven research into understanding the relationship between soil properties and seismic performance.

B. Soil Dynamics Fundamentals

The propagation of seismic waves through soil is governed by principles of wave mechanics and is influenced by soil stiffness, density, and damping characteristics (Kramer, 1996). Shear wave velocity (Vs) has emerged as a key parameter in characterizing soil response to dynamic loading, with lower velocities generally associated with higher amplification potential.

Research by Idriss and Seed (1968) established the significance of soil non-linearity during strong ground motions, demonstrating that soil stiffness decreases and damping increases with increasing strain levels. This non-linear behavior significantly affects how seismic energy is transmitted to foundations.

C. Foundation Types and Seismic Response

Different foundation systems—shallow footings, mat foundations, and deep foundations—interact uniquely with surrounding soil during earthquakes. Shallow foundations are more susceptible to settlement and lateral spreading in poor soil conditions (Tokimatsu and Seed, 1987), while pile foundations may experience complex loading patterns due to kinematic interaction with moving soil layers (Mylonakis et al., 1997).

Recent research has focused on performance-based design approaches that consider both inertial forces from the superstructure and kinematic forces from soil movement (Gazetas and Mylonakis, 1998; Boulanger et al., 2007). These approaches recognize the need to account for site-specific soil conditions in foundation design.

III. INFLUENTIAL SOIL PROPERTIES

A. Soil Composition and Classification

Soil composition, typically characterized by grain size distribution, mineralogy, and plasticity, fundamentally influences seismic response. Cohesionless soils such as sands and gravels behave differently under cyclic loading compared to cohesive soils like clays and silts (Ishihara, 1996).

ASTM D2487 and the Unified Soil Classification System provide standardized approaches to categorizing soils, which serves as a starting point for assessing seismic behavior. However, research by Bray and Sancio (2006) has demonstrated that traditional classification systems alone may not adequately predict dynamic soil behavior, particularly for intermediate soils.

B. Density and Void Ratio

Soil density, often expressed in terms of relative density for granular soils or void ratio, strongly correlates with seismic performance. Loose deposits are more susceptible to compaction during shaking, resulting in settlement that can affect foundation support (Tokimatsu and Seed, 1987).

Experimental studies by Silver and Seed (1971) established that the volumetric strain potential during cyclic loading decreases exponentially with increasing relative density. This relationship underscores the importance of soil compaction as a mitigation measure for seismic risk.

C. Moisture Content and Saturation

The degree of saturation critically affects soil behavior during earthquakes. Saturated cohesionless soils are susceptible to liquefaction—a phenomenon where cyclic loading causes loss of shear strength and soil behaves temporarily as a viscous fluid (Seed and Idriss, 1971).

Recent research has revealed complex relationships between partial saturation and liquefaction resistance. Tsukamoto et al. (2002) demonstrated that partially saturated soils exhibit higher liquefaction resistance due to suction pressures between particles, but this benefit diminishes rapidly with increasing saturation levels.

D. Stratification and Heterogeneity

Natural soil deposits rarely exist as homogeneous layers. Stratification and lateral variability can lead to differential foundation performance during earthquakes. Wave reflection and refraction at layer interfaces can cause complex patterns of energy concentration (Kramer, 1996).

Studies by Dobry et al. (1976) highlighted that sharp impedance contrasts between adjacent soil layers can lead to trapped waves and prolonged shaking. This phenomenon has implications for foundation design, particularly in basins with soft sediments overlying bedrock.

IV. SOIL AMPLIFICATION PHENOMENA

A. Site Response Analysis

Site response analysis examines how local soil conditions modify earthquake ground motions as they propagate from bedrock to the surface. One-dimensional equivalent linear analyses, popularized through programs like SHAKE (Schnabel et al., 1972), have become standard practice in geotechnical earthquake engineering.

Advanced methods incorporating non-linear soil behavior, such as those implemented in DEEPSOIL (Hashash et al., 2016) and D-MOD (Matasovic and Vucetic, 1995), provide more accurate predictions of soil response under strong shaking. These analyses help quantify the degree of amplification expected at a specific site.

B. Topographic Effects

Beyond soil properties, topographic features like hills, ridges, and valleys can significantly modify seismic waves. Numerical and experimental studies have documented amplification factors exceeding 2.0 at ridge crests (Ashford et al., 1997), with implications for foundations located on or near topographic features.

The combined effects of soil conditions and topography have been observed in multiple earthquakes, including the 1994 Northridge earthquake, where damage patterns correlated strongly with both soil properties and local topography (Stewart et al., 2001).

C. Basin Effects

Sedimentary basins can trap seismic waves, leading to prolonged shaking and potential resonance effects. Three-dimensional basin response has been extensively studied following observations from the 1995 Kobe earthquake and the 1994 Northridge earthquake (Graves, 1998; Kawase, 1996).

Recent advances in computational capabilities have enabled realistic simulation of basin effects, demonstrating that simplified 1D analyses may significantly underestimate shaking duration and amplitude in basin settings (Day et al., 2008). These findings emphasize the importance of considering regional geological structures in foundation design.

V. SOIL-FOUNDATION INTERACTION MECHANISMS

A. Kinematic Interaction

Kinematic interaction occurs when foundation elements restrict soil deformation, causing foundation motions to deviate from free-field ground motions. This effect is particularly significant for embedded foundations and pile foundations that extend through multiple soil layers (Mylonakis et al., 1997).

Recent studies utilizing centrifuge testing have provided valuable insights into kinematic interaction effects. Experiments by Wilson (1998) and Brandenberg et al. (2005) quantified bending moments induced in pile foundations due to soil layer deformation, demonstrating that these moments can be substantial even before inertial forces from the superstructure are considered.

B. Inertial Interaction

Inertial interaction results from the dynamic response of the structure itself, generating forces that are transmitted to the foundation and surrounding soil. This interaction involves complex phenomena including foundation damping and period lengthening (Stewart et al., 1999).

Analytical models for soil-structure interaction have evolved from simple spring-dashpot representations to sophisticated numerical approaches. The substructure method, endorsed by NIST GCR 12-917-21 (2012), provides a practical framework for incorporating inertial interaction effects in design.

C. *Foundation Damping*

Foundations dissipate energy through radiation damping (waves propagating away from the foundation) and hysteretic damping (inelastic soil deformation). These mechanisms can significantly reduce structural response during earthquakes (Gazetas, 1991).

Experimental work by Veletsos and Nair (1975) and analytical studies by Gazetas and Stokoe (1991) have quantified foundation damping effects for different foundation types and soil conditions. These studies demonstrate that properly accounting for foundation damping can lead to more economical designs without compromising safety.

VI. CRITICAL SOIL PHENOMENA AFFECTING FOUNDATIONS

A. *Liquefaction and Lateral Spreading*

Liquefaction represents one of the most dramatic soil failure mechanisms during earthquakes. The temporary loss of shear strength in saturated cohesionless soils can lead to large foundation settlements, tilting, or even overturning (Seed and Idriss, 1971).

Lateral spreading—horizontal displacement of soil due to liquefaction on mild slopes or near free faces—has caused severe damage to foundations in numerous earthquakes. The 1995 Kobe earthquake provided extensive documentation of lateral spreading effects on pile foundations, with observed failures informing modern design approaches (Tokimatsu et al., 1996; Ishihara and Cubrinovski, 1998).

B. *Cyclic Softening of Clays*

While liquefaction primarily affects granular soils, fine-grained soils can experience cyclic softening during earthquakes. This phenomenon involves progressive loss of strength due to pore pressure accumulation, albeit at a slower rate than in sands (Boulanger and Idriss, 2007).

The Mexico City earthquake of 1985 demonstrated the vulnerability of structures founded on soft clay deposits. Research by Zeevaert (1991) and Romo (1995) documented how cyclic degradation of clays contributed to foundation failures during this event.

C. *Seismic Settlement*

Even without liquefaction, soils can experience volumetric and deviatoric strains during shaking, resulting in settlement that affects foundation performance. Tokimatsu and Seed (1987) developed widely used methods for estimating earthquake-induced settlements in dry and saturated sands.

Recent research has focused on differential settlement, which poses greater challenges for foundations than uniform settlement. Dashti et al. (2010) utilized centrifuge testing to investigate mechanisms of building settlement during liquefaction, identifying contributions from volumetric strains, partial bearing failure, and soil-structure interaction effects.

VII. ASSESSMENT METHODS AND PARAMETERS

A. *In-Situ Testing*

Field testing methods provide valuable information about soil properties relevant to seismic performance. Standard Penetration Tests (SPT) and Cone Penetration Tests (CPT) remain widely used for liquefaction assessment (Youd et al., 2001), while shear wave velocity measurements using surface wave methods or downhole techniques directly characterize soil stiffness (Andrus and Stokoe, 2000).

Recent advances in testing technology, including direct-push permeability measurements and full-scale dynamic loading tests, have enhanced our ability to characterize soil behavior under seismic conditions (Lunne et al., 1997; Cox et al., 2009).

B. *Laboratory Testing*

Laboratory testing complements field investigations by providing controlled measurement of soil properties. Cyclic triaxial, simple shear, and torsional shear tests characterize strain-dependent modulus reduction and damping, which are essential inputs for site response analysis (Kramer, 1996).

Advanced constitutive models derived from laboratory testing, such as those developed by Manzari and Dafalias (1997) and Boulanger and Ziotopoulou (2015), enable more realistic simulation of soil behavior in numerical analyses. These models capture critical aspects of cyclic mobility and phase transformation behavior.

C. *Numerical Modeling Approaches*

Numerical modeling of soil-foundation systems has evolved substantially with computational advances. Methods range from simplified approaches using Winkler springs to sophisticated finite element and finite difference methods that incorporate non-linear soil behavior and three-dimensional effects (Bielak et al., 2005; Pecker et al., 2001).

The emergence of performance-based earthquake engineering has driven development of probabilistic assessment frameworks that quantify uncertainty in soil properties and seismic loading (Kramer and Mayfield, 2007). These approaches recognize the inherent variability in soil conditions and provide more comprehensive risk assessment.

VIII. MITIGATION STRATEGIES

A. *Soil Improvement Techniques*

Various ground improvement methods can enhance soil performance during earthquakes. Densification techniques like dynamic compaction and vibrocompaction effectively mitigate liquefaction risk in granular soils by increasing relative density (Mitchell, 2008).

Grouting and chemical stabilization methods alter soil composition to increase strength and reduce deformation potential. Recent innovations include colloidal silica and microbially induced calcite precipitation as environmentally friendly alternatives for liquefaction mitigation (Gallagher and Mitchell, 2002; DeJong et al., 2006).

B. *Foundation Design Adaptations*

Foundation designs can be modified to accommodate anticipated soil behavior during earthquakes. Options include ground-improving piles, which enhance soil resistance rather than bypassing poor soils (Baez and Martin, 1993), and foundation isolation systems that decouple structures from ground motion (Jangid and Datta, 1995).

Performance-based design approaches that explicitly consider foundation deformation limits are gaining acceptance. These methods, as outlined in ASCE/SEI 41-17 and FEMA P-58, allow for more rational design decisions based on acceptable levels of foundation performance under varying earthquake scenarios.

IX. STRUCTURAL CONSIDERATIONS

The superstructure design must account for anticipated foundation performance during earthquakes. Structural elements can be detailed to accommodate expected foundation settlements or lateral displacements (PEER, 2017). Flexible coupling beams and separation joints represent strategies for managing differential foundation movements.

Recent research on rocking foundations challenges traditional design philosophies by intentionally allowing foundation uplift during strong shaking. Studies by Gajan and Kutter (2008) demonstrated that controlled rocking can reduce structural demands while causing manageable foundation settlements.

X. FUTURE RESEARCH DIRECTIONS

A. *Advanced Characterization Methods*

Emerging technologies promise improved characterization of spatial soil variability relevant to foundation performance. Geophysical methods including electrical resistivity tomography and multi-channel analysis of surface waves enable more comprehensive site assessment than traditional point measurements (Everett, 2013).

Machine learning approaches that integrate multiple data sources show potential for improved prediction of soil behavior during earthquakes. These methods could help bridge the gap between limited site investigation data and the comprehensive soil understanding needed for reliable foundation design (Tinoco et al., 2018).

B. *Performance Monitoring*

Instrumented foundations and soil deposits provide invaluable data on actual performance during earthquakes. Expanded monitoring networks, such as those deployed by the USGS and the Network for Earthquake Engineering Simulation, are enhancing our understanding of soil-foundation interaction (Çelebi, 2013).

Distributed fiber optic sensing technologies offer new capabilities for monitoring strain distribution in foundations during seismic events. These systems provide high-resolution data that can validate numerical models and improve design approaches (Kramer et al., 2018).

C. *Resilience-Based Design Frameworks*

Future design approaches will likely shift toward resilience-based frameworks that consider not only safety but also post-earthquake functionality. These approaches require more sophisticated modeling of soil-foundation interaction and better quantification of performance uncertainty (Bruneau et al., 2003).

Integration of economic and social consequences into technical design decisions represents a frontier in earthquake engineering. Research by Marquis et al. (2017) demonstrates how geotechnical factors affect community recovery following earthquakes, highlighting the broader impacts of foundation performance.

XI. CONCLUSIONS

This review has demonstrated the critical influence of soil properties on foundation performance during earthquakes. Key findings include:

1) Local soil conditions can dramatically amplify ground motions, altering the seismic demands on foundations compared to bedrock conditions.
2) Soil-foundation interaction involves complex kinematic and inertial mechanisms that must be considered in design, particularly for important structures.
3) Phenomena such as liquefaction, lateral spreading, and cyclic softening represent major challenges for foundation performance, requiring careful assessment and mitigation.
4) Advances in soil characterization, numerical modeling, and performance monitoring are improving our ability to predict and enhance foundation performance during earthquakes.

Future progress in this field will require continued integration of observational data, experimental results, and numerical simulations. The development of performance-based, resilience-focused design approaches holds promise for more effective mitigation of earthquake impacts on foundations and the structures they support.

REFERENCES

[1] Ambraseys, N. N. (1988). Engineering seismology. Earthquake Engineering & Structural Dynamics, 17(1), 1-105.

[2] Andrus, R. D., & Stokoe, K. H. (2000). Liquefaction resistance of soils from shear-wave velocity. Journal of Geotechnical and Geoenvironmental Engineering, 126(11), 1015-1025.

[3] ASCE. (2016). Minimum design loads and associated criteria for buildings and other structures (ASCE/SEI 7-16). American Society of Civil Engineers, Reston, VA.

[4] ASCE. (2017). Seismic evaluation and retrofit of existing buildings (ASCE/SEI 41-17). American Society of Civil Engineers, Reston, VA.

[5] Ashford, S. A., Sitar, N., Lysmer, J., & Deng, N. (1997). Topographic effects on the seismic response of steep slopes. Bulletin of the Seismological Society of America, 87(3), 701-709.

[6] Baez, J. I., & Martin, G. R. (1993). Advances in the design of vibro systems for the improvement of liquefaction resistance. In Proceedings of the 7th Annual Symposium of the Vancouver Geotechnical Society, Vancouver, BC.

[7] Bielak, J., Loukakis, K., Hisada, Y., & Yoshimura, C. (2005). Domain reduction method for three-dimensional earthquake modeling in localized regions, Part I: Theory. Bulletin of the Seismological Society of America, 95(3), 817-824.

[8] Boulanger, R. W., & Idriss, I. M. (2007). Evaluation of cyclic softening in silts and clays. Journal of Geotechnical and Geoenvironmental Engineering, 133(6), 641-652.

[9] Boulanger, R. W., Curras, C. J., Kutter, B. L., Wilson, D. W., & Abghari, A. (2007). Seismic soil-pile-structure interaction experiments and analyses. Journal of Geotechnical and Geoenvironmental Engineering, 125(9), 750-759.

[10] Boulanger, R. W., & Ziotopoulou, K. (2015). PM4Sand (Version 3): A sand plasticity model for earthquake engineering applications. Center for Geotechnical Modeling, University of California at Davis, CA, Report No. UCD/CGM-15/01.

[11] Brandenberg, S. J., Boulanger, R. W., Kutter, B. L., & Chang, D. (2005). Behavior of pile foundations in laterally spreading ground during centrifuge tests. Journal of Geotechnical and Geoenvironmental Engineering, 131(11), 1378-1391.

[12] Bray, J. D., & Sancio, R. B. (2006). Assessment of the liquefaction susceptibility of fine-grained soils. Journal of Geotechnical and Geoenvironmental Engineering, 132(9), 1165-1177.

[13] Bray, J. D., Sancio, R. B., Durgunoglu, T., Onalp, A., Youd, T. L., Stewart, J. P., ... & Kayen, R. (2004). Subsurface characterization at ground failure sites in Adapazari, Turkey. Journal of Geotechnical and Geoenvironmental Engineering, 130(7), 673-685.

[14] Bray, J. D., Seed, R. B., & Seed, H. B. (1994). Analysis of earthquake fault rupture propagation through cohesive soil. Journal of Geotechnical Engineering, 120(3), 562-580.

[15] Bruneau, M., Chang, S. E., Eguchi, R. T., Lee, G. C., O'Rourke, T. D., Reinhorn, A. M., ... & von Winterfeldt, D. (2003). A framework to quantitatively assess and enhance the seismic resilience of communities. Earthquake Spectra, 19(4), 733-752.

[16] Çelebi, M. (2013). Seismic monitoring of structures and new developments. In Earthquakes and Health Monitoring of Civil Structures (pp. 37-84). Springer, Dordrecht.

[17] CEN. (2004). Eurocode 8: Design of structures for earthquake resistance. European Committee for Standardization, Brussels.

[18] Cox, B. R., Stokoe, K. H., & Rathje, E. M. (2009). An in-situ test method for evaluating the coupled pore pressure generation and nonlinear shear modulus behavior of liquefiable soils. Geotechnical Testing Journal, 32(1), 11-21.

[19] Cubrinovski, M., Bradley, B., Wotherspoon, L., Green, R., Bray, J., Wood, C., ... & Wells, D. (2011). Geotechnical aspects of the 22 February 2011 Christchurch earthquake. Bulletin of the New Zealand Society for Earthquake Engineering, 44(4), 205-226.

[20] Dashti, S., Bray, J. D., Pestana, J. M., Riemer, M., & Wilson, D. (2010). Mechanisms of seismically induced settlement of buildings with shallow foundations on liquefiable soil. Journal of Geotechnical and Geoenvironmental Engineering, 136(1), 151-164.

[21] Day, S. M., Graves, R., Bielak, J., Dreger, D., Larsen, S., Olsen, K. B., ... & Juve, G. (2008). Model for basin effects on long-period response spectra in southern California. Earthquake Spectra, 24(1), 257-277.

[22] DeJong, J. T., Fritzges, M. B., & Nüsslein, K. (2006). Microbially induced cementation to control sand response to undrained shear. Journal of Geotechnical and Geoenvironmental Engineering, 132(11), 1381-1392.

[23] Dobry, R., Oweis, I., & Urzua, A. (1976). Simplified procedures for estimating the fundamental period of a soil profile. Bulletin of the Seismological Society of America, 66(4), 1293-1321.

[24] Everett, M. E. (2013). Near-surface applied geophysics. Cambridge University Press.

[25] Gajan, S., & Kutter, B. L. (2008). Capacity, settlement, and energy dissipation of shallow footings subjected to rocking. Journal of Geotechnical and Geoenvironmental Engineering, 134(8), 1129-1141.

[26] Gallagher, P. M., & Mitchell, J. K. (2002). Influence of colloidal silica grout on liquefaction potential and cyclic undrained behavior of loose sand. Soil Dynamics and Earthquake Engineering, 22(9-12), 1017-1026.

[27] Gazetas, G. (1991). Formulas and charts for impedances of surface and embedded foundations. Journal of Geotechnical Engineering, 117(9), 1363-1381.

[28] Gazetas, G., & Mylonakis, G. (1998). Seismic soil-structure interaction: new evidence and emerging issues. Geotechnical Special Publication, 75(2), 1119-1174.

[29] Gazetas, G., & Stokoe, K. H. (1991). Free vibration of embedded foundations: theory versus experiment. Journal of Geotechnical Engineering, 117(9), 1382-1401.

[30] Goda, K., Pomonis, A., Chian, S. C., Offord, M., Saito, K., Sammonds, P., ... & Wilkinson, S. (2013). Ground motion characteristics and shaking damage of the 11th March 2011 Mw9.0 Great East Japan earthquake. Bulletin of Earthquake Engineering, 11(1), 141-170.

[31] Graves, R. W. (1998). Three-dimensional finite-difference modeling of the San Andreas Fault: source parameterization and ground-motion levels. Bulletin of the Seismological Society of America, 88(4), 881-897.