

## The



## **Geo-Institute**

## of the American Society of Civil Engineers

### **Presents**

# Competition Rules for the National GeoWall

## **Held During**

## **Geo-Congress 2023**

## **Important Dates**

**Rules published**: October 17, 2022 **Design papers due**: January 20, 2023

Finalists notified: February 10, 2023

Pre-Competition Captains' Meeting: March 26, 2023

Competition: March 27, 2023

Geo-Congress 2023 Information: <a href="https://www.geocongress.org/">https://www.geocongress.org/</a>

**GeoChallenge Official Information Site:** 

http://www.mygeoworld.info/groups/profile/61033/geochallenge

Revision 01: October 12, 2022



#### GeoWall 2023 Competition Rules Geo-Institute of the ASCE



- 1. **Objective** The objective of the GeoWall competition is to design and build a model mechanically stabilized earth (MSE) retaining wall using kraft paper reinforcement taped to a poster board wall facing. The competition objectives for students are to:
  - a) Design a MSE wall using the least amount of reinforcement needed to support the retained soil plus both vertical and horizontal (static and dynamic) surcharge loads,
  - b) Effectively communicate their analysis and design processes,
  - c) Enjoy a friendly but spirited competition among schools, and
  - d) Attend a world-class professional engineering conference.
- 2. **Background** MSE walls have roots to prehistoric builders who used sticks and tree branches to reinforce soil structures. The modern use of reinforced soils dates to the 1960s and French architect Henri Vidal's development of the Reinforced Earth® system. In the US, the first MSE wall was built on California SR-39 near Los Angeles in 1971. A more recent application of MSE walls is as support for bridge abutments as shown in Figure 1. This year's competition will model this application of MSE walls by requiring teams to construct a three-sided wall.





Figure 1: Typical use of MSE walls as bridge abutments

- 3. **Eligibility** Only one team per school will be allowed to compete. A team consists of a maximum of four (4) students consisting of no more than two (2) graduate students. Each team shall designate a captain who shall be the point of contact for the team. All team members must be enrolled students at the date of the national competition.
- 4. **Design Report Submittal** Invitation to the National Competition will be based upon submittal and ranking of the Mechanically Stabilized Earth (MSE) Wall Design Report. The report must include:
  - a) Cover page with name of institution; names and status (graduate, undergraduate) of each team member; identification of team captain with email address; and name, title, and email address of faculty advisor.
  - b) Material properties used in design including methods (lab tests, correlations, assumptions) used to obtain the properties.
  - c) Description of the engineering design and construction procedures including assumptions and equations used.
  - d) A complete description of the geometry and placement of all reinforcing elements. Estimated mass of the reinforcing paper in grams (not including facing material or tape).
  - e) Safety appendix (Appendix E) which outlines the potentially hazardous tasks reasonably expected during the competition and how the team will mitigate these hazards.

f) Completed reimbursement appendix (Appendix A)

#### Formatting requirements:

a) Length shall be a maximum of three (3) pages long (not including references, cover page, safety appendix or reimbursement appendix). Over-length design reports will not be reviewed and will be disqualified.

Rev 01: October 12, 2022

- b) One-inch margins, single-spaced, and 12 point Times New Roman font.
- c) All pages after the cover page shall contain a header identifying the team and a footer with the page number.
- d) Entire design report must be submitted in a single PDF format file with a filename of <School Abbreviation>2023GeoWall.pdf.

Design reports will be judged by a panel of practicing engineers and professors. Judging will consider reasonableness of design equations, material properties, factors of safety, assumptions, and satisfaction of the objectives of this competition. "Trial and error" designs will be heavily penalized. The judging rubric is presented in Appendix C.


Complete Design Report must be submitted in PDF format via email to Dr. Beena Ajmera (bajmera@iastate.edu) by 6:00 pm PST January 20, 2023. Subject line must include "GeoWall 2023 Submittal." Sender will receive confirmation of receipt by e-mail. Any changes or corrections made to the design report after this time will incur a penalty.

5. **National Competition Selection** – Up to twenty teams will be selected for the National Finals GeoWall competition based upon scores earned on the design reports.

Teams selected for National Finals must complete Appendices F and G and submit copies to Dr. Ajmera at the email address in section 4.

- 6. **Sandbox** The MSE wall is to be constructed within an apparatus hereafter referred to as a sandbox. Each team shall bring their own sandbox to the competition. Painting and the addition of school or sponsor logos and other decorations to the exterior of the sandbox is highly encouraged. The sandbox shall be made up of a bottom and four vertical sides with no top. The front panel and part of the two side panels are removable as shown in Figure 2. The removable box panels will be in place during wall construction and removed after construction to expose the MSE wall. The sandbox will also include two PVC piles as shown in Figures 2 through 4. The sandbox shall meet the following requirements:
  - a) Have exterior walls and base constructed of any grade of plywood not to exceed ¾ inch (19 mm) thick.
  - b) Have planar inside surfaces with the natural smooth plywood finish.
  - c) Have removable front and side panels as shown in Figure 2. Panels must be flush with the base of the box and held in place with threaded inserts, screws, hinges or other easily removable fasteners.
  - d) Have a full-sized base such that it extends no more than ¾ inch (19 mm) beyond the base of the wall once the front and side panels have been removed.
  - e) Include a steel tie rod designed to keep the two fixed sides of the box parallel after removal of the facing panel.
  - f) Include circular guides to ensure bases of the PVC piles are held in the correct location. A temporary template may be used to control alignment at the top of the piles.
  - g) Any templates used must be removed after wall construction and before testing.
  - h) All dimensions of the sandbox shall be as shown in Figures 2 and 3.

For convenience, sandboxes may be designed so that they can transported as flat pieces and reassembled at the competition site.






Figure 2: Sandbox dimensions (not to scale)





Figure 3: Load Placement (not to scale)



Guide rod Hardwood impact pad %" Steel L
%" bolts & nuts as needed 4" Eye hooks to hold bucket handle 4.4" EMT (thin wall electrical conduit)

Front View
Figure 4: Dimensions of Horizontal Load Frame (not to scale)

Sandboxes and PVC piles will be checked for compliance at the pre-competition captain's meeting. Teams will have until 8:45 am local time the day of the competition to correct any compliance issues. Any team with a sandbox and/or PVC piles out of compliance at the start of the competition will be penalized.

Rev 01: October 12, 2022

- 7. **Piles** Two vertical piles will be used to apply the horizontal load to the backfill behind the wall. Each team will provide their own piles. Piles will be fabricated out of 1½ inch Schedule 40 PVC pipe. Please see Figure 2 for the pile locations and length requirements.
- 8. **Backfill Material** The backfill material will be sand provided by competition organizers on site. The sand will be a clean, dry, rounded to subrounded sand with grain size as specified in Table 1 and Figure 5. The backfill material must be used as-is; no water, additives, or chemical stabilizers may be placed in the backfill material.

Competition organizers will make reasonable efforts to ensure the competition backfill materials meet the specifications in Table 1 and Figure 5. Teams will be allowed to examine a sample of the competition backfill at the captain's meeting. No backfill samples may be removed from the meeting room. Teams may modify their wall design at this time if they desire. See section 12 below.

TC 11 1 D		1	1' '1' '	C TT 7 11	
Table 1: Represent	tative anticinated	1 0r91n_017A	dietribution to	· ( teo W/ all	competition cand
Table 1. Replesell	tan ve aminerpatet	a grann-size	distribution for	. Occo w an	compenion sand.

Typical	Distribution	Lowe	r Bound	Upper Bound	
Size (mm)	% Passing	Size (mm)	% Passing	Size (mm)	% Passing
2.00	100.0	1.30	100.0	2.50	100.0
1.70	96.8	1.20	96.9	2.30	96.9
1.18	41.8	1.15	93.7	2.10	93.7
1.00	15.8	0.80	38.7	1.60	38.7
0.85	3.3	0.60	12.7	1.30	12.7
		0.50	2.0	1.10	2.0

- 9. **Wall Materials** Materials will be provided by competition organizers on site. See Appendix B for detailed specifications
  - a) Facing Two pieces of poster board must be joined with a lap splice. See Figure 6 for dimensions.
  - b) Reinforcement 60 lb kraft paper. Quantity of reinforcement will be measured by mass to the nearest 0.01g. There are no restrictions on the shape or geometry of reinforcing elements, but all reinforcement must be cut from a single sheet 24" × 24" kraft paper.
  - c) Reinforcement Attachment to Facing Heavy-duty polypropylene packaging tape that is 2" wide.

Competition organizers will make reasonable efforts to ensure the wall materials meet the specifications in Appendix B. Teams will be allowed to examine small samples of the reinforcing material at the captain' meeting. No reinforcing material samples may be removed from the meeting room. Teams may modify their wall design at this time if they desire. See section 12 below.




Figure 5: Estimated grain size distribution of backfill sand




Figure 6: Dimensions of the poster board wall facing (not to scale)

- 10. **Construction Tools** The following construction tools may be used and must be provided by the competing team (quantities of these items shall not be restricted):
  - a) Pencils, pens and markers
  - b) Rulers and straight edges
  - c) Levels
  - d) Manually operated cutting instruments (e.g., scissors, utility knifes, safety razor blades, hole punch)

Rev 01: October 12, 2022

- e) Cutting boards or mats
- f) Design notes, calculations, and drawings
- g) Material handling and compaction tools consisting of any hand operated devices
- h) Screwdrivers (battery operated drills or screwdrivers may be used, but only to remove fasteners when removing the facing panels)
- i) Temporary templates for use in any stage of competition. These templates may be made of any material, must not have any moving parts, and must be removed at the end of the any stage in which they are used.

Buckets and a shovel will be provided by the competition organizers. It may be necessary for teams to haul backfill a distance up to 20 feet.

- 11. **Execution** Construction and testing of the wall will be done in the following stages:
  - a) **Reinforcement Fabrication Stage** Each team will be provided with a single sheet of 60 lb kraft paper approximately 24 in × 24 in. The team must fabricate all their reinforcing elements from this sheet using authorized construction tools. Fifteen (15) minutes will be allocated for this stage. Teams will be penalized for time exceeding the time limit. After all reinforcing element are fabricated, excess material will be disposed of and the judges will weigh the reinforcing elements to the nearest 0.01g.
  - b) Wall Assembly Stage After each team's reinforcing elements have been fabricated and weighed, the team will be provided with two sheets of poster-board (22 in × 28 in) and a roll of packing tape. The team must assemble their wall using these materials and authorized construction tools. Dimensions for the wall facing are shown in Figure 6.
    - i) Tape may be used for only two purposes: 1) to join the two poster-board sheets along the lap slice (Figure 6) to form the wall facing and 2) to attach reinforcement to wall facing. The poster-board sheets must be joined using a single lap splice on each side not exceeding 1" to form the wall facing. A single continuous strip of tape may be used on each side of the poster-board to join the poster-board sheets. The tape must be in contact with only the two poster-board sheets. No other adhesives may be used to join the poster-boards.
    - ii) Tape used to attach reinforcement to the wall facing must be used in individual pieces no larger than 2 in × 2 in. The adhesive side of each piece of tape must be in contact with both the wall facing and a reinforcing element. Tape pieces may not overlap one another, although they may overlap the tape forming the poster-board lap splice. All tape pieces must be placed on the vertical planes forming the wall facing. No tape piece may be applied to more than one vertical plane simultaneously.
    - iii) Tape may not be used for any other purpose, including but not limited to: sealing corners of facing material, joining two or more reinforcing elements, anchoring facing material or reinforcement to the box. This is the only stage in which the team is allowed to use tape.

The wall should be trial-fitted to the sandbox during this stage. Any portion of the wall that rises above an imaginary line that is 3/16 in below the top of the sandbox must be trimmed off. The assembly stage is complete when the facing material is properly folded and trimmed, all the reinforcing elements are attached to the facing, and the wall is placed in the sandbox. No sand is added to the box in this stage. Fifteen (15) minutes will be allocated for this stage. Teams will be penalized for time exceeding the time limit. Judges will check to ensure the wall is properly assembled.

Rev 01: October 12, 2022

c) Construction Stage – After the wall is assembled and checked by the judges, the judges will instruct the team to start construction. During this stage, the team fills the box with sand so that the sand fill line (see Figure 2) is covered and the backfill is level, and places the empty rectangular vertical surcharge bucket on top of the sand. The facing material must be in direct contact with the inside of the sandbox at all times during this stage. The tie rod may be removed from the box at the start of this stage, but it must be in place before any sand is placed in the box. Temporary templates or guides may be used during this stage so long as they are removed before the end of the stage.

The construction stage is complete when the wall is in place, the sand backfill covers the sand fill line and is level, any temporary templates or guides have been removed, and the empty vertical surcharge loading bucket is in place. Twenty (20) minutes will be allotted for this stage. Teams will be penalized for time exceeding the time limit. At the end of this stage, judges will check fill placement and the placement of the empty vertical surcharge load bucket to ensure they meet requirements.

- d) **Loading Stage** Details of the load placement are shown in Figure 3. This stage occurs in three steps: 1) removal of front and side panels, 2) placement of 50 lb vertical surcharge, and 3) placement of the 20 lb static horizontal surcharge load in an empty 5 gallon bucket on the loading frame followed by a single application of the dynamic horizontal load. During each step, the wall will be checked for the following three criteria: 1) excessive deformation (any portion of the wall extending outside imaginary planes extending vertically from the base of sandbox), 2) excessive soil leakage (more than 30 cm<sup>3</sup> of sand passing out of the sandbox), and 3) catastrophic failure. The team will be penalized for excessive soil loss and excessive deformation, but will be disqualified for a catastrophic failure.
  - i) When directed by the judge, the team shall remove the front and side panels of the sandbox. After the panels are removed, the judge will wait one (1) minute and then check the three criteria.
  - ii) If the wall does not fail catastrophically, the team will then place 50 lbs of sand in the vertical surcharge loading platform (see Appendix B for platform details). The team will have one (1) minute to place the load. After the load is placed, the judge will wait one (1) minute and then check the three criteria.
  - iii) If the wall does not fail catastrophically, the team will place the 5 lb drop weight on top of the load frame, hang an empty 5 gallon bucket on the loading frame, place 20 lbs of sand in the bucket (see Figure 3), and then trip the drop weight for a single application of the 5 lb weight falling 10 in and impacting the top of the loading arm (see Figure 4). The team will have one (1) minute to complete this loading sequence. After the sequence is complete, the judge will wait one (1) minute and then check the three criteria. The horizontal load frame with vertical drop weight will be provided by the competition organizers. Teams should not bring their own load frames to the competition.

$$if |m_{D} - m_{A}| \le 0.25 \qquad M = m_{A}$$

$$if |m_{D} - m_{A}| > 0.25 \qquad M = \max \begin{bmatrix} (m_{D} - 0.25) - \frac{(m_{D} - m_{A} - 0.25)}{2} \\ m_{A} + \frac{(m_{A} - m_{D} - 0.25)}{2} \end{bmatrix}$$
(1)

Rev 01: October 12, 2022

Where,

 $m_D$  = reinforcing mass (g) reported in design report;

 $m_A$  = reinforcing mass (g) used during competition; and

M = adjusted mass (g) rounded to two decimal places

13. **Scoring** – After completion of the loading stage, the score for each team will be computed using the following formula:

$$Score = R + 15(20 - M) - 10N_{min} - 40N_{maj} - 2T - 20D$$
(2)

Where,

R = report score out of 60 points

M = adjusted mass of the reinforcement material in grams from Equation 1

 $N_{min}$  = number of minor rules violations

 $N_{maj}$  = number of major rules violations

T =total number of minutes over time limit for all phases rounded up to the nearest minute in each phase

D= deflection rating

8 if wall fails deflection criteria during initial loading without surcharge

6 if wall fails deflection criteria during vertical surcharge loading

4 if wall fails deflection criteria during horizontal surcharge loading

0 if wall passes deflection criteria for all loading phases

If the wall fails catastrophically during any loading stage, the team will be disqualified.

#### a) Minor Penalties

- i) Box dimension out of spec
- ii) Pile location out of spec
- iii) Minor safety mishaps
- iv) Any addendum to the design report required by judges which simply clarifies content but does not change the design
- v) Any other rule violation that in the opinion of the judges that has the potential to provide the team with a measurable, but minor advantage

#### b) Major Penalties

- i) Soil leakage greater than 30 cm<sup>3</sup> (volume of standard 1 oz plastic medicine cup)
- ii) Improper use of adhesive tape
- iii) Major safety mishaps include any mishap that results in bleeding
- iv) Any addendum to the design report required by judges which results in a significant change to the design

v) Any other rule violation that in the opinion of the judges has the potential to provide the team with a significant advantage, but does not warrant disqualification

Rev 01: October 12, 2022

- c) **Disqualification** Teams may be disqualified for the following:
  - i) Failure to send a representative to the pre-competition captains' meeting
  - ii) Unsafe practices
  - iii) Design or construction techniques which violate the spirit of the competition and provide a large and unfair advantage
  - iv) Catastrophic wall failure at any point during the loading
  - v) Any other rule violation that in the opinion of the judges has the potential to provide the team with a significant advantage and warrants disqualification

Scores will be recorded to the nearest tenth of a point. In the event of a tie, the following criteria will be used, in order, to break the tie: 1) lowest actual reinforcement mass, 2) higher report score, 3) lowest deflection rating, and 4) judges' consensus of best-decorated sandbox.

The judges will follow the rules as published using reasonable judgment and interpretation. The head judge will be the arbiter of any disputes, which are to be brought forth solely by the Team Captain. Decisions of the head judge are final. Results posted at the competition are not subject to review after the competition.

**Scoring Example**: Assume a team constructs a wall with following characteristics

- Report Score: 48/60, R = 48

Design report specifics 8.57 g of reinforcement. Reinforced used is 8.25 g. From Equation 1,
$$M = \max \begin{cases} (8.57 - 0.25) - \frac{8.57 - 8.25 - 0.25}{2} = 8.29g \\ 8.25 + \frac{8.25 - 8.57 - 0.25}{2} = 7.97 g \end{cases} = 8.29 g$$

- Minor deduction for tape overlapping on wall, A
- Execution times were
  - o Reinforcement fabrication: 15:18 (18 sec over allotted time, round up to 1 min)
  - Wall assembly: 16:05 (1:05 over allotted time, round up to 2 min)
  - o Construction: 18:27 min (under allotted time)
  - Total time over: 1+2=3 min, T=3Note: Only times over limit during each stage are counted. Teams get no benefit for times under the limit of any individual stage.
- Wall passed deflection tests during initial loading without surcharge and vertical surcharge loading phases, but failed deflection test during the horizontal surcharge loading phase, D = 4Using Equation 2, the final score would be

$$Score = 48 + 15(20 - 8.29) - 10(1) - 40(0) - 2(3) - 20(4) = 127.7$$

See Appendix D for scoring checklists.

14. Pre-Competition Team Captains' Meeting – A team captains' meeting will be held prior to the competition for the purposes of: checking sandboxes and PVC piles for compliance, examining construction tools and any temporary templates, establishing competition order, gathering team biographical information, and disseminating any logistical or administrative information. This is a MANDATORY meeting. Each team must have the team captain (or designee) present. All team members are encouraged to attend. Specific meeting time and location will be announced on the GeoWall website before the conference. Teams without a representative at the captains' meeting will be disqualified.

Rev 01: October 12, 2022

Teams should bring their sandboxes, PVC piles, and any hardware, tools or templates needed for assembly during the competition. Sandboxes and piles should be assembled and will be checked for compliance at the meeting. Teams will have until 8:45 am local time of the day of the competition to correct any compliance issues identified during the captains' meeting. Any sandboxes or piles found out of compliance at the captains' meeting will be rechecked at this time.

Teams shall complete Appendices F and G and bring copies to the captains' meeting. The information on these forms will be used by the emcee during the competition.

#### **Appendices**

Rev 01: October 12, 2022

## **Appendix A: Reimbursements**

#### This form is to be submitted with your design report.

This year, any monies due to competitors will be paid to a representative of your university. Examples of valid representatives are your faculty advisor or your departmental accounting administrative assistant. Unacceptable representatives include students, parents, friends, etc.

Please provide complete contact information for this representative.

School	
Name of Representative	
Position at Institution	
Name on Check (Check Made Out To:)	
Complete Mailing Address	
Phone	
Email Address	

#### **Appendix B: Material Specifications**

#### • Sand:

o Clean sand with grain size distribution as specified in Table 1 and Figure 5

Rev 01: October 12, 2022

o Grain shape will be rounded to sub-rounded

#### • Sandbox Material:

- o Walls and Base: 23/32 or 3/4 inch plywood, any grade
- o Pile Guide: any wood material ¼ inch thick or less
- o Tie Rod: 1/4 inch threaded steel rod with washers and nuts as needed
- o Fasteners: any suitable wood fasteners

#### • Pile Material:

- o 1-½ inch Schedule 40 PVC pipe
- **Horizontal Load Frame Materials**: These are recommended materials. Teams may fabricate their load frames out of any materials so long as they have the correct moment arm as shown in Figures 3 and 4. The load frames provided by organizers for the competition will use the following materials and meet the dimensions shown in Figure 4.
  - o 1-\(^4\) inch steel EMT conduit (thin wall electrical conduit)
  - o ¾ inch steel L
  - o ¼ inch bolts
  - o ¼ inch eye hooks

#### • Facing Material:

- o Poster Board, 22 inch x 28 inch, White
- o Grammage: 194 g/m<sup>2</sup>, 0.125 g/in<sup>2</sup>
- o Office Depot® Item # 858277 (Pack Of 10)

#### • Reinforcing Material:

- o 60 lb Kraft Paper
- o Grammage: 97.7 g/m<sup>2</sup>, 0.063 g/in<sup>2</sup>
- o Office Depot® Postal Wrap Item # 444835 (2 ft x 50 ft roll)

#### • Adhesive Material:

- o Heavy duty, clear, 2 inch wide, polypropylene package tape
- o Scotch® 142-B Super Strength Mailing Tape, clear
- o Office Depot® Item #650457, 2 inch x 22.2 yd with dispenser

#### • Rectangular Vertical Surcharge Bucket/Platform:

- o Sterillite TouchTop Waste Bucket, 7.5 gal
- o Walmart SKU# 073149104380

#### • Horizontal Surcharge Bucket:

- o 5 gallon Home Depot Bucket
- o Home Depot Internet SKU #100087613

### **Appendix C: Design Report Judging Rubric**

#### Geo-Institute of the ASCE: GeoWall Design Paper – Scoring Form

Rev 01: October 12, 2022

**Reviewer Guidelines:** 1) Place weight on the team ability for engineering reasoning not technical knowledge; 2) Place weight on team communication skills on procedures, findings and observations; 3) Score in 0.5-point increments; and 4) Team to be awarded higher score if design parameters were verified beyond assumptions and references. Max = maximum number of points; Act = points awarded.

the message.  c. Grammar and punctuation are correct 2 Error free paper with writing that clearly presents design.  d. Figures & tables are clear, properly numbered, captioned and referenced in the text e. References are reasonably formatted and complete 1 Quantity appropriate with correct citations and references f. Reimbursement appendix (Appendix A) and safety appendix (Appendix E) complete with reasonable controls 2 Experimental Methods, Analyses and Design a. Methods to obtain soil properties 3 Experimental methods are reasonable and clearly described b. Methods to determine reinforcement properties 3 Experimental methods are reasonable and clearly described c. Methods to determine backfill-reinforcement interaction 3 Experimental methods are reasonable and clearly described c. Methods to determine backfill-reinforcement interaction 3 Experimental methods are reasonable and clearly described c. Methods to determine backfill-reinforcement interaction 3 Experimental methods are reasonable and clearly described c. Methods to determine backfill only) 3 Experimental methods are reasonable and clearly described c. Earth-pressure calculations (backfill only) 3 Experimental methods are reasonable and clearly described 4 Experimental methods are reasonable and clearly described 5 Experimental methods are reasonable and clearly described 6 Experimental methods are reasonable and clearly described 6 Experimental methods are reasonable and clearly described 7 Experimental methods are reasonable and clearly described 8 Experimental methods are reasonable and clearly described 9 Experimental methods are reasonable and clearly described and clearly d	points awarded.	1	1	
a. Paper length, margins & font are acceptable b. Layout, or structure, of paper is logical c. Grammar and punctuation are correct d. Figures & tables are clear, properly numbered, captioned and referenced in the text e. Referenced in the text e. References are reasonably formatted and complete f. Reimbursement appendix (Appendix A) and safety appendix (Appendix E) complete with reasonable controls  2 Experimental Methods, Analyses and Design a. Methods to obtain soil properties b. Methods to determine reinforcement properties c. Methods to determine backfill-reinforcement interaction d. Engineering properties are reasonable d. Model and assumptions are reasonable d. Determination of reinforcement spacing d. Method and assumptions are reasonable d. Determination of reinforcement spacing d. Method and assumptions are reasonable d. Determination of re		Max	Act	Notes
b. Layout, or structure, of paper is logical  c. Grammar and punctuation are correct  d. Figures & tables are clear, properly numbered, captioned and referenced in the text  e. References are reasonably formatted and complete  f. Reimbursement appendix (Appendix A) and safety appendix (Appendix E) complete with reasonable controls  2 Experimental Methods, Analyses and Design  a. Methods to obtain soil properties  b. Methods to determine reinforcement properties  c. Methods to determine backfill-reinforcement interaction  d. Engineering properties are reasonable  e. Earth-pressure calculations (backfill only)  f. Vertical surcharge load included in the design  g. Method used to account for eccentrically applied loads  p. Method used to account for 3-D wall geometry  j. Determination of reinforcement length  k. Determination of reinforcement spendig mich addressed in report is, on the whole, clear, precise, and well-reasoned. Engineering Reasoning and Communication  The report is, on the whole, clear, precise, and well-reasoned. Engineering Reasoning and Eognement and problem-solving skills.  2 Paper organization is clear and support the message. Error free paper with writing that clearly reserved in report is, on the whole, clear, precise, and well-reasoned. Engineering Rems and distinctions are reasonable and clearly described experimental methods are reasonable and clearly described e	1) Formatting, Mechanics, Grammar & Safety			
the message.  c. Grammar and punctuation are correct 2 Error free paper with writing that clearly presents design.  d. Figures & tables are clear, properly numbered, captioned and referenced in the text e. References are reasonably formatted and complete 1 Quantity appropriate with correct citations and references f. Reimbursement appendix (Appendix A) and safety appendix (Appendix E) complete with reasonable controls 2 Experimental Methods, Analyses and Design a. Methods to obtain soil properties 3 Experimental methods are reasonable and clearly described b. Methods to determine reinforcement properties 3 Experimental methods are reasonable and clearly described c. Methods to determine backfill-reinforcement interaction 3 Experimental methods are reasonable and clearly described c. Methods to determine backfill-reinforcement interaction 3 Experimental methods are reasonable and clearly described c. Methods to determine backfill-reinforcement interaction 3 Experimental methods are reasonable and clearly described c. Methods to determine backfill only) 3 Experimental methods are reasonable and clearly described c. Earth-pressure calculations (backfill only) 3 Experimental methods are reasonable and clearly described 4 Experimental methods are reasonable and clearly described 5 Experimental methods are reasonable and clearly described 6 Experimental methods are reasonable and clearly described 6 Experimental methods are reasonable and clearly described 7 Experimental methods are reasonable and clearly described 8 Experimental methods are reasonable and clearly described 9 Experimental methods are reasonable and clearly described and clearly d	a. Paper length, margins & font are acceptable	1		Paper complies with specifications
c. Grammar and punctuation are correct d. Figures & tables are clear, properly numbered, captioned and referenced in the text e. References are reasonably formatted and complete t. References are reasonably formatted and complete t. References are reasonably formatted and complete t. Reimbursement appendix (Appendix A) and safety appendix (Appendix E) complete with reasonable controls t. Reimbursement appendix (Appendix A) and safety appendix (Appendix E) complete with reasonable controls to safe during competition.  2 Experimental Methods, Analyses and Design a. Methods to obtain soil properties 3 Experimental methods are reasonable and clearly described Experimental methods are reasonable and active described and clearly described and clearly described Experimental methods are reasonable and active described and clearly descri	b. Layout, or structure, of paper is logical	2		Paper organization is clear and supports the message.
referenced in the text  e. References are reasonably formatted and complete  f. Reimbursement appendix (Appendix A) and safety appendix (Appendix E) complete with reasonable controls  2. Experimental Methods, Analyses and Design  a. Methods to obtain soil properties  b. Methods to determine reinforcement properties  c. Methods to determine reinforcement interaction  d. Engineering properties are reasonable  d. Engineering properties are reasonable  e. Earth-pressure calculations (backfill only)  f. Vertical surcharge load included in the design  g. Method used to account for eccentrically applied loads  g. Method used to compute pressure applied from laterally loaded piles and impact load addressed in report  i. Method used to account for 3-D wall geometry  j. Determination of reinforcement length k. Determination of reinforcement length k. Determination of reinforcement spacing l. Everiting Reasoning and Communication  The report is, on the whole, clear, precise, and well-reasoned. Engineering Reasoning and Communication  The report is, on the whole, clear, precise, and well-reasoned. Engineering reasoning and problem-solving skills.	c. Grammar and punctuation are correct	2		Error free paper with writing that clearly presents design.
c. Reimbursement appendix (Appendix A) and safety appendix (Appendix F) complete with reasonable controls  2		2		=
1. Kelmoursement appendix (Appendix A) and safety appendix (Appendix E) complete with reasonable controls 2. Experimental Methods, Analyses and Design  a. Methods to obtain soil properties 3. Experimental methods are reasonable and clearly described  b. Methods to determine reinforcement properties 3. Experimental methods are reasonable and clearly described  c. Methods to determine backfill-reinforcement interaction 3. Experimental methods are reasonable and clearly described  c. Methods to determine backfill-reinforcement interaction 3. Experimental methods are reasonable and clearly described  and clearly described  Experimental methods are reasonable and clearly described  and clearly described  Experimental methods are reasonable and clearly described  Experimental methods are reasonable and clearly described  and clearly described  Backfill unit weight, friction angle, reinforcement strength are compared to typical values  interface friction angle, reinforcement strength as compared to typical values  Calculations are correct and presented in a logical, readily followed format  Calculations are correct and presented in a logical, readily followed format  Calculations are correct and presented in a logical, readily followed format  Calculations are correct and presented in a logical, readily followed format  Calculations are correct and presented in a logical, readily followed format  Calculations are correct and presented in a logical, readily followed format  Calculations are correct and presented in a logical, readily followed format  Calculations are correct and presented in a logical, readily followed format  Calculations are correct and presented in a logical, readily followed format  Calculations are correct and presented in a logical, readily followed format  Calculations are correct and presented in a logical, readily followed format  Calculations are correct and presented with a logical preadily followed format  Calculations are correct and presented with a logical preadily followed format  Calcu	e. References are reasonably formatted and complete	1		citations and references
a. Methods to obtain soil properties  b. Methods to determine reinforcement properties  c. Methods to determine backfill-reinforcement interaction  d. Experimental methods are reasonable and clearly described  c. Methods to determine backfill-reinforcement interaction  d. Experimental methods are reasonable and clearly described  Experimental methods are reasonable and effect on reinforcement strength and clearly described  Experimental methods are reasonable and effect on reinforcement strength and clearly described and effect on reinforcement interesonable and effect on reinforcement pullout  Model and assumptions are re		2		and provides viable plans to keep team
a. Methods to obtain soil properties  b. Methods to determine reinforcement properties  c. Methods to determine backfill-reinforcement interaction  d. Engineering properties are reasonable and clearly described  Experimental methods are reasonable and clearly described  Experimental methods are reasonable and clearly described  Backfill unit weight, friction angle, interface friction angle, reinforcement strength are compared to typical values in a logical, readily followed format  f. Vertical surcharge load included in the design  f. Vertical surcharge load included in the design  g. Method used to account for eccentrically applied loads  g. Method used to account for eccentrically applied loads  h. Method used to compute pressure applied from laterally loaded piles and impact load addressed in report  i. Method used to account for 3-D wall geometry  i. Method used to account for 3-D wall geometry  j. Determination of reinforcement length k. Determination of reinforcement spacing l. Evaluation of connection strength 3 Method and assumptions are reasonable and electron reinforcement pullout Method and assumptions are reasonable and electron reinforcement spacing 3 Method and assumptions are reasonable and electron reinforcement spacing 3 Method and assumptions are reasonable and electron reinforcement spacing 5 Determination of reinforcement spacing 6 Scores may range from 0 to 10. It is to opinion of the reviewer as to how the overall report measures up to the criter irrelevant information is presented, key assumptions are identified, and key concepts are clarified. The authors have shown, through their report, excellent engineering reasoning and problem-solving skills.	2) Experimental Methods, Analyses and Design			
and clearly described  Experimental methods are reasonable and clearly described  Experimental methods are reasonable and clearly described  Backfill unit weight, friction angle, reinforcement strength are compared to typical values in terface friction angle, reinforcement strength are compared to typical values in a logical, readily followed format  f. Vertical surcharge load included in the design  f. Vertical surcharge load included in the design  g. Method used to account for eccentrically applied loads  g. Method used to account for eccentrically applied loads  h. Method used to compute pressure applied from laterally loaded piles and impact load addressed in report  i. Method used to account for 3-D wall geometry  4 geometry are reasonable and appropriate  j. Determination of reinforcement length  k. Determination of reinforcement spacing  l. Evaluation of connection strength  3 Method and assumptions are reasonable and appropriate  Scores may range from 0 to 10. It is the opinion of the reviewer as to how the overall report measures up to the criter listed under item 3, "engineering reasoning and communication".	a. Methods to obtain soil properties	3		and clearly described
and clearly described  and clearly described  Backfill unit weight, friction angle, interface friction angle, reinforcement strength are compared to typical values  e. Earth-pressure calculations (backfill only)  f. Vertical surcharge load included in the design  f. Vertical surcharge load included in the design  g. Method used to account for eccentrically applied loads  g. Method used to account for eccentrically applied loads  h. Method used to compute pressure applied from laterally loaded piles and impact load addressed in report  i. Method used to account for 3-D wall geometry  d. Method and assumptions are reasonable considers distribution of lateral load or wall and dynamic pressure created by impact energy  i. Method used to account for 3-D wall geometry  4 geometry are reasonable and appropriate  j. Determination of reinforcement length  k. Determination of reinforcement spacing  1. Evaluation of connection strength  3. Method and assumptions are reasonable and appropriate  Scores may range from 0 to 10. It is the opinion of the reviewer as to how the opinion of the revi	b. Methods to determine reinforcement properties	3		and clearly described
d. Engineering properties are reasonable  e. Earth-pressure calculations (backfill only)  f. Vertical surcharge load included in the design  f. Vertical surcharge load included in the design  g. Method used to account for eccentrically applied loads  h. Method used to compute pressure applied from laterally loaded piles and impact load addressed in report  i. Method used to account for 3-D wall geometry  i. Method used to account for 3-D wall geometry  j. Determination of reinforcement length k. Determination of reinforcement spacing l. Evaluation of connection strength 3) Engineering Reasoning and Communication  The report is, on the whole, clear, precise, and well-reasoned. Engineering terms and distinctions are used effectively and in keeping with established professional usage. The report demonstrates a clear and key concepts are clarified. The authors have shown, through their report, excellent engineering reasoning and problem-solving skills.  i method and assumptions are reasonable and appropriate  j. Determination of reinforcement length should report is on the whole, clear, precise, and well-reasoned. Engineering terms and distinctions are used effectively and in keeping with established professional usage. The report demonstrates a clear and key concepts are clarified. The authors have shown, through their report, excellent engineering reasoning and problem-solving skills.	c. Methods to determine backfill-reinforcement interaction	3		and clearly described
in a logical, readily followed format  f. Vertical surcharge load included in the design  3	d. Engineering properties are reasonable	3		
effect on reinforcement pullout  Model and assumptions are reasonable Considers both lateral loads on the wall and effect on reinforcement pullout  Model and assumptions are reasonable Considers both lateral loads on the wall and effect on reinforcement pullout  Model and assumptions are reasonable Considers distribution of lateral load or wall and effect on reinforcement pullout  Model and assumptions are reasonable Considers distribution of lateral load or wall and dynamic pressure created by impact energy  i. Method used to account for 3-D wall geometry  j. Determination of reinforcement length  k. Determination of reinforcement spacing  J. Evaluation of connection strength  J. Evaluation of the whole, clear, precise, and well-reasoned.  Engineering Reasoning and Communication  The report is, on the whole, clear, precise, and well-reasoned.  Engineering terms and distinctions are used effectively and in keeping with established professional usage. The report demonstrates a clear and precise analysis of the MSE wall design problem, very little or no irrelevant information is presented, key assumptions are identified, and key concepts are clarified. The authors have shown, through their report, excellent engineering reasoning and problem-solving skills.	e. Earth-pressure calculations (backfill only)	3		•
g. Method used to account for eccentrically applied loads  h. Method used to compute pressure applied from laterally loaded piles and impact load addressed in report  i. Method used to account for 3-D wall geometry  i. Method used to account for 3-D wall geometry  i. Method used to account for 3-D wall geometry  i. Determination of reinforcement length  k. Determination of reinforcement spacing  l. Evaluation of connection strength  3) Engineering Reasoning and Communication  The report is, on the whole, clear, precise, and well-reasoned. Engineering terms and distinctions are used effectively and in keeping with established professional usage. The report demonstrates a clear and precise analysis of the MSE wall design problem, very little or no irrelevant information is presented, key assumptions are identified, and key concepts are clarified. The authors have shown, through their report, excellent engineering reasoning and problem-solving skills.  Considers both lateral loads on the wall and effect on reinforcement pullout  Model and assumptions are reasonable Considers distribution of lateral loads on wall and effect on reinforcement pullout  Model and assumptions are reasonable Considers distribution of lateral load or wall and dynamic pressure created by impact energy  Method and assumptions for 3-D geometry are reasonable and appropriate  3 Method and assumptions are reasonable and appropriate  5 Method and assumptions are reasonable and appropriate  5 Scores may range from 0 to 10. It is the opinion of the reviewer as to how the overall report measures up to the criter listed under item 3, "engineering reasoning and communication".	f. Vertical surcharge load included in the design	3		
h. Method used to compute pressure applied from laterally loaded piles and impact load addressed in report  i. Method used to account for 3-D wall geometry  i. Method used to account for 3-D wall geometry  i. Determination of reinforcement length  k. Determination of reinforcement spacing  l. Evaluation of connection strength  3	g. Method used to account for eccentrically applied loads	3		Considers both lateral loads on the wall
i. Method used to account for 3-D wall geometry  4 geometry are reasonable and appropriate  j. Determination of reinforcement length k. Determination of reinforcement spacing l. Evaluation of connection strength 3 Method and assumptions are reasonable and appropriate  3 Method and assumptions are reasonable and appropriate  3 Method and assumptions are reasonable and appropriate  4 Method and assumptions are reasonable and appropriate  5 Method and assumptions are reasonable and appropriate  6 Method and assumptions are reasonable and appropriate  7 Method and assumptions are reasonable and appropriate  8 Method and assumptions are reasonable and appropriate  9 Method and assumptions are reasonable and appropriate  10 Scores may range from 0 to 10. It is the opinion of the reviewer as to how the overall report measures up to the criter listed under item 3, "engineering reasoning and communication".  10 It is the opinion of the reviewer as to how		6		
k. Determination of reinforcement spacing l. Evaluation of connection strength 3	i. Method used to account for 3-D wall geometry	4		Method and assumptions for 3-D geometry are reasonable and
k. Determination of reinforcement spacing l. Evaluation of connection strength 3	j. Determination of reinforcement length	3		Method and assumptions are reasonable
3) Engineering Reasoning and Communication  The report is, on the whole, clear, precise, and well-reasoned.  Engineering terms and distinctions are used effectively and in keeping with established professional usage. The report demonstrates a clear and precise analysis of the MSE wall design problem, very little or no irrelevant information is presented, key assumptions are identified, and key concepts are clarified. The authors have shown, through their report, excellent engineering reasoning and problem-solving skills.  Scores may range from 0 to 10. It is the opinion of the reviewer as to how the overall report measures up to the criter listed under item 3, "engineering reasoning and communication".		3		Method and assumptions are reasonable
The report is, on the whole, clear, precise, and well-reasoned.  Engineering terms and distinctions are used effectively and in keeping with established professional usage. The report demonstrates a clear and precise analysis of the MSE wall design problem, very little or no irrelevant information is presented, key assumptions are identified, and key concepts are clarified. The authors have shown, through their report, excellent engineering reasoning and problem-solving skills.  Scores may range from 0 to 10. It is the opinion of the reviewer as to how the overall report measures up to the criter listed under item 3, "engineering reasoning and communication".	I. Evaluation of connection strength	3		Method and assumptions are reasonable
Engineering terms and distinctions are used effectively and in keeping with established professional usage. The report demonstrates a clear and precise analysis of the MSE wall design problem, very little or no irrelevant information is presented, key assumptions are identified, and key concepts are clarified. The authors have shown, through their report, excellent engineering reasoning and problem-solving skills.  Scores may range from 0 to 10. It is the opinion of the reviewer as to how the overall report measures up to the criter listed under item 3, "engineering reasoning and communication".				
	Engineering terms and distinctions are used effectively and in keeping with established professional usage. The report demonstrates a clear and precise analysis of the MSE wall design problem, very little or no irrelevant information is presented, key assumptions are identified, and key concepts are clarified. The authors have shown, through their	10		Scores may range from 0 to 10. It is the opinion of the reviewer as to how the overall report measures up to the criteria listed under item 3, "engineering reasoning and communication".
10001   00   1	Total	60		

## Appendix D: Judges' Scoring Checklist for GeoWall Competition D1: Captains' meeting—Box check

Rev 01: October 12, 2022

Team School:	Team School:		ctions
Item	Instruction	Minor	Major
Plywood	☐ 23/32 or ¾-inch thickness		
	☐ Inside surfaces planar and natural		
Box dimensions	☐ Within tolerance		
	☐ Sand fill height marked		
Facing panels	☐ Flush to box base		
	☐ Removable fasteners		
	☐ Base extends to outside of vertical		
	facing panels		
Tie rod	☐ ¼-inch diameter		
	☐ Located within tolerances		
Piles	☐ 1-½-inch Sch. 40 PVC		
	<ul><li>Length in tolerance</li></ul>		
	□ Base guides ≤ ¼-inch thick		
	☐ Locations in tolerance		
	☐ Upper pile template easily removable		
Tools	<ul> <li>Only authorized tools used</li> </ul>		
Other minor, explain:			
Other major, explain:			
Disqualification, explain:			
	Total deductions		

#### **D2:** Reinforcement fabrication

Item	Instruction	Ti	me
			> 15:00
		Total	(min:sec )
Time	Give start command. Time ends when all		
	elements cut to size and shape		
		Mas	ss (g)
		Design	Actual
Mass	Weigh reinforcement to nearest 0.01 g		
Compute official adju	usted Mass, M, using Equation 2	M =	
		Dedu	ctions
Deductions		Minor	Major
Tools	☐ Only authorized tools used		
Safety	☐ No mishaps		
Other, explain			
	Total deductions		

Rev 01: October 12, 2022

Notes:

## **D4:** Wall Assembly

Item	Instruction	Tiı	me
			> 15:00
		Total	(min:sec )
Time	Give start command. Time ends when soil		
	filled to line and empty loading platform is		
	in place		
		Dedu	ctions
		Minor	Major
Backfill	□ Level		
	☐ Filled to fill line		
Tools	☐ Only authorized tools used		
Safety	☐ No mishaps		
	Total deductions		

## **D3:** Construction

Item	Instruction	Ti	me
			> 25:00
		Total	(min:sec )
Time	Give start command. Time ends when soil		
	filled to line and empty bucket is in place		
		Dedu	ıctions
		Minor	Major
Backfill	□ Level		
	☐ Filled to fill line		
Tools	☐ Only authorized tools used		
Safety	☐ No mishaps		
	Total deductions		

Rev 01: October 12, 2022

## D4: Loading

Team School:				
Item	Instruction	Scoring Gui	delines	
Stage 1: Backfill Only	<ul> <li>Place clean poster board on floor in front of box</li> <li>At judge's direction, students remove front panel for drills/screwdrivers may be used to remove fastener</li> <li>Once panels are completely removed, start 1 min w</li> <li>At end of 1 min, make following checks:</li> </ul>	rs.	ctric	
	<ul> <li>Swipe front wall front and sides with straight edge to check wall deflection</li> <li>Less than 30 cm<sup>3</sup> sand leaked from box onto floor</li> <li>Catastrophic failure</li> </ul>	□ Pass □ Pass □ Pass	☐ Fail D = 8 ☐ Fail Major Ded. ☐ Fail ☐ Disqualified	
Stage 2: Vertical Surcharge	At judge's direction, students add 50 lbs of sand to surcharge bucket. Students have			
	☐ Loading complete within 1 minute	□ Yes	☐ No Minor Ded.	
	<ul> <li>Swipe wall front with straight edge to check wall deflection</li> </ul>	□ Pass	☐ Fail <i>D</i> = 6	
	☐ Less than 30 cm³ sand leaked from box onto floor	□ Pass	☐ Fail Major Ded.	
	☐ Catastrophic failure	□ Pass	☐ Fail Disqualified	
Stage 3: Horizontal Load	,			
	☐ Loading complete within 1 minute	□ Yes	☐ No Minor Ded.	
	<ul> <li>Swipe wall front with straight edge to check wall deflection</li> </ul>	□ Pass	☐ Fail <i>D=4</i>	
	☐ Less than 30 cm³ sand leaked from box onto floor	□ Pass	☐ Fail Major Ded.	
	☐ Catastrophic failure	□ Pass	☐ Fail ☐ Disqualified	

Rev 01: October 12, 2022

### **D5: Scoring**

Adjusted mass, M, computed by

$$|m_D - m_A| \le 0.25$$

$$|m_D - m_A| > 0.25$$

$$|m_D - m_A| > 0.25$$

$$|m_D - m_A| > 0.25$$

$$|m_A - m_D - m_A| = max$$

$$|m_A - m_D - m_A| = max$$

$$|m_A - m_D - m_A| = max$$

$$Score = R + 15(20 - M) - 10N_{min} - 40N_{maj} - 2T - 20D$$

Rev 01: October 12, 2022

Team School:			
Item	Score	Weight	Extended
Report score out of 60, R		1	
Reinforcement mass score, enter as (60 – M)		15	
Total # of minor deductions, N <sub>min</sub>		-10	
Total # of major deductions, N <sub>maj</sub>		-40	
Total time over limit rounded up to nearest whole minute, T		-2	
Deflection rating, D			
8 = Deflection exceeded at Stage 1			
6 = Deflection exceeded at Stage 2		-20	
4 = Deflection exceeded at Stage 3			
0 = Deflection never exceeded			
Catastrophic failure any stage disqualifies the team	DQ	Stage #	
		Final	
		Score	

#### **Appendix E: Safety Appendix**

This section is intended for each team to consider the competition steps and manage safety risk. Use additional rows as necessary.

Rev 01: October 12, 2022

Title	Work Task	Hazards	Controls

- 1) Safety mishaps that result in bleeding will be classified as "major."
- 2) Proper personal protective equipment (PPE; such as, masks, safety googles, closed toed shoes, gloves, etc.) should be identified and used during the competition. Failing to use PPE will result in major and/or minor penalties based on judges' discretion.

## Appendix F: Bio-form to be completed by the <u>team captain</u> and submitted to the head judge at the pre-competition meeting

Rev 01: October 12, 2022

Geo-Institute of ASCE Geo-Congress 2023
GeoWall Competition Bios
Team School:
Team Mascot:
No. of Years Competing at Nationals:
Team Advisor:
Team Captain:
Current Year in School (junior, senior, MS, or PhD):
Hometown (City and State or Country)
Other School Activities:
Interests/Hobbies:
Future Plans, e.g., graduate school, consulting, government, other?
Geographical preferences?

## Appendix G: Bio-form to be completed by each <u>team member</u> and submitted to the head judge at the pre-competition meeting

Rev 01: October 12, 2022

Geo-Institute of ASCE Geo-Congress 2023
GeoWall Competition Bios
Team School:
Team Mascot:
No. of Years Competing at Nationals:
Team Advisor:
Team Member:
Current Year in School (junior, senior, MS, or PhD):
Hometown (City and State or Country)
Other School Activities:
Interests/Hobbies:
Future Plans, e.g., graduate school, consulting, government, other?
Geographical preferences?