Glass fibre reinforced polymer (GFRP) has been used in many applications in engineering and civil engineering. These materials were first developed and used in the 1930s in the USA in boats and in aeronautical fields. Glass fibre reinforced polymer (GFRP) bars have high strengths, are light in weight, flexible and can be produced more cheaply than carbon fibre. They are also more durable than steel, as they do not corrode. Figure 1 shows a construction worker carrying GFRP soil nails for the MTR Shatin Central Link in Hong Kong. FRP has been used in mining and tunnelling for many years and is now being used in soil nails and tieback ground anchor applications due to the durability concerns associated with conventional steel reinforcement.

No guidelines could be found that assist the designer of soil-nailed retaining structures in the use of FRP bars. This article therefore aims to combine various sources and provide guidance on the design of lateral support systems using FRP bars as soil nails or ground anchors.

**CURRENT PRACTICE IN THE DESIGN OF SOIL-NAILED WALLS AND ANCHORED RETAINING STRUCTURES**

Current practice in southern Africa for soil-nailed or multi-anchored embedded retaining walls includes the use of either high-yield threadbar, self-drilling anchors (SDA) or multiwire high-tensile steel strands. These elements, when used in a permanent scenario, require significant corrosion prevention measures. Often high-yield threadbar and SDAs are designed using a sacrificial corrosion thickness allowance. This is highly questionable over the couplers applied to SDAs and when read in conjunction with international codes of practice.

The performance of a steel soil nail is normally assessed by evaluating its unidirectional tensile capacity, and simple empirical calculation methods (wedge analysis or triangular resultant earth pressure).
Although these elements also experience shear forces and bending moments where they intersect with the shear plane, these checks are generally disregarded, as it is considered that steel reinforcement in combination with grout is much stronger than the shear force and bending moment requirements. These structural forces can, however, be assessed by using geotechnical finite element packages.

Glass fibre reinforced polymer (GFRP) and carbon fibre reinforced polymer (CFRP) are durable elements but come with other complications, such as long-term creep (similar to geosynthetic materials), susceptibility to alkali attack, temperature variations and ultraviolet light exposure, and reduced shear capacity. Fibre-reinforced bars are anisotropic in nature and are manufactured by a pultrusion process embedded in either a polyester, vinylester or epoxy resin matrix, and therefore have a high tensile strength in the longitudinal direction. These resins are designed to transfer load between the fibres that provide the required strength. CIRIA (2005) states that polyester resin provides good mechanical resistance and electrical properties with reasonable chemical resistance. Epoxy resin provides better resistance to alkalis and solvents with slightly less weathering resistance. Vinylester together with electrical and chemical resistant (ECR) glass is often the chosen resin and fibre combination due to its ability to resist degradation. One of the main concerns about the performance of FRP is the potential to degrade in the long term in the high-pH environment of the grout body itself. Steel, in comparison, is isotropic in nature. The shear and bond capacity and the thread of bars can be controlled by the addition of FRP fibres wrapped at 45° to the longitudinal direction (Cheng et al. 2009), as shown in Figure 2. GFRP is more economical than CFRP (twice the price of conventional strand anchors) and will typically be the preferred option from a cost perspective, despite CFRP having superior stiffness and creep performance properties. In active application (stressed ground anchors), however, CFRP is the preferred choice, as will be discussed under Mechanical Behaviour later in this article.

**MECHANICAL BEHAVIOUR**

Figure 4 shows the stress-strain behaviour of various FRPs compared with steel. It can be seen that FRPs are generally much stronger, with a higher ultimate strength for bars of the same diameter when compared with conventional steel reinforcement.

CFRP exhibits slightly lower elastic moduli (66–100%) compared with steel, while GFRP exhibits much lower elastic moduli when compared with steel (20–25% of steel). ASTEC GFRP has elastic moduli of up to 60 GPa.

**RECOMMENDED PRACTICE**

The current SAICE Lateral Support to Surface Excavation Code of Practice (1989) recommends the use of double corrosion protection (DCP) in permanent applications, although many practitioners rather use sacrificial thickness design methods on soil nails. It appears from a review of international standards that, when working in a highly aggressive environment, DCP needs to be used to ensure the lifespan of steel soil nails. The selection tree in Figure 3 is provided to assess when FRP would be advantageous to a project in comparison with steel elements, and shows that in a highly corrosive environment FRP will be the preferred solution. In addition, when the reinforcement needs to be cut by a TBM or piling rig, FRP is ideal.

![Figure 3 Reinforcement selection based on corrosive environment](image-url)
threadbar. GFRP also comes in hollow bar sections that can be used as self-drilling anchors (SDA) in collapsible profiles.

From these tables it can be established that, although GFRP is considerably stronger than steel, depending on its manufacturing process, the factored design capacities are much smaller. This can be attributed to the creep properties of the FRP bars. Thomas (2019) states that the working load for a GFRP and steel bolt (assumed to be a high-yield threadbar) is the same, and that a steel bar can therefore typically be replaced by a GFRP bar of the same diameter. However, the tables show that, typically, use of a GFRP might require a bar slightly larger in diameter than a high-yield threadbar to ensure that the same tensile load can be achieved under working load conditions (SLS).

### Table 1 Design ultimate tensile loads and working tensile loads of GFRP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GFRP bar diameter (mm)</th>
<th>Unfactored ultimate tensile load (kN)</th>
<th>Design ultimate tensile load (kN)</th>
<th>ACI440 (2015/2022) at 100 years</th>
<th>Axial stiffness EA (MPa.m²)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>42/62</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>60/89</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>631</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>88/132</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>138/207</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2 Design ultimate tensile loads and working tensile loads of high-yield threadbar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High-yield threadbar</th>
<th>Unfactored ultimate tensile load (kN)</th>
<th>Design ultimate tensile load (kN)</th>
<th>Working tensile capacity (kN)</th>
<th>Axial stiffness EA (MPa.m²)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>691</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4 Stress-strain properties of GFRP, CFRP and conventional steel

Figure 5 Prestressed CFRP rods
which will be most critical for FRP when considering ACI440 (2022). The axial stiffness of a GFRP bar, even with an increase in diameter, is still lower than that of a high-yield threadbar of one size smaller. The different material properties indicate that larger deformation should occur in a GFRP soil-nail wall compared with a soil-nail wall reinforced with high-yield threadbar. No case studies could be found to prove this.

GFRP or CFRP can also be used to replace HTS stressed tiebacks which might cause significant problems in a permanent scenario with double corrosion protection requirements. It should, however, be remembered that ground anchors are typically made of high-tensile steel (3 to 4 times stronger than conventional steel) and that this plays a major role in determining the number of “equivalent” GFRP or CFRP bars. Typical CFRP anchor configuration details are provided in Figure 5. The CFRP is spliced with a swaged sleeve and threaded stud, as shown in the figure.

Table 3 compares the conventional 15.2 mm HTS low-relaxation strand with a 19 mm GFRP rod. The table shows that 3 × 19 mm GFRP bars may be required to replace one 15.2 mm HTS strand effectively for a long-term (100-year) application. This also implies that the combined axial stiffness will be larger than that of one 15.2 mm HTS strand, and that smaller additional deflection could result with additional load attracted during excavation in a multi-anchored piled wall. Also, a larger-diameter borehole will be required to house the additional number of GFRP bars, but a larger diameter will result in an increased bond resistance. Today, however, it is standard practice to only use CFRP bars in permanent active applications (stressed ground anchors), as the differences between HTS and CFRP are less pronounced. The significant reduction in short-term ultimate strength can be attributed to the long-term creep behaviour of GFRP bars, which is similar to that of geogrids.

Conventionally, for geogrids in the serviceability limit state, the time-dependent constant tensile force-versus-strain behaviour, at various magnitudes of working loads, is very important. This is normally reported as an isochronous curve, and a post-construction strain limit of 0.5–1.0% for MSEW structures governs the SLS. If an additional strain from post-construction of 1% occurs on an 8 m free length, additional movement of 80 mm can occur. This would be detrimental to the behaviour of an embedded retaining wall and therefore the aim is to design for close to 0% post-construction strain with GFRP and CFRP.

Although it does not seem to be common practice to provide isochronous curves, or plots of creep strain versus time at various stress levels for particular fibre reinforced bars as detailed in ACI440, this is considered crucial to assess. Youssef and Benmokrane (2014) undertook creep tests on six commercially available GFRP bars in Canada, at tensile loads of 15 and 30% of the ultimate tensile strength. These tensile force ratios are close to the SLS tensile capacity derived in Tables 1–3, and are in accordance with ACI440. The bars loaded to 15% of the short-term ultimate tensile strength had almost no creep during the constant load test, while the bars stressed to 30% crept slightly, but within acceptable limits, with time.

The creep rupture of GFRP and CFRP is important for the ULS design strength and is provided in Figure 6. The figure

Table 3 Design ultimate tensile loads and working tensile loads of both HTS strands and GFRP strands

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strand/bar</th>
<th>Unfactored ultimate tensile load (kN)</th>
<th>Design ultimate tensile load (kN)</th>
<th>Tensile capacity (kN) at 2 years</th>
<th>Working tensile capacity (kN) at 100 years</th>
<th>Axial stiffness EA (MPa.m²)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15.2 (HTS low-relaxation strand)</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 (GFRP)</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>100*</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.7 (CFRP)</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Below 30% unfactored ultimate tensile load to prevent significant relaxation and increased displacement of embedded retaining wall
shows the strength retention of CFRP and GFRP with the reduced tensile capacity. For a 100-year period the retention due to creep is 45% and 70% for GFRP and CFRP respectively.

To avoid failure of an FRP-reinforced member due to creep rupture, safe design stress levels below $T_{ULS}$ should be maintained, and to prevent significant creep movements, safe stress levels less than $T_{SL}$ must be maintained. Table 1 already factored the short-term ultimate strengths of ASTEC bars accordingly. The equations below are simplifications of the ACI440 recommendations:

For the serviceability limit state, the following limits are applicable:

- **GFRP**: $T_{SL} = 0.2C_{E} f_{u}^* = 0.2 \times 0.7 f_{u}^* A = 0.14 f_{u}^* A$
- **CFRP**: $T_{SL} = 0.55C_{E} f_{u}^* = 0.55 \times 0.9 f_{u}^* = 0.495 f_{u}^* A$

In the ultimate limit state, the following limits are applicable:

- **GFRP**: $T_{ULS} = \phi C_{E} f_{u}^* = 0.55 \times 0.9 f_{u}^* = 0.495 f_{u}^* A$
- **CFRP**: $T_{ULS} = \phi C_{E} f_{u}^* = 0.55 \times 0.9 f_{u}^* = 0.495 f_{u}^* A$

ASTEC GFRPs were tested in shear and performed well. The shear capacity increases significantly if the angle being tested is smaller than 90° (Thomas 2019), as some of the shear load is transferred into a tensile load component. This shear capacity can be higher than that of steel. One should, however, also factor in this contribution to shear capacity with the applicable tensile factors provided in ACI440.

Shear capacity can be calculated empirically (Thomas 2019) or using actual test results. Testing is typically undertaken in accordance with ASTM D7617 and can be done with either a single shear test or a double shear test (Figure 7).

ASTEC recently undertook numerous tests on GFRP, with both vinyl ester and epoxy resin bars. The shear and moment capacity were also calculated in accordance with ACI440. These results are provided in Table 4.

**Figure 7** Double shear test on GFRP bar

**Bond Performance**

Although the recommended formulae typically given for the design of soil nails and anchors assume that a uniform increased capacity can be achieved with an increase in fixed length, this is in fact not correct, as was already shown by Ostermayer in 1975 (Figure 8). This uniform increase can be reasonably assumed for short nails, typically <2.5 m. For lengths exceeding 2.5 m the achieved bond strength between the soil and the grout body typically decreases with an increase in length; a significant increase in length results in only a small increase in capacity. For more elastic reinforcement, such as GFRP bars, the average bond strength achieved is lower than that for HTS. Figure 9 by Barley and Graham for London Clays (taken from Bridges 2015) shows that the stiffer (EA) the tendon, the more uniform the stress distribution along its length, and the more efficient the system is in increasing tensile resistance with an increase in fixed length. The guaranteed grout–GFRP bar bond strength for Dextra bars is 9 600 kPa.
It is, however, always recommended that the bond capacity be confirmed by undertaking pull-out tests, and that the above reduction with an increase in bond length be considered if testing short nails.

**INTERACTION AT THE FAILURE PLANE**

Soil nails work predominately in tension, but due to relative displacement on the failure plane, shear forces will also develop in soil nails. These shear loads will induce a bending moment in the soil nail at a small distance inside the failure wedge and behind the failure plane, as shown in Figure 10. The behaviour is similar to that of a free-headed pile. These structural forces are normally not critical under serviceability conditions, as only small shear movements normally occur, but they could be problematic in the ultimate limit state. The mobilisation of shear forces and bending moments in soil nails is affected by the thickness of the shear zone. The wider the shear zone, the lower the shear forces and bending moments.

Conventionally for high-yield threadbar, this phenomenon can be reviewed using the equations provided in SANS 10162 for combined shear and tensile load, and for combined tensile load and bending moment, namely:

\[
\frac{T_u}{T_{us}} + \frac{M}{M_{us}} \leq 1.0
\]

and

\[
\frac{T_u}{T_{us}} + \frac{V}{V_{us}} \leq 1.4
\]

This phenomenon was assessed using both 2D and 3D geotechnical finite element software, modelling the nails as beam elements to ensure that shear forces and bending moments could develop.

The example consists of a 5 m soil-nail wall in a silty sandy material. A typical manual calculation will assume a redistribution of a triangular pressure for a

---

**Table 4 Shear and moment capacity of ASTEC GFRP bars**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GFRP bar</th>
<th>Unfactored ultimate 90° shear capacity assuming 150 MPa (kN)</th>
<th>Design ultimate bending moment capacity (kN.m)</th>
<th>SLS bending moment capacity (kN.m) (ACI 440 (2015/2022))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.09/0.135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>0.525</td>
<td>0.19/0.285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>1.113</td>
<td>0.40/0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>0.84/1.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Figure 8** Tensile capacity of fixed length (Y in kN) with a fixed length of X in m

**Figure 9** Decrease in bond strength with an increase in fixed length (after Barley & Graham for London Clays, *Bridges* 2015)
5 m high wall, i.e. 0.5γK,HsFoS = 0.5(18) (0.33)(5)(1.5) = 167 kN. For a three-nail vertical spacing, 55 kN ultimate capacity and 37 kN serviceability capacity would normally be designed for. According to ACI440 (2020), this would require the use of a GFRP bar of 19 mm governed by the SLS, and a 16 mm high-yield threadbar governed by the ULS in accordance with SANS 10162 (ignoring sacrificial thickness allowances) when considering tensile load only. In addition to the above calculation, it is assumed the excavation has sufficient “cohesion” to stand up vertically during excavation without support before the application of shotcrete and mesh, as described by Van der Merwe and Schulz-Poblete (2019). Also, the nails need to be angled to intercept the failure plane at an angle larger than normal to ensure that tensile loads develop and that the nails do not go into compression. This will also ensure that bending moments in the soil nails are smaller.

The new guidelines on numerical modelling using EN1997 (2022+) were followed to assess the structural forces in the soil nails:

1. Input/Material Factoring Approach (MFA) using:
   - factors of actions γf for GEO limit states
   - factors on material properties γM from set EQU/GEO.

2. Output/Effects Factoring Approach (EFA)
   - factors of actions γf and effects-of-action γE for STR-P limit states as given in SANS 10160-1
   - factors on material properties γM from set STR/STR-P.

The soil nails were modelled in a staged excavation in RS2 and RS3 (Rocscience 2019), as shown in Figures 11(a) and 11(b).

Table 5 summarises the structural forces derived in the nails from the FE analysis, assuming the bending stiffness with an uncracked grout body.

It can be seen from the structural forces in Table 5 that the shear forces are small, contrary to what was believed, but that large moments (relative to the bars’ moment capacities) develop. Therefore the nail should be sized as follows to prevent

The nails need to be angled to intercept the failure plane at an angle larger than normal to ensure that tensile loads develop and that the nails do not go into compression. This will also ensure that bending moments in the soil nails are smaller.

There are two MFA checks, one where material properties are factored before all the stages from Stage 1, and the other after every stage to assess the structural forces.
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---

**Table 5** Nail forces from EFA, MFA (from first stage) and MFA (after every stage)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Axial (kN)</th>
<th>Shear force (kN)</th>
<th>Bending moment (kN.m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EFA (unfactored SLS)</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFA (factored by 1.35)</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MFA (all stages factored)</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MFA (final stage factored)</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.225</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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**COST COMPARISON**
When a high-yield threadbar is compared with a GFRP bar of the same diameter, the cost of the GFRP will be 1 to 1.5 times the cost of the high-yield threadbar, depending on the number of couplers required. However, when allowance is made for DCP HDPE sheathing to protect the high-yield threadbar from corrosion, the GFRP bar will become more economical. CFRP typically costs two to three times the price of a comparable GFRP bar.

---

**CONCLUSIONS**
GFRP soil nails and CFRP stressed anchors are recognised technology with excellent durability for design lives exceeding 100 years. The long-term creep properties of GFRP and CFRP significantly affect the design working loads of these elements and eliminate the requirement for double corrosion protection. Although the contribution of the bending moment and shear capacity of soil nails is typically ignored in the design of conventional soil nails, it is recommended that these structural forces should be assessed and the element designed accordingly to ensure that brittle nail failures do not occur.

Typically, a GFRP bar, for Dextra products, of one diameter larger needs to be used in comparison with a conventional high-yield threadbar solution, as shown in this study. Pull-out resistance might be lower than for conventional soil nails and needs to be tested to ensure that there is sufficient length behind the failure plane. The costs of these GFRP bars should be comparable to those of high-yield threadbar when the need for DCP sheathing is eliminated.

---

**NOTE**
Reference details are available from the authors.
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