AD A135 463	STUDIES ON THE MECHANICS OF RAPIDLY FLOWING 1/2 GRANULAR-FLUID MATERIALSIU) CALIFORNIA UNIV SAN DIEGO	
UNCLASSIFIED	F/G 20/4 -NL	_
l 1		
		Ī



 $\overline{\mathbb{N}}$

ł,

1

MICROCOPY RESOLUTION TEST CHART NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS - 1963 - A

.#5



UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA San Diego

Studies on the Mechanics of Rapidly Flowing Granular-fluid Materials

A dissertation submitted in partial satisfaction of the requirements for the degree Doctor of Philosophy in Oceanography

by

Daniel Martin Hanes

Committee in charge: Professor Douglas L. Inman, Chairman Professor Joseph R. Curray Professor Albert T. Ellis Professor Robert T. Guza Professor Stanley Middleman Dr. Richard J. Seymour

1983

This document has been approved for public release and sale; is distribution is unlimited. This dissertation of Daniel Martin Hanes is approved, and is acceptable in quality and form for publication on microfilm:

um Kich R.T. Accession For Chairman NTIS GRA&I DTIC TAB Unannounced **icat**ion University of California, San Diego By_ Distribution/ Availability Codes PTIC Avail and/or 1983 Dist Special **i**11 t has been approved public release and sale; its stribution is unlimited.

Table of Contents

.. .

7

. .--

. .

Section	page
List of symbols	vii
Notation	×
List of figures	хi
List of tables	xiii
Acknowledgements	xiv
Vita and publications	хv
Fields of study	xvi
Abstract	xvii
1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Definitions and characteristics of a	
granular-fluid material	2
1.2 Previous theoretical approaches to the	
constitutive behavior	3
1.3 Previous experimental work on the	
constitutive behavior	5
1.4 The thickness of motion	8
1.5 Guide to the dissertation	9
2. THEORETICAL CONSIDERATIONS	12
2.1 The balance laws	13
2.2 Flow in a semi-infinite granular bed	14
2.3 Constitutive models for rapidly flowing,	
granular-fluid materials	29
2.3.1 The grain inertia region of Bagnold	21

in.

2.3.2 McTigue's modification	30
2.3.3 The kinetic theory of Savage, Jeffrey,	
and Jenkins	33
2.4 Application of constitutive theories to shear	
flow	37
2.4.1 Solutions using McTigue's constitutive	
relations	38
2.4.2 Solutions using the 'kinetic' theory of	•
Jenkins and Savage	42
2.4.2.1 Analytic solutions	44
2.4.2.2 Numerical solutions	49
3. EXPERIMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS	55
3.1 Apparatus	55
3.2 Material description	58
3.3 Experimental plan	59
3.4 Measurement systems	62
3.5 Approximations and assumptions	66
3.5.1 Effects of rotation	68
3.5.2 Boundary wall effects	69
3.5.3 Interstitial fluid effects	71
3.5.4 Unsteadiness	74
3.6 Quality and quantity of data	75
4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	81
4.1 Constitutive behavior	82
4.2 The stress ratio	90

「ない」という

ł

••

v

.....

4.3 Immersed weight of the shearing grains	101
4.4 An effect of grain angularity	108
5. CONCLUSIONS	112
6. REFERENCES	117
7. APPENDIX-DATA	121

vi

LIST OF SYMBOLS

•··· •

御御い

÷ •.

...

A	function representing anisotropy of granular collisions
В	Bagnold number $(\rho_{a}\lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}D \frac{dU}{d\pi}/\mu)$
Б	body force
D	grain diameter
ΔE	ratio of kinetic energy generated to kinetic
	energy dissipated in a granular collision
e	internal energy; coefficient of elasticity of a grain
F	a function of N, different in different theories;
	a force
ģ	gravity
κ _i	constants
N	volume concentration
N _c	volume concentration at which free energy is a minimum
Nm	maximum volume concentration
No	volume concentration at the surface of a flow
P	pressure
Q	heat flux through boundary
ā	heat flux
R	ratio of collisional forces to viscous forces
Re	Reynold's number
S	separation distance between grains
Ŧ	stress tensor
t	time
U	velocity of grains

vii

٩ĸ

۲.

Um	the characteristic, or maximum velocity
-u	velocity of fluid
x	spacial coordinate, usually direction of flow
У	spacial coordinate, usually in cross-flow direction
Z _o	thickness of motion
z	spacial coordinate, usually vertical '
α	function of N in constitutive theories, different
	for different theories
ß	an angle, usually slope of inclined plane
Г	a constant = <u>dN</u> in McTigue's theory
Y 5	heat source
Θ	pseudo-temperature (mechanical analogy to temperature)
ĸ	"mechanical" thermal conductivity
λ	linear concentration, D/s
ц	fluid viscosity
π	3.14159
P	density
٩	fluid density
٥ _s	solid grain density
τ	a stress
τ _o	applied shear stress
τ _n	applied normal stress
Ŧ	"rate of deformation" tensor
φ	friction angle
Φ.	friction angle for initial vield

viii

.

or ϕ_d friction angle for residual, or dynamic yield $\phi_{\mathbf{r}}$ identity tensor Ŧ superscript indicating vector superscript indicating tensor ix

Notation

Indicial notation is used when convenient:

Repeated indices indicate summation.

A comma followed by an index indicates

differentiation with respect to the index.

e.g.: $U_{i,i} = \frac{dU_1}{dx_1} + \frac{dU_2}{dx_2} + \frac{dU_3}{dx_3}$

gradient operator

e.g.: $\nabla \cdot \overline{\overline{1}} = \overline{T}_{ij,j}$ (i equations)

Indicates derivative when function only depends on one variable (usually z).

e.g.: $U'=\frac{dU}{dz}$ if U is a function of z only

Material derivative = $\frac{d}{dt} + U_1 \frac{d}{dx_1}$ e.g.: $\frac{D\overline{U}}{Dt} = \frac{d\overline{U}}{dt} + U_1 \frac{d\overline{U}}{dx_1} + U_2 \frac{d\overline{U}}{dx_2} + U_3 \frac{d\overline{U}}{dx_1}$

D Dt

List of Figures

. . .

٠,

ł

....

-

Figure		pag e
2-1	Definition sketch for granular bed	15
2-2	Stability of a grain at rest	18
2-3	Definitions for Bagnold's formulation	22
2-4	Schematic of Bagnold's apparatus	23
2-5	Definitions for inclined plane flow	26
2-6	Definitions for vertical chute flow	28
2-7	Mohr's circle illustrating failure plane	32
2-8	Analytic solution using McTigue's theory	41
2-9	Analytic solution using Jenkin's and	
	Savage's theory	50
2-10	Numerical solutions using Jenkin's and	
	Savage's theory	52
3-1	Schematic of shear cell apparatus	56
3-2	Strain gage calibration curve	64
3-3	Strain gage linkage	65
3-4	Centrifugal stress compared to applied	
	normal stress	70
3-5	Possible effect of rotation on the	
	interstitial water	78
4-1	Stresses vs. shear rate for glass spheres	
	in air	84
4-2	Stresses vs. shear rate for glass spheres	
	in water	85
4-3	Possible air gap in shearing region	86

xi

. .

_

T.

4-4	Ln stress vs. In shear rate for glass	
	spheres in air	87
4-5	Ln stress vs. In shear rate for glass	
	spheres in water	88
4-6	Nondimensional stress vs. concentration	
	for l.l mm glass spheres in air	91
4-7	Nondimensional strass vs. concentration	
	for 1.85 mm glass spheres in air	92
4-8	Nondimensional stress vs. concentration	
	for 0.55 mm sand in air	93
4-9	Stress ratios for glass spheres in air	95
4-1Ø	Stress ratios for glass spheres in water	95
4-11	Stress ratios for sand in air and water	97
4-12	Measured vs. predicted bedload	104
4-13	Mean measured vs. mean predicted bedload	106
4-14	Possible imbrication resulting from sand	
	being sheared in air	110
4-15	Possible imbrication resulting from sand	
	being sheared in water	111

. .

xii

List of Tables

Table		page
3-1	Granular material description	50
3-2	Measurement accuracies	67
3-3	Bagnold numbers for the present experiments	73
3-4	Summary of the experiments	80
4-1	Measured stress ratios	98
4-2	Friction angles	100
4-3	Regression between stress ratio and shear rate	103
4-4	Correlations between bedload, N, and U'	107

Acknowledgements

I wish to acknowledge and thank:

Sea Grant, for funding the initial field work which motivated these studies(#NOAA Ø4-8-MØ1-193). The Office of Naval Research, for funding the lab work(Code 422CS #N ØØ014-83-C-0182).

My committee, for their guidance and patience. Professor D.L. Inman, for his support, advise, and for allowing me to learn about his view of the world. Dick Seymour, for nearly a decade of enthusiasm, encouragement, scientific insight, and friendship. Bob Guza, for his keen editorial eye, his critical thinking, and his endurance. Mike Clark, for drafting the figures and for his ribald humor. Mert Ingraham, for machining the shear cell.

The students and staff of the Shore Processes Lab, the Hydraulics Lab, and the Nearshore Research Group, for knowing how to make work pleasurable.

Steve Pawka, for helping me maintain a level perspective when black looked like white, and white like black. Margie Edwards, for her moral support, and for helping prepare this thesis. Rusty Erdman, for helping me maintain a semblance of sanity during the last few months.

Hank Aaron and Sandy Koufax, who first impressed upon me the impact of a collisional interaction.

Everyone who has shared a beach fire or the warmth of friendship with me.

Mom and Dad, without whom I wouldn't be here.

xiv

Born May 26, 1955 - Dallas, Texas

- 1977 B. A., Applied Mechanics and Engineering Science, University of California, San Diego
- 1979 M. S., Oceanography, Scripps Institution of Oceanography, University of California, San Diego

1977 - Research Assistant, Scripps Institution of Oceanography, Present University of California, San Diego

Publications

"Performance analysis of a tethered float breakwater," (with R. J. Seymour), The Journal of the Waterway Port Coastal and Ocean Division, v. 105, n. WW3, 1979.

"F eld measurements of bed and suspended load motion in the surf zone," (with D. L. Inman), p. 217-218, <u>Proc. 17th Int. Conf. on Coastal</u> <u>Engineering</u>, abstracts vol., 456 pp., 1980.

"Field measurements of sand motion in the surf zone," (with D. L. Inman, J. A. Zampol, T. E. White, B. W. Waldorf and K. A. Kastens), Proc. 17th Int. Conf. on Coastal Engineering, Am. Soc. Civil Eng., 1980.

"Rheology of granular-fluid material," p. 49-53 in Fluid-sediment interactions on beaches and shelves, progress report, 1980-1981, (D. L. Inman, R. T. Guza, C. D. Winant and R. E. Flick). <u>SIO Reference</u> Series 81-27, 1981.

"Vertical mixing in surf zone sand beds," <u>Transactions</u>, American Geophysical Union, v. 63, n. 3, p. 64 (abstract only), 1982.

"Rapid shear flow in a granular bed," presented at the International Union of Theoretical and Applied Mechanics Symposium on Deformation and Failure of Granular Materials, Delft, 1982.

VITA

FIELDS OF STUDY

Major Field: Oceanography

Studies in Physical Oceanography Professors R.T. Guza, M.C. Hendershott, W. Munk, R.L. Salmon, and J.L. Reid Studies in Nearshore Processes Professor D.L. Inman Studies in Marine Chemistry Professor J. Gieskes Studies in Biological Oceanography Professor M.M. Mullin Studies in Marine Geology Professors G. Arrhenius, W.H. Berger J.R. Curray, and J.W. Hawkins. Studies in Applied Mathematics Professor S. Rand

1. Introduction

Theoretical and experimental studies on the rapid flow of granular materials have increased in number and significance during the past ten years. This is due in part to the relevence of these flows to a variety of problems of industrial and geophysical significance. Landslides and snow avalanches, the bedload transport of coarse grained sediments, and the saltation of sand grains in air (Owen,1964) can all be treated as flowing granular materials. Analogously, the flow of seeds and grains in hoppers, pharmaceutical powders, and slurries of coal in air or water are examples of important granular flows in industrial processing.

The surge in interest is presumably due also to the intriguing nature of rapid granular flows. The study of these flows cuts across traditional disciplinary boundaries, with contributions being made by applied and theoretical mathematicians and mechanicians, chemical engineers, geoscientists, numerical analysts, and others.

Although there has been much progress made in understanding the flow of granular materials, there are still many conflicting theories, few consistent observations, and several unaddressed questions.

<u>l.l</u> Definitions and characteristics of a granular-fluid material

A granular material can be defined as an assembly of discreet particles confined by either a body force or physical boundaries. The voids between individual grains may be filled with a fluid such as air or water, or by a vacuum as in the ice rings of Saturn. When subjected to the proper forces and boundary conditions the material may deform in a manner similiar to a fluid. Hence this twocomponent mixture has been called a granular-fluid material (Inman et.al.,1966), although under some conditions the true fluid component may be inconsequential to the granular flow.

A principal property of granular-fluid materials is that the volume concentration is related to the deformation of the material. The volume concentration is defined as the portion of the total volume which is occupied by the granular component. The importance of the volume concentration was first identified by Reynolds(1885). Reynolds observed that a packed granular material must undergo volumetric expansion in order to deform. He referred to this behavior as dilatency. The term dilatency has subsequently been extended to describe those materials in which the rate of deformation and the volume concentration or density are inversely related for a given stress state.

As implied above, a granular material may deform in a variety of ways in response to applied stresses. The nature of this deformation is governed by the granular concentration, N, and by the ratio of the shear stress to the normal stress (Terzhagi, 1943), which will be referred to as the stress ratio (Txz/Tzz).

At high concentrations and low stress ratios the material behaves elastically, with all grains initially in contact remaining in contact. As suggested by Coulomb(1773), when the stress ratio reaches the critical, or static yield value, denoted as $\tan\phi_i$ the material begins to undergo a slipping and rolling type of deformation, in which grain layers may override one another for large distances at low shear rates. At higher shear rates and lower volume concentrations, the stresses become dependent upon the rate of deformation. Collisions between grains play a dominant role, and the interstitial fluid may be inconsequential to the dynamics. This corresponds to the grain-inertia regime first described by Bagnold(1941,1954), and this rapid flow regime is the primary area of interest in this work.

1.2 Previous theoretical approaches

There is a large body of literature dealing with the slow deformation of granular materials at relatively high concentrations (e.g. Vermeer, 1982). Since Drucker and

Prager (1952) applied the associated flow rules of plasticity to soil mechanics, there have been many attempts to treat granular materials as plastic media. Nonassociated flow rules have also been proposed by de Josselin de Jong (1959,1971), Spencer(1964), and others. The various advantages and shortcomings of these theories are discussed in Mandl and Luque (1970) and Mehrabadi and Cowin (1978). Although several of these theories have value for the quasistatic flows expected in soil mechanics and for the flow of grains in bins and hoppers, they are not applicable to rapid flow conditions where the stresses are expected to depend on the rate of deformation of the material.

In this work the discussion will be restricted to rapid shear flows of granular materials in which dilatency and shear rate dependence of the stresses are important. The theories describing rapid granular flows which account for dilatency and rate dependent stresses can be conveniently divided into those which are derived from consideration of particle interactions and those which are deduced from continuum mechanical and thermodynamic considerations.

The continuum approach is exemplified by Goodman and Cowin (1972), McTigue(1979), and Passman et.al.(1988). In these theories the volume concentration is considered as an independent field variable. Forms for the free energy, entropy, etc., are postulated and the constitutive behavior is subsequently deduced from thermodynamic constraints or,

at times, suggested in an ad-hoc manner. A common feature of theories utilizing this approach is that there are generally several undetermined parameters, and sometimes undetermined functions. This makes experimental verification extremely difficult (see Bailard(1978), for example). A strong supporting feature of these theories, on the other hand, is that they either incorporate or predict a Coulomb yield condition for initial failure.

For the particle interaction approach, the constitutive behavior of the assembly is formulated by examining the interactions between individual grains. The primary mechanism for stress transfer is a granular collision. Bagnold (1954) considered the mean paths of particles undergoing simple shear deformation in order to formulate the stresses resulting from intergranular collisions. More recently, McTigue(1979), Ogawa(1978;1980), Savage and Jeffrey (1982), and Jenkins and Savage (1983) have included the fluctuating component of velocity in modeling the collisional stress transfer in a manner analogous to kinetic theory of gases. Ackermann and Shen (1982) also consider the stresses resulting from particle and fluid translations.

The particle interaction approach is more satisfying than the present state of the continuum approach from a physical point of view. Furthermore, it predicts stresses which are quadratic in shear rate, in agreement with several observations.

1.3 Previous experimental work

The experimental observations of rapid granular flows have primarily been concerned with two types of flow: shear flow between concentric cylinders or parallel plates, and gravity flow down inclined chutes and channels. The earliest , and still the most consistent measurements of granular fluid flow between concentric cylinders were made by Bagnold(1954). Savage and McKeown (1983) have subsequently repeated and extended Bagnold's work. Savage and Sayed(1983) have studied similiar flows between parallel plates in an annular shear cell. There have been many attempts to experimentally study gravity flow down inclines, including Savage(1978), Bailard(1978), and Ishida and Shirai (1979). A good review of these flows is presented in Savage (1982). Numerical simulations of rapid granular shear flows have been carried out by Cambell(1982).

For the case of shear flow between moving boundaries, accurate point measurements of velocity and concentration have proven to be quite elusive. Researchers have been consequently forced to accept the standard rheological techniques of measuring stresses and velocities at the boundaries of the flow, and the average concentration within the flow.

Bagnold(1954) studied the flow of neutrally bouyant spheres immersed in fluid and sheared between concentric

cylinders. He demonstrated the existence of a normal dispersive pressure which was proportional to the shear stress. The data also strongly supported the concept that stress transfer is due to collisional interactions between grains. Both of these observations have been duplicated by Savage and McKeown(1983). Savage and Sayed(1983) experimentally studied the rapid flow of granular materials (in air) in an annular, parallel plate shear cell. Their results further confirmed the quadratic rate dependence of the stresses. Savage and Sayed's measurements of the stress ratio were higher than Bagnold's, and showed some dependency upon the volume concentration.

The steady flow of granular material down inclined chutes and channels has prompted considerable discussion, with several apparently contradictory observations being published. Most of these contradictions have been explained by considering the effects of different materials and boundary conditions. On the basis of Bailard's and Savage's works, it is safe to conclude that steady flows are indeed possible over a range of inclinations. Beyond this conclusion these experiments have added little to the general understanding of granular flows. They do, however, illustrate the lack of understanding for those flows in which the body force (usually gravity) plays an important role in determining the velocity and concentration structure within the flow.

This is an important consideration for almost all geophysical flows because the flow thickness is generally limited in some manner by gravity. The question of the thickness of motion is a central question which will be addressed in this work.

1.4 The thickness of motion

One of the least understood parameters determining the bedload transport of granular sediments is the thickness of motion in the bed (Komar and Inman, 1978; Inman and Hanes, 1980). There is an analogous uncertainty with avalanches, debris flow, mud flows, and the slip faces of sand dunes. The thickness of motion in these granular-fluid flows would be predictable if the complete constitutive behavior of the material were known. However, the constitutive behavior is not known over all ranges of the stress ratio and the volume concentration, hence the prediction of a thickness of motion based upon the equations of motion is quite unlikely. This is because the mechanisms for stress tranfer are likely to change as the level of no motion is approached. Collisions between grains probably become less dominant as sliding friction-due to rubbing contact ingreases

Bagneld's solution to this problem was to impose a yield criterion at the boundary between moving and stationary grains. He suggested a Coulomb yield criterion,

much like the residual angle of sliding friction in soil mechanics. Bagnold used this fundamental assumption in the derivation of nearly all of his sediment transport theory (1956,1966), as did Bailard and Inman(1979) in their rederivation of Bagnold's results.

Despite the acceptance and use of the assumption of a dynamic yield criterion for granular shear flows, the yield criterion had not been experimentally tested for these flows prior to the present study.

1.5 Guide to this dissertation

In the next section the deformation of a granular bed subjected to gravity and to traction applied to its surface is considered. It is demonstrated that as a consequence of momentum conservation, the stress ratio (shear stress/normal stress) must decrease with increasing depth in the bed, resulting in an internal boundary separating a shearing region (above) from a rigid region(below). Constitutive theories for rapidly flowing granular-fluid materials are presented and applied to this flow. Original analytic solutions corresponding to McTigue's constitutive theory and numerical solutions corresponding to Jenkins and Savage's constitutive theory are presented. An approximate analytic solution to Jenkins and Savage's theory is also presented, following the developments of Jenkins and Savage(1983). The analytic and

numerical solutions suggest a finite thickness of motion. They also demonstrate the dilatant nature of granular-fluid materials, the effects of the kinetic energy involved in the velocity fluctuations, and the importance of the boundary conditions upon the flow.

Section 3 describes the experimental considerations. Experiments are performed in an annular shear cell of mean radius 12.4 cm. The granular materials included two sizes (1.1mm and 1.85mm) of spherical glass beads, and natural sand(0.55 mm). Both water and air are used as interstitial fluids. The approximations involved in interpreting the experimental data are examined. These include the effects of rotation, measurement accuracies, and unsteadiness in the flow.

Section 4 presents the results of the experiments and compares these results to the constitutive theories. The stresses are found to be quadratically dependent upon the shear rate, in agreement with the collisional models of momentum transfer. Stresses are also found to be weakly dependent upon the volume concentration at low concentrations, and strongly dependent at higher concentration. The existence of an internal boundary is repeatedly observed. The thickness of the shearing region varies between 5 and 15 grain diameters. The stress ratios are approximately constant, with a slight dependence on the shear rate and volume concentration. The total immersed weight of the grains in the shearing region is caculated by

applying a dynamic Coulomb yield criterion at the internal boundary. Measurements are in fair agreement with the predicted values.

2. Theoretical considerations

Several theories for the constitutive behavior of rapidly flowing granular-fluid materials are presented here. These, along with the basic balance laws for mass, momentum, and energy are applied to the steady, rapid, shear flow of a cohesionless granular bed subjected to gravity and surface traction. The results show why there is a level, called the level of no motion, below which grains remain rigidly locked together.

The granular material will sometimes be considered as a continuum, and sometimes as an assembly of particles. Physical descriptors at a point, such as bulk density or velocity, must be considered in the continuum context as properties averaged over the scale of several grains. The velocity will be treated as the sum of a mean translation and a fluctuation about the mean. The spin of individual grains in not explicitly considered. The grains are assumed to be cohesionless, with no chemical or electrostatic interactions.

The effects of an interstitial fluid are neglected in this analysis. This is a valid approximation when the forces resulting from grain-to-grain interactions are much greater than those resulting from fluid-to-grain interactions, and the influence of the fluid upon the grainto-grain interactions is unimportant. The conditions under

which this approximation is valid are discussed in greater detail in section 3.5.3.

2.1 The balance laws

The balance laws for mass, linear momentum, angular momentum, and energy can be written as:

$$\frac{D\rho}{Dt} + \rho U_{i,i} = 0$$
 2-1a

$$\rho \frac{DU_{i}}{Dt} = T_{ij,j} + \rho b_{i}$$
2-2

$$T_{ij} = T_{ji}$$

$$P \frac{De}{Dt} = T_{ij} T_{ij} - q_{i,i} + \rho\gamma$$
2-3
2-4

where:

 $\overline{\mathbf{b}}$ is a body force

e is the internal energy

 \overline{q} is the heat flux

 γ is a heat source

The mass conservation equation, 2-1, can be rewritten for materials with incompressible grains by substituting the definition of bulk density, giving:

$$\frac{DN}{Dt} + NU_{i,i} = 0 \qquad 2-1b$$

The momentum equation, 2-2, is a balance between accelerations, on the left side, and the combined forces represented by the divergence of the stress tensor and a body force, both on the right side. The absence of coupled stresses is evidenced in the conservation of angular momentum, indicating a symmetric stress tensor (equation 2-3).

From the energy equation (2-4) it can be seen that there are three mechanisms by which the internal energy can be altered. The first is via dissipation due to the deformation, the second is a net flux of heat due to heat flux gradients, and the third is some unspecified heat source (or sink).

2.2 Flow in a semi-infinite, granular bed

Consider a bed of cohesionless grains oriented with its surface perpendicular to the gravity field, as shown in Figure 2-1. If traction, $\overline{\tau} \approx \tau_0 + \tau_n$, is applied to the surface of the bed, the granular material will deform. Consider the case of steady shear deformation in which the mean paths of all moving grains are horizontal, and there are no gradients in the direction of mean flow. In this case the mass balance is identically satisfied, and the linear momentum conservation equation reduces to:

 $T_{ij,j} = \rho_s N b_i$ 2-6a



Figure 2-1. Definitions for a semi-infinite granular bed subject to surface traction and gravity forces.

Expressing this in terms of the x,z coordinate system depicted in Figure 2-1:

$$T_{xz,z} = 0$$
 2-6b

$$T_{zz,z} = -\rho_s Ng \qquad 2-6c$$

Integrating these equations and applying the boundary conditions:

$$T_{xz} = \tau_{0}$$

$$T_{zz} = \tau_{0}$$

$$at z = 0$$

$$2-7a$$

$$2-7b$$

gives:

$$T_{xz} = \tau_0$$

$$T_{zz}(z) = \tau_n + \int_{\rho_s} Ng \, dz$$

$$Q-8a$$

$$2-8a$$

$$2-8b$$

$$0$$

The shear stress remains constant at all depths, equal to the applied shear stress. If the shear stress were to change with depth, the deformation would be unsteady. The normal stress is an increasing function of depth. This is due to the weight of the grains. The ratio of the shear stress to the normal stress decreases with increasing depth in the bed, and eventually the flow presumable must cease. As the depth increases, the situation is analogous to piling more logs on a horse-drawn sled. Eventually the load becomes too heavy for the horse to pull.

Following the well established Coulomb yield criterion for static yield, it is useful to define a Coulomb yield criterion for dynamic yield, corresponding to the limiting value of the stress ratio at which motion ceases. If this concept is valid, then at the boundary between

mobile and immobile grains, the stress ratio should be constant for a given material. The stress ratio can be expressed as a dynamic friction angle:

shear stress/normal stress = $tan\phi_{r}$ 2-9

A simple physical argument supporting the concept that the stability of a stationary grain is determined by the ratio of the shear and normal forces exerted on the grain is shown in Figure 2-2. Grain A is subjected to a normal stress, F_n , and a shear stress, F_0 . If the applied stresses combine to result in a net torque about the point of contact, c, the grain will begin to roll. In terms of the stresses and the angle β , this condition is simply:

 $\frac{F_0}{F_n} \ge \tan(\beta)$

2-10

The angle β , and analogously, the angle of dynamic friction, ϕ_r , are expected to be functions of the packing and material characteristics.

This approach is somewhat simplistic since one must consider the mechanics of the actual forces which act on an individual grain and not simply the continuum quantity of stress. In fact, the forces acting on a grain depend upon the nature of the packing, the deformation, and the properties of the granular-fluid material. The forces which one grain can exert on a second grain can be transmitted in three ways: grains may collide and impart momentum to one another, they may push against each other in response to a



Figure 2-2. Stability diagram for grain A. Grain A will begin to roll about point C if:

$$\frac{r_0}{F_n} \ge \tan\beta$$
body force or an applied stress, or they may frictionally stress each other by sliding over one another while resisting relative motion. The second two processes usually occur together and require approximately continuous contact.

If material at rest is packed in a rigid or near rigid state, as it is prior to static yield, then the frictional forces acting on a grain are probably well represented by the average stress state. The resistance to relative motion arises from static friction, and the well established Coulomb yield criterion thus is consistent on a macroscopic scale. After, but still near the initial yield point, the frictional forces are still well represented by the average stress state, and resistance to relative motion arises from sliding friction. This resistance is generally less than that of static friction, so the coefficient of friction is lower. Thus the residual angle of internal friction in soil mechanics is less than the static angle as discussed by Bagnold (1966).

In flows where the moving grains are no longer tightly packed, contact between grains is intermittant because of collisional interactions. The forces acting on a grain can momentarily be greater or less than those described by the average stress state. The stress ratio could vary considerably, depending on the concentration and shear rate.

It is interesting to note that a knowledge of $\tan \phi_r$ allows for the prediction of the total immersed weight of

the moving grains. Combining equations 2-8 and 2-9 and modifying the density to allow for possible buoyancy effects of the immersing fluid gives:

$$\int_{0}^{Z} (\rho_{s} - \rho_{f}) \operatorname{Ng} dz = \frac{\tau_{o}}{\tan(\phi_{r})} - \tau_{n} \qquad 2-11$$

where Z is the depth in the bed at which motion ceases.

In the case where the applied stress is purely shear and the normal force is due solely to the immersed weight of the grains, equation 2-11 is a very simple relation relating these two quantities. As mentioned previously, this relation is a fundamental assumption underlying much of Bagnold's work on sediment transport.

2.3 Constitutive models for rapidly flowing, granular-fluid materials

The first model to be presented was formulated by R.A. Bagnold (1954), when he published the results of a remarkable set of experiments investigating the simple shear flow of a granular-fluid suspension. Bagnold demonstrated the importance of granular collisions, particularly for rapid flows. In the second model presented, McTigue(1979) modifies Bagnold's theory by adding a frictional stress which is expected to be important for flows near the initial yield point. In the third formulation discussed, Savage and Jeffrey(1981), and Jenkins and Savage(1983) approach the

collisional problem in a manner analogous to the kinetic theory of gases. Their results are shown to be consistent with Bagnold's for the simple shear flow of neutrally buoyant spheres.

2.3.1 The grain-inertia regime of Bagnold

Bagnold(1941,1954) was first to discover and explain the non-Newtonian nature of rapid granular-fluid shear flows when he recognized the importance of granular collisions. By considering the mean paths of grains undergoing rapid, shear deformation, Bagnold recognized that both the momentum transferred per collision and the frequency of granular collisions are proportional to the mean shear rate (see Figure 2-3), resulting in tangential and normal stresses quadratic in the mean shear rate. Bagnold experimentally verified this quadratic dependence of the stresses, as well as the dependence of the stresses upon the volume concentration, by studying the flow of neutrally buoyant spheres sheared between concentric cylinders, as shown in Figure 2-4. The apparatus was cleverly constructed to allow for measurements of the shear stress and also of the normal stress as a function of the mean granular concentration and the mean shear rate. Combining theory with observations, Bagnold proposed the following constitutive relations for the grain-inertia regime:



Figure 2-3. Definitions for Bagnold's formulation. F_x and F_z are the forces that result from a collision between two grains moving at relative velocity δU . 22

ł



$$T_{xz} = .013 \rho_s (\lambda DU')^2$$
 2-12a

$$T_{zz} = .041 \rho_s (\lambda DU')^2$$
 2-12b

where U' (= $\frac{dU}{dz}$) is the mean shear rate and where λ , the linear concentration, is the ratio of the grain diameter to the mean free separation distance between grains (D/s in Figure 2-3). λ is given as a function of the volume concentration by:

$$\lambda = \left[\left(\frac{Nm}{N}\right)^{\frac{1}{3}} - 1\right]^{-1}$$

where $N_{\!_{\!M\!}}$ is the maximum possible concentration.

These relations were experimentally verified for

$$B \ge 450$$
 and $.14 \le N \le .60$ $(1.4 \le \lambda \le 14)$ 2-14

where
$$:_{B} = \frac{\lambda^2 \rho_s D^2 U'}{U}$$

2-15

2-13

is the Bagnold number, and is analogous to a Reynolds number. The stress ratio, $T_{\chi Z}/T_{ZZ}$ or $tan(\phi_r)$ is equal to about 0.32, or $tan(18^\circ)$. Bagnold suggested that this ratio is constant in the grain-inertia regime. At lower values of B, the stress ratio increased, reaching a maximum value of 0.75 in the macro-viscous regime.

Bagnold's results have stood for nearly 30 years for the conditions under which they were formulated: steady, uniform, simple shear flow of neutrally buoyant granular

materials. In several situations involving more complex flows or boundary conditions, the application of Bagnold's relations leads to unrealistic constraints. Complications arise from one of two sources. First, the stress ratio was found to be constant in Bagnold's grain-inertia regime (using neutrally buoyant particles), conflicting with later observations of flows (of non-neutrally buoyant particles) in which the stress ratio varies. Second, and more importantly, the stresses vanish for vanishing mean velocity gradient because in Bagnold's apparatus there was no source for granular velocity fluctuations other than the mean shear.

To demonstrate these limitations we consider three flows: gravity driven flow down an inclined channel, gravity driven flow down a vertical chute, and the simple shear flow described in the previous section.

As presented in Bailard and Inman(1979), for gravity driven flow down an inclined plane (see Figure 2-5) the momentum equation for steady flow is simply :

 $\nabla \cdot \overline{T} = -\rho_{e} \overline{g} N$ 2-16a

or in terms of the coordinates of Tigure 2-5 :

$$T_{xz,z} = -\rho_s gN \sin(\beta)$$
 2-16b

$$[zz_z] = -\rho_s gN \cos(\beta) \qquad 2-160$$

Integrating these equations and applying a stress free boundary condition at the upper surface yields:



Figure 2-5. Definitions for inclined plane flow.

--.

$$T_{xz} = -\rho_s g \sin(\theta) \int_0^z N dz'$$
 2-17a

$$\int_{zz}^{z} = -\rho_{s}g \cos(\beta) \int_{0}^{z} N dz'$$
T
$$Z = -\rho_{s}g \cos(\beta) \int_{0}^{z} N dz'$$
2-17b

and
$$\frac{xz}{T_{zz}} = \tan(\beta)$$
 2-17c

The stress ratio is constant throughout the flow, and equal to tan β for any slope β . This is in accordance with Bagnold's relations if and only if $\beta = 18^{\circ}$. In contrast, steady flows of this nature have been reported by Bailard(1978), Savage(1980,1982), and Ishida and Shirai(1982) over a range of inclinations.

A similiar problem arises in the horizontal flow of a granular bed due to traction applied to its upper surface, as discussed previously. It was shown that as a direct result of the conservation of momentum, the stress ratio varied with depth in the flow. Once again, this is inconsistent with Bagnold's observation of a constant stress ratio in the grain-inertia regime.

A third flow, which illustrates the most important shortcoming of Bagnold's relations, is the steady, gravity driven flow down a vertical chute as seen in Figure 2-6. The momentum equation is again

 $\nabla \cdot \overline{I} = -\rho_s N\overline{g}$ 2-18a Because $\frac{d}{dz}=0$ for uniform flow, the stresses, velocity, and concentration are fuctions of x only, and equation 2-18a becomes:

Figure 2-6. Definitions for vertical chute flow.

$$T_{zx,x} = -\rho_s Ng$$
 2-18b
 $T_{xx,x} = 0$ 2-18c

Because the geometry and forces are completely symmetric about the centerline, symmetry forces U' to vanish at the centerline. But, according to equations 2-12 and 2-18c, if U' vanishes anywhere, it vanishes everywhere, and the flow is inconsistent with equations 2-12 and 2-18.

These obvious limits to Bagnold's relations arise primarily because Bagnold considered the mean paths of the grains, but did not directly consider the fluctuating component of velocity. He was clearly aware of the fluctuating component, as he assumed grain oscillations about the mean path resulted in granular collisions. In fact, if one considers the fluctuating velocity to be driven by the mean velocity gradient, then Bagnold's theory does implicitly consider the fluctuations in a qualitative way. However, by not explicitly treating the velocity fluctuations, there is no clear way to account for the diffusion of fluctuation velocity or the generation of fluctuation velocity by mechanisms other than the mean shear.

The fact that Bagnold's model agrees well with his experiments should not be overlooked. A more sophisticated theory must agree with Bagnold's results for the simple shear flow of neutrally buoyant grains.

CORRECTED PAGE

2.3.2 McTigue's modification

McTigue(1979,1982) placed the collisional arguments "of Bagnold in a more rigorous framework by formulating the stresses resulting from granular collisions as an integral, over all possible collisions, of the momentum transferred in any single two particle (binary) collision. He further suggested that the model could be improved by adding an equilibrium stress to represent the quasi-static stresses which occur when the material is near the initial failure state.

The inclusion of an equilibrium stress is reminiscent of the work of Goodman and Cowin(1970,1971) and Savage(1979). McTigue divides the total stress \overline{T} , into \overline{T}° , the equilibrium stress, and \overline{T}^{*} , the dissipative stress due to granular collisions. The form for each of these components of the stress tensor is given below for a cohesionless granular material composed of incompressible spheres:

$$\bar{T}^* = K_1 (N_m - N)^{-2} \Pi^{\frac{1}{2}} \bar{T} - K_2 (N_m - N)^{-2} \bar{T}^2$$
 2-19a

$$\bar{\bar{T}}^{0} = -\alpha (N^{2} - N_{c}^{2})\bar{1} + \alpha \sin\phi (N^{2} - N_{c}^{2}) \Pi \bar{T}$$
2-19b

where
$$\Pi' = \frac{1}{2}I - \Pi = \frac{1}{2}$$
 trace $(\frac{\pi}{2})$ 2-190

$$I = \text{trace}(T) \qquad 2-19d$$
$$TT = \frac{1}{T} ((\text{trace} \overline{T})^2 - \text{trace}(\overline{T}^2)) \qquad 2-19e$$

 $\Pi = \frac{1}{2} \left(\left(\text{trace } \overline{T} \right)^2 - \text{trace} \left(\overline{T}^2 \right) \right) \qquad 2-19e$ $K_1, K_2, \text{ and } \alpha \text{ are non-negative constants of the flow, } N_C$

is the critical value of N at which the free energy of the

material is a minimum (see Goodman and Cowin, 1971, 1972, and Passman, et al., 1980), and ; is the internal angle of static friction. The function $(N_m - N)^{-2}$ is an empirical fit to Bagnold's(1954) data, where N_m represents a maximum possible concentration. The dissipative part of the stress tensor is quadratic in the shear rate in accordance with Bagnold's model.

In the limit \overline{T} the equilibrium stress describes an isotropic pressure $p(N) = \alpha(N^2 - N_C^2)$ and stress components T_{xz} =-p, and T_{zz} =-p sin ϕ . These components satisfy a Coulomb yield criterion on the plane inclined ϕ as seen in Figure 2-7. On the plane ϕ :

τ _o	= $p \sin(\phi) \cos(\phi)$	2-20a
τ _n	= $-p(1-sin^2(\phi)) = -pcos^2(\phi)$	2-20b

$$\frac{\tau_0}{\tau_n} = \tan(\phi) \qquad 2-20c$$

For simple shear flow the total stress components are:

$$T_{xz} = -\alpha \sin(\phi) (N^2 - N_c^2) - K_1 (N_m - N)^{-2} (U')^2$$
 2-21a

$$T_{zz} = -\alpha (N^2 - N_c^2) - K_2 (N_m - N)^{-2} (U')^2$$
 2-21b

Although there is little physical justification for the form of the equilibrium pressure term, the theory does have several desirable features. The addition of an equilibrium stress alleviates two of the shortcomings of



ł

Bagnold's original constitutive relations by allowing for a varying stress ratio, and non-zero stresses in the limit of vanishing deformation. Furthermore, in the limit of vanishing deformation, the equilibrium stress is in agreement with a Coulomb criterion for static yield, which is in accordance with many observations of the behavior of real granular materials.

One of the major drawbacks of this theory is that it is nearly impossible to test experimentally because of the large number of unknown constants and parameters. For example, the theory is incomplete in its determination of α . Clearly α is related to the pressure, and its variation between flows is probably related to the energy tied up in the random fluctuations in velocity. But since α is not determined within the theory, it is just another unknown constant which must be fit to the data.

2.3.3 The "kinetic" theory of Savage, Jeffrey, and Jenkins

Savage and Jeffrey(1981) and Jenkins and Savage(1983) derive constitutive relations for the rapid shear flow of cohesionless spheres by explicitly considering the fluctuating component of velocity in calculating the momentum transfer due to binary granular collisions. Following the examples of Ogawa(1978,1980), they consider the fluctuating component of the velocity to be a mechanical, or "macroscopic" temperature, which will be

CORRECTED PAGE

referred to as the pseudo-temperature. The development is analogous to the kinetic theory of gases, with the primary differences being that in a granular-fluid the collisions are driven by the inhomogeneity in the mean flow, and energy is lost via internal dissipation during imperfectly elastic granular collisions.

One of the essential ingredients in the development of these theories was the recognition that the distribution of collisions is anisotropic in a shear flow even though the distribution of grains may be homogeneous. The simple explanation for this is that grains being pushed together by the mean flow are more likely to collide than grains which are being separated from each other by the mean flow.

Savage, Jenkins, and Jeffrey's basic approach is to define the stresses and energy dissipation in terms of integrals over all probable collisions. By assuming a single particle velocity distribution function, and a complete pair distribution function for two particles at contact, these integrations can be carried out.

Savage and Jeffrey assume the single particle velocity distribution function to be Maxwellian about the mean velocity. They derive a complete pair distibution function to be a function of:

 $R=D\frac{dU}{dz} \overline{(v^{\mu})}$ = the mean shear characteristic velocity divided by the rms precollisional velocity perturbation. They can then numerically integrate the collision integrals

ORRECTED PAGE

for arbitrary R. Unfortunately, R is not determined, but must be guessed or measured for a given flow of any granular material.

Jenkins and Savage modified the theory by assuming the collision distribution function, A, to be linear in the velocity gradient. They suggest using the form:

$$V = 1 - \frac{\alpha \overline{K} \cdot \overline{U}_{12}}{\sqrt{\pi \Theta}}$$

ā

2-22

2-24

where \bar{u}_{12} is the relative velocity of colliding grains, \bar{K} is the vector connecting the center of the two grains at collision, and $\alpha(N)$ is an unknown function. This is a simple form which captures the ideas about collision anisotropy expressed above. After carrying out the necessary integrations the following expressions are obtained by Jenkins and Savage:

$$\overline{T} = \frac{\sqrt{\pi\Theta} \kappa}{D} \overline{I} - \frac{\kappa(2+\alpha)}{5} (tr(\overline{T})\overline{1} + 2\overline{T})$$
 2-23

$$\gamma = \frac{\kappa (1-e)}{2D^2} (120 - (3\pi + 4\alpha)D \frac{\sqrt{0}}{\sqrt{\pi}} tr(\bar{T})) \qquad 2-25$$

where
$$\kappa = 2\rho_s N g_0(N)\Gamma(1+e) \frac{\sqrt{5}}{\sqrt{\pi}}$$
, 2-26

$$g_0(N) = \frac{1}{1-N} + \frac{3N}{2(1-N)^2} + \frac{N^2}{2(1-N)^3} = \frac{N(2-N)}{(1-N)^3}, \quad 2-27$$

e is the coefficient of elasticity of the granular material, and Θ is the pseudo-temperature.

The relative importance of the interstitial fluid can be estimated in the context of this theory as the ratio between the "effective" granular viscosity (the ratio of the shear stress to the shear rate) to the interstitial fluid viscosity.

$$R = \frac{\rho_{s}(1+e)(2+\alpha)DN^{2}\sqrt{0}}{5u(1-N)^{3}\sqrt{\pi}}$$
2-28

This ratio, given by equation 2-28, is analogous to the Bagnold number in the sense that it represents the relative importance of grain-to-grain forces compared to fluid-tograin forces.

The set of equations 2-23 to 2-27 is closed by formulating a conservation equation for mechanical energy. For simple shear flow the energy balance is:

$$(\kappa \Theta')' + T_{XZ}U' - \frac{\delta(1-e)\kappa \Theta}{D^2} = 0$$
 2-29

and the stresses are:

 $T_{xz} = \frac{-\kappa(2+\alpha)}{5} U^{*}$ 2-30a

$$T_{zz} = \frac{\kappa \sqrt{\pi \Theta}}{D}$$
2-30b
and
$$\frac{T_{xz}}{T_{zz}} = \frac{(2+\alpha)U^{4}}{5D\sqrt{\pi \Theta}}$$
2-30c

In equation 2-29, the first term represents the diffusion of mechanical heat, the second term is the generation of mechanical heat by the mean shear, and the last term is the dissipation into actual heat due to imperfectly elastic granular collisions. Somewhat analogous

to the generation of turbulence in a fluid, there is a cascade of energy from the mean shear into fluctuating kinetic energy, and finally into true heat, as suggested by McTigue(1979) and Jenkins and Cowin(1979).

This theory is physically sound, and experimentally testable since there are relatively few empirical constants. The only unknown quantity which can be experimentally determined is the function $\alpha(N)$. This is simple, particularly for the case in which it is assumed constant. Jenkins and Savage's treatment of the granular collisions is idealistic in the sense that rotation of the grains, frictional forces, and multiple collisions are all ignored. The collision anisotropy is also parameterized in a simple manner. Nevertheless, the approach is rational, physically reasonable, and amenable to inclusion of more complicated granular interactions.

2.4 Application of constitutive theories to shear flow

The constitutive relations of McTigue and those of Jenkins and Savage will now be applied to the flow of a granular bed subjected to gravity and traction to its surface, as discussed previously in section 2.1.

An analytic solution using McTigue's constitutive theory is derived. The solutions closely resemble McTigue's solutions for inclined plane flow. The solutions predict a finite thickness of motion, with the concentration

increasing linearly with depth from a minimum (N_{D}) at the surface to a maximum (N_{D}) at the bottom of the moving layer. The velocity is shown to decrease from its maximum (U_{m}) at the surface to zero at the bottom.

An analytic solution presented by Jenkins and Savage (using their constitutive theory) is given because it represents the solution of the granular bed flow in the limit of vanishing gravity. This solution is testable using a parallel plate shear apparatus, as will be discussed in sections 3 and 4. The exact equations of motion using Jenkins and Savage's constitutive theory are solved numerically. The solutions demonstrate the importance of the boundary condition for the pseudo-temperature. It is also shown that there is a depth in the bed at which the pseudo-temperature reaches a minimum, corresponding to a thickness of "thermalization".

2.4.1 Solutions using McTigue's constitutive relations

Combining McTigue's constitutive relations, equation 2-21, with the momentum conservation equations, 2-6, the following equations of motion are obtained:

$$T'_{xz} = 0 = 2\alpha NN'sin(\phi) + K_1[(N_m-N)^{-2}(U')^2]'$$
 2-31a

$$-T'_{zz} = \rho_s Ng = 2\alpha NN' + K_2[(N_m - N)^2 (U')^2]' 2-31b$$

Combining these equations in order to obtain an independent

equation for the volume concentration yields

$$N' = \frac{\rho_s g}{2\alpha (1 - \frac{K_2}{K_1} \sin(\phi))} \equiv \Gamma \qquad 2-32$$

The gradient of N is constant, so the volume concentration is a linear function of depth in the bed. Applying the boundary condition

$$N = N_{o} at z=0$$
 2-33

gives

$$N = N_{A} + \Gamma z \qquad 2-34$$

The volume concentration increases linearly from N at the surface.

The velocity gradient, U', can be solved for by combining equations 2-31 with 2-34 and integrating:

$$-U' = \left(\frac{\alpha \sin(\phi)}{K_{1}}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(N_{m} - N \right) \left(\frac{\tau_{0}}{\alpha \sin(\phi)} + N_{c}^{2} - N_{0}^{2} - 2-35 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

$$2\Gamma N_{c} z - \Gamma^{2} z^{2} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

$$2-35$$

The magnitude of the velocity gradient is a maximum at the surface and decreases with depth, as the concentration increases. The equilibrium stress increases with depth as the dynamic, or dissipative stress, decreases. At some depth the dynamic stresses vanish due to a vanishing velocity gradient. Noting that

 $2\Gamma N_0 z + \Gamma^2 z^2 = N^2 - N_0^2$ 2-36

and combining equations 2-35 and 2-36 (for N<N_m) reveals:

$$U^{1} \longrightarrow 0 \text{ as } \mathbb{N}^{2} \longrightarrow \frac{\tau_{0}}{\alpha \sin(\phi)} + \mathbb{N}_{C}^{2}$$
 2-37

Thus there is a level of vanishing dynamic stress, denoted by $z_{\rm c}$, at which

$$N_{b} = N|_{z=Z_{0}} = (\frac{\tau_{0}}{\alpha \sin(\phi)} + N_{c}^{2})^{\frac{1}{2}}$$
 2-38

To obtain the velocity profile, emation 2-35 can be directly integrated with the application of the boundary conditions:

U=y at z=Ø m	2-39a
U=Ø at z= z	2-39b

to give: $\frac{U}{U_{m}} = \frac{N_{m}N_{b}^{2} \left(\frac{\pi}{2} - \sin^{-1}(\frac{N}{N_{b}})\right) - \frac{2}{3}F^{\frac{3}{2}} - N_{m}NF^{\frac{1}{2}}}{N_{m}N_{b}^{2} \left(\frac{\pi}{2} - \sin^{-1}(\frac{N}{N_{b}})\right) - \frac{2}{3}[F(0)]^{\frac{3}{2}} - N_{m}N_{o}[F(0)]^{\frac{1}{2}}}$

where:

$$F = N_{b}^{2} - N^{2}$$
 2-41
N = N₀ + Γz 2-42

 $U/U_{\rm m}$, $(N - N_{\rm o})/(N_{\rm b} - N_{\rm o})$, $T_{\rm XZ}^{\star}/(T_{\rm XZ}^{\circ} + T_{\rm XZ}^{\star})$, and $T_{\rm XZ}^{\circ}/(T_{\rm XZ}^{\circ} + T_{\rm XZ}^{\star})$ are plotted against nondimensional depth, $z/Z_{\rm o}$, for various values of N_o and N_b in Figure 2-8. It should be noted that neither N_o nor N_c are known a priori.

As the concentration becomes greater with depth, the velocity gradient decreases, maintaining a constant shear stress. The dissipative stress is a maximum at the surface



Figure 2-P. Solutions for velocity, volume concentration, and the dissipative and equilibrium components of the stress, based upon McTigue's constitutive theory. The velocity is normalized by its maximum value, the stresses are normalized by the total stress, and the depth is normalized by the thickness of motion, Z₀.

and approaches zero at z_0 , the level of no motion. The equilibrium stress varies in the opposite sense, and the total shear stress remains constant.

This solution, indicating that the concentration increases linearly with depth in the flow, is similiar to the solutions for inclined plane flow presented by Mctigue(1979). It should be noted, however, that the neither the measurements of Bailard(1978) nor those of Savage(1978) support this theory. Rather, these observations suggest that the concentration is a minimum at the top and bottom of the flow, and a maximum near the middle of the flow.

At the level of no motion the stresses are

$$T_{xz} = -\alpha (N_b^2 - N_c^2) \sin(\phi)$$
 2-43a
$$T_{zz} = -\alpha (N_b^2 - N_c^2)$$
 2-43b

and
$$\frac{T_{xz}}{T_{zz}} = \sin(\phi)$$
 2-43c

As suggested by McTigue(1979) when he analyzed inclined plane flow, one could define a dynamic friction coefficient, tan_{ϕ_1} , such that

$$\sin(\phi) = \tan(\phi_A) \qquad \qquad 2-44$$

as suggested by equation 2-43c. This is in agreement with the suggestion earlier of a dynamic Coulomb yield criterion.

2.4.2 Solutions using the 'kinetic' theory of Jenkins and Savage

Nondimensionalizing terms by D, $\rho_{\rm S}$, and g, the momentum equations 2-30 become

$$\frac{(2+\alpha)}{5} \frac{\kappa U'}{5} = -\tau_0$$
 2-45a

where
$$\kappa = \frac{N^2(2-N)(1+e)}{(1-N)^3} \sqrt{6}$$
 2-450

The energy equation, 2-29, becomes

$$(\kappa \Theta')' - \tau_0 U' - 6(1 - e) \kappa \Theta = 0$$
 2-46

Equations 2-45 and 2-46 are four equations with four unknown functions of depth, z. These equations are subject to the following boundary conditions at z=0:

U = U m	2- 4 7a
N = N _o	2-47b
√π к √Θ = τ _n	2-47c

Boundary conditions a and b are the velocity and concentration at the upper surface of the bed. Boundary condition c indicates the balance between the applied normal stress and the normal stress generated by the deformation of the material. Boundary condition d states that there is no diffusive flux of mechanical temperature at z=0. There is some uncertainty associated with this boundary condition, as discussed by Jenkins and Savage(1983). Since the applied

stresses must result from the interaction of the granularfluid material with a boundary, the nature of this interaction should strongly effect the flux of mechanical temperature at the boundary.

Possibly a more appropriate boundary condition is:

 $\Theta' = D(U')^2$

Equation 2-47e is essentially a dimensional argument that \Im and U' should be of the same order.

2.4.2.1 Analytic solutions using 'kinetic' theory

The set of equations 2-45 to 2-47 can be solved numerically using standard integration techniques. These solutions will be presented below, but first analytic solutions will presented for the limiting case in which the applied normal stress is much greater than the self weight of the granular-fluid material undergoing shearing. This is equivalent to ignoring gravity, thus reducing the problem to be identical to Bagnold's formulation and experiments. The development follows Jenkins and Savage(1983).

The boundary condition 2-47c applied to the integral of equation 2-45b indicates the normal stress is everywhere equal to the applied normal stress as indicated below:

√π κ √θ = τ_m 2-48

The energy equation 2-46 is transformed by substituting κ from equation 2-48 and combining equation 2-

44

2-47e

CORRECTED PAGE

45a :

$$\frac{{}^{T}n}{\sqrt{\pi}} \frac{\Theta'}{\sqrt{\Theta}} + \frac{5\sqrt{\pi}\tau_{0}^{2}\sqrt{\Theta}}{(2+\alpha)\tau_{0}} - \frac{6(1-e)^{T}n\sqrt{\Theta}}{\sqrt{\pi}} = 0$$

^VMaking the variable substitution

$$H^2 = \Theta$$

transforms this equation into

where

$$\zeta = \frac{5\pi \tau_{h}^{2}}{2(2+\alpha)\tau_{n}^{2}} - 3(1 - e)$$
 2-51b

Because gravity has been ignored, there is no limit to the amount of material which can be sheared. The problem can be reformulated at two parallel boundaries moving in opposite directions. The separation distance between the boundaries is 2L, and z=0 is centered midway between the boundaries. The boundary conditions now become:

$$U_{m} = U(L) = -U(-L)$$
 2-52

If K=0, then there is no (mechanical) heat flux through the boundaries, and equations 2-51 have solutions:

 $U' = \frac{U_{m}}{L}$ 2-53

 $N = N_0$

$$H = \frac{U_{m}}{L} \frac{(\frac{2+\alpha}{30(1-e)})^{1/2}}{(\frac{2+\alpha}{30(1-e)})}$$

The flow is simple shear flow, with constant volume concentration, temperature, and shear rate. The stresses are

2-49

45

2-50

2-54

2-55

given by:

$$T_{xz} = \frac{F(U')^2 (2+\alpha)^{\frac{3}{2}} (1+e)}{5\sqrt{30}(1-e)\pi}$$

$$T_{zz} = \frac{F(U')^2 (2+\alpha) (1+e)}{30(1-e)}$$
2-56b

where

$$F = \frac{N^2(2-N)}{(1-N)^3}$$
 2-57

These results are completely consistent with Bagnold's. The primary difference is that the empirical functions of concentration determined by Bagnold have been replaced by the analytic expressions of equations 2-56 and 2-57.

The stress ratio is also constant, and given by

$$\frac{T_{x2}}{T_{zz}} = \frac{\tau_0}{\tau_n} = \left(\frac{6(1-e)(2+\alpha)}{5\pi}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$$
 2-58

For the more general case of K>Ø equations 2-51 and boundary condition 2-52 have solutions

$$U = U_{m} \frac{\sin(\sqrt{R_{z}})}{\sin(\sqrt{R_{L}})}$$
 2-59

$$H = \frac{U_m (2+\alpha) \sqrt{K} \tau_n \cos(\sqrt{K}z)}{5\sqrt{\pi} \tau_n \sin(\sqrt{K}L)}$$
 2-60

In order to determine the stress ratio it is necessary to specify the heat flux at the boundaries:

$$q(L) = -q(-L) \equiv Q$$
 2-61

where $q = -\kappa \theta' = \frac{-\tau_n}{\sqrt{\pi}} \frac{\theta'}{\theta}$ from equation 2-48 2-62

From equations 2-60 and 2-61 :

$$Q = \frac{\tau_n^2 U_m 2(2+\alpha)K}{5\pi \tau_0}$$
2-63
so τ_0 / τ_n is given by:

$$2 \frac{\tau_0}{\tau_n} = \frac{Q}{U_m} + \left(\frac{Q^2}{\tau_n^2 U_m^2} + \frac{24(1-e)(2+\alpha)}{5\pi}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$$
 2-64

Expressing H and U in terms of Q, $\tau_{\rm n}$, and U_m gives:

$$U = U_{m} \frac{\sin(\sqrt{K_{z}})}{\sin(\sqrt{K_{L}})}$$
 2-65

where
$$H_m = \frac{Q\sqrt{\pi}}{2\tau_n} / Ksin(\sqrt{KL})$$
 2-66b

and where K is defined by equation 2-51c. For K>0, Q is positive, indicating fluctuation energy is lost through the boundaries. Energy enters the flow as the moving boundaries do work on the mean flow. The energy is converted via granular collisions into fluctuation (kinetic) energy, which in turn is either dissipated into true heat or diffuses through the boundaries. From equations 2-40c and 2-46, for increasingly elastic (higher e) collisions, Q increases. Since less kinetic energy is dissipated during collisions, more is lost through the boundaries.

For K< 0, equation 2-51 has solutions:

$$U = U_{m} \frac{\sinh(\sqrt{R_z})}{\sinh(\sqrt{R_L})}$$
 2-67

$$H = H_{m} \frac{\cosh(\sqrt{K_{2}})}{\cosh(\sqrt{KL})}$$
where $H_{m} = \frac{\sqrt{\pi Q}}{2 \tau_{m} \sqrt{K} \tanh(\sqrt{KL})}$
2-68b

These solutions correspond to the case where fluctuation energy is highly dissipated by granular collisions, and the boundary must act as a direct source of fluctuation energy.

Examples of the velocity, concentration, and temperature profiles are plotted for the cases of K=0, K>0, and K<0, in Figure 2-9.

For K>Ø, the temperature and shear reach their maximums at the center of the flow, where N is at its minimum. The collisions between relatively inelastic grains dissipate more energy than is available from the mean shear, so macroscopic heat must diffuse inward from the boundaries. For K<Ø, the situation is the opposite: collisions between highly elastic grains generate more fluctuation energy than they dissipate, so macroscopic heat diffuses outward towards the boundaries.

At this point it is useful to consider the function ^(a)(N) which parameterizes the collision anisotropy discussed earlier. As mentioned, the theory of Savage and Jeffrey(1981) is consistent with that of Jenkins and Savage(1983) for the case where the precollisional velocity fluctuation is large compared to the mean velocity. Savage

CORRECTED PAGE

and Jeffrey derive the anisotropy function to be

 $A = \operatorname{erfc} \left(\frac{\overline{K} \cdot \overline{U}}{\sqrt{\Theta_{s}}} \right)$

where

$$\operatorname{erfc}(x) = \frac{2}{\pi} \int_{x}^{\infty} e^{-\frac{x^{2}}{\sqrt{\pi}}} dt = 1 - \operatorname{erf}(x) \qquad 2-69b$$
$$= 1 - \frac{2}{\sqrt{\pi}} e^{-x^{2}} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{2^{n} x^{2n+1}}{1 \cdot 3 \cdots 2n+1}$$

Assuming the argument is small, a linear form is adopted for erfc(x) retaining only the first term in $\tilde{K} \cdot \tilde{U} / \sqrt{\Theta \pi}$

2-69a

 $A = 1 - 2 \frac{\overline{K} \cdot \overline{U}}{\sqrt{6\pi}}$ 2-69c

In this approximation we find $\alpha = 2$. Although $\overline{K} \cdot \overline{U}$ is not always much less than $\sqrt{\partial \pi}$ this approximation gives some idea of the order of magnitude of α .

Using a value of $\alpha = 5, \tau / \tau$ can be calculated from equation 2-58 for the gravity free shear flow discussed earlier. For glass grains, e is approximately 9.9, giving:

$$\frac{\tau_{\theta}}{\tau_{n}} = \frac{6(1-.9)(2+5)}{5\pi} = 0.52$$
 2-70

This value is close to measurements of the stress ratio to be discussed is section 4.

2.4.2.2 Numerical solutions using 'kinetic' theory

Returning now to the semi-infinite granular bed described earlier, equations 2-45 and 2-46 can be combined



Figure 2-9. Analytic solutions for the velociy, volume concentration, and pseudo-temperature based upon the constitutive theory of Jenkins and Savage (in the limit of $g \rightarrow 0$). Values are normalized by the maximum values. a) no heat flux through the boundary, b) heat flux out of the material(K>0), c) heat flux into the material(K<0).

and simplified by redefining κ as:

where
$$c = \frac{1+e}{\sqrt{\pi}}$$
 2-71b

and
$$F = \frac{N^2(2-N)}{(1-N)^3}$$
 2-71c

By introducing the definition:

$$I = \Theta'$$
 2-72

the following equations are obtained:

$$F' = \Theta^{-1} \left(\frac{N}{C \sqrt{\pi}} - FI \right)$$
 2-73

$$I' + I\left(\frac{F}{F} + \frac{I}{2\Theta}\right) + \frac{5\tau_0^2}{(2+\alpha)c^2F^2\Theta} -6(1-e)\Theta = 0$$
 2-74

$$U' = \frac{-5\tau_0}{(2+\alpha)cF_{\nu}\Theta}$$
 2-75

Equations 2-73 to 2-75 can be numerically integrated with the application of appropriate boundary conditions (equation 2-47) at the upper surface of the flow. As mentioned earlier, the energy flux through the boundary and hence boundary condition for Θ ' is not well understood. For this reason solutions are presented for both boundary conditions 2-47d and 2-47e.

Some examples of the numerical solutions for U,N, and Θ are given in Figure 2-12. In this figure, $\alpha = 5$ and e=0.9. The integration was stopped at a depth of ten grain diameters.



Figure 2-10. Numerical solutions for the velocity, volume concentration, and pseudo-temperature based upon the constitutive theory of Jenkins and Savage. The velocity and pseudo-temperature are normalized by their maximum values. Depth in the bed is nondimensionalized by the grain diameter. In all solutions a=5. For a): $\tau_0=5$, $\tau_n=10$,0'=0 at z=0; b): $\tau_0=5$, $\tau_n=10$, $0'=-D(U')^2$ at z=0; c): $\tau_0=5.8$, $\tau_n=10$, 0'=0 at z=0.

As illustrated earlier in the analytic solutions, there is a positive correlation between U' and θ , and a negative correlation between U' and N. The first condition arises because the mean shear is the source of energy for velocity fluctuations. The second correlation simply reflects the dilatent behavior of granular materials.

Figures 2-10a and 2-10b illustrate that the nature of the flow depends upon the stress ratio and energy flux at the upper boundary. With $\theta'=0$ and N_o kept constant, a high value of $\frac{\tau_o}{\tau_n}$ results in (Figure 2-10c) N increasing with depth, while U' and θ decrease with depth. A lesser $\frac{\tau_o}{\tau_n}$ (Figure 2-10a) results in the opposite trends.

This is explained by examining the amount of energy converted from the mean shear into fluctuation energy, relative to the amount of energy dissipated in the collisions. Taking the ratio of these two quantities (from equations 2-74 and 2-75) gives

$$\Delta E = \frac{(2+\alpha)(U')^2}{30(1-e)\Theta} = \frac{5\tau_0^2}{6(1-e)(2+\alpha)c^2F^2\Theta^2}$$
 2-76

If $\Delta E \neq 1$, then in order to conserve energy, there must be a vertical diffusion of fluctuation energy. Rewriting ΔE in terms of the applied stresses it is found that at the upper boundary:

$$\Delta E \Big|_{z=0} = \frac{5\pi}{6(2+\alpha)(1-e)} (\frac{\tau_{e}}{\tau_{n}})^{2}$$
 2-77

If ΔE is greater than 1 (high $\frac{\tau_0}{\tau_n}$), then there is an excess of fluctuation energy which diffuses downward into

the material. As a consequence, the pseudo-temperature and shear must decrease with depth, and the concentration must increase, as seen in Figure 2-10c. If ΔE is less than one, then the opposite effects must occur, as in Figure 2-10a. Figure 2-10b demonstrates that a low stress ratio at the boundary can be compensated for by allowing the boundary to act as a source of fluctuation energy (Θ '<0).

It is interesting to note that ΔE is proportional to the stress ratio (see equation 2-30c), and must therefore decrease with depth as a consequence of the self-weight of the grains. Eventually ΔE will reach a value less than one, and fluctuation energy will have to be conducted into this region. For any given flux at the surface, there is a finite depth to which the energy can be conducted, since it will continually be lost (below the depth where $\Delta E=1$). At this depth the pseudo-temperature will be at its minimum. Below this depth, the energy conservation equation can only be satisfied if there is a source of energy somewhere below.

This is unreasonable for the semi-infinite granular bed, so it must be assumed that the equations of motion are no longer valid below the maximum depth toward which fluctuation energy can diffuse. Physically, this is due to the concentration increasing and the pseudo-temperature decreasing to such an extent that the grains are 'frozen' into a rigid packing. This depth is clearly analogous to the level of no motion, but in the context of this theory, it is the depth at which $\Theta' = \emptyset$, or the level of 'thermalization'.
3. Experimental considerations

An apparatus capable of measuring the large stresses and dilatency effects typical of granular-fluid materials undergoing rapid shear deformation was constructed in order to experimentally study the validity of a dynamic yield criterion and evaluate the constitutive theories of section 2.3.

The granular materials chosen for study in this apparatus were spherical glass beads and natural sand. In accordance with the theoretical developments previously presented, the majority of the experiments involved the shearing of spherical glass beads in air. However, because many granular flows of interest involve nonspherical grains, and immersing fluids with densities comparable to that of the grains, series of experiments were also run using water as the immersing fluid, and sand as the granular material.

3.1 Apparatus

An annular, parallel plate shear cell, sometimes called a ring, annular ring, or torsional shear cell, is shown schematically in Figure 3-1. The design closely follows that of Carr and Walker (1868), and Savage (1978). The primary modification is that the outer wall is clear, allowing for direct visual observations.



Figure 3-1. Schematic of annular shear cell

apparatus.

Shearing takes place in a 4.4 centimeter wide annular gap centered at a radius of 12.4 centimeters. The area of a horizontal slice through the annulus was 341 square centimeters. The at rest volume of the material studied ranged from about 200 to 1000 cubic centimeters.

The upper and lower plates were roughened by cementing with epoxy one to two grain layers of the material being sheared to each surface. The side walls were smooth, and rotated rigidly with the lower plate, which was belt driven by a variable speed motor. The upper plate was free to move vertically, but restrained from rotating by a linkage to a strain gage. A counterweight system allowed variation of the applied normal stress.

The outer wall was clear acrylic, protected by a thin, replaceable, clear polycarbonate inner lining. This allowed for direct visual observation of the boundary between the shearing and nonshearing regions, when such a boundary existed.

For any given experiment the independent variables were: the applied normal stress, τ_n ; the rotation rate of the bottom plate with its annular ring; and total mass of the granular-fluid material. The measured dependent variables were: the force exerted by the upper plate on the strain gage, F; the displacement of the upper plate; and the location of the boundary between the shearing and nonshearing regions, if it existed. Calculated variables include: the normal stress at the boundary between the

shearing and nonshearing regions (from eq. 2-8b); the mean shear stress, τ_0 , (from eq. 4~2); the average, or nominal volume concentration in the shearing region, N, defined as the mass of material in the region divided by the volume of the region; and the nominal shear rate, defined as the difference in velocity between upper and lower plate divided by the thickness of the shearing region.

3.2 Material description

The granular materials used in this study were spherical glass beads and natural sand. The sand was obtained from Boomer Beach in La Jolla, California. The sand is a well rounded, quartz sand, and is described by Inman(1953). The sand was washed and sieved into the size fraction which was used in the experiments. The upper and lower sieve mesh sizes were .594 mm and .500 mm, giving the sand a nominal diameter of .55 mm. The glass beads were purchased from Potters Industries of New Jersey and the Ferro Corporation of North Carolina. Because the beads had a large variation in the degree of their sphericity, only the most spherical grains were used. These grains were separated from the less spherical ones by rolling them down a smooth plane inclined at approximately two degrees from horizontal. The beads were also sieved to obtain nearly uniform sizes. The upper and lower mesh sizes for the nominal 1.1 mm spheres were 1.189 mm. and 1.6 mm. The upper

and lower mesh sizes for the nominal 1.85 mm spheres were 2.0 mm and 1.7 mm.

The densities of the various materials were determined by measuring the amount of water displaced in a 100 ml. graduated cylinder by a known mass of material.

The physical characteristics of the materials are given in Table 3-1.

3.3 Experimental plan

Given three different materials and two immersing fluids, there were six possible combinations of granular material and interstitial fluid. Depending upon the amount of material and the conditions to which it was subjected, two types of flow were observed. In one case, all of the material in the annulus sheared. In the second case, only a portion of the material sheared, while the rest of the material remained locked in rigid body rotation below the shearing grains. These two cases are referred to as fully and partially shearing. The differences between them will be discussed in section 4. For each type of flow, the applied normal stress and the velocity of the lower boundary could be independently controlled, as described above.

The basic procedures for the experiments are as follows:

A pre-weighed amount of granular material was placed in the shear cell. For the partially shearing experiments,

Material	Nominal	Density			
	Diameter (mm)	(gm/cm ³)			
Spherical	1.1	2.5			
glass beads	1.85	2.8			
Natural, well rounded	0.55	2.6			

...

quartz sand

¥.

•••

.

Table 3-1. Characteristics of the granular materials.

60

η

chalk dust was placed on the side wall. After applying a known normal stress, the material was pre-stressed and consolidated by slowly shearing it back and forth for five cycles. The initial at rest volume of the material was recorded along with the zero offset of the strain gage. The shearing was begun by slowly increasing the speed of rotation of the bottom assembly to the desired level. After steady state was reached (about 5-15 seconds), the period of rotation, the output of the strain gage, and the displacement of the upper plate were recorded. The motor speed was then reduced slowly to zero. The level of no motion was recorded for the partially shearing experiments by measuring where the chalk dust had been rubbed off of the side wall. The material was then post-stressed and consolidated as before. The final at rest volume of the granular material and the zero offset of the strain gage were recorded again. If these values deviated from the initial values, then the averages of the two were used in later calculations.

The entire process was repeated for a variety of applied normal stresses and speeds. For the fully shearing experiments the speed was adjusted to maintain the same volume concentration over a range of applied normal stresses. For these experiments, the normal stress and the associated speeds of rotation were changed without bringing the system to a halt after it was determined the results thus obtained were the same as when the shearing was stopped

after each run.

For the experiments in which water was the interstitial fluid, water was added to the system as the material dilated. This was done in order to maintain the fluid level even with the surface of the upper plate, and thus avoid any buoyancy effect on the plate (which would introduce uncertainty in the applied normal stress).

3.4 Measurment systems

The variables which were directly measured were the mass and the initial, at rest volume of the granular material, the change in volume of this material during shear, the torque transmitted by the granular material from the lower rotating plate to the upper fixed plate, the rotational period of the lower plate and attached side walls, and the thickness of the shearing region while shear was occuring and afterwards, when it was at rest.

The total mass of the granular material was measured using a pan balance accurate to 0.1 grams. The at rest volume of this material was calculated from measurements of the height of the material in the annulus of the shear apparatus. The resolution of this measurement was 0.05 centimeters, corresponding to a volume of 17 cubic centimeters. The change in volume during shearing was calculated by measuring the vertical displacement of the upper plate with a machinist's gage accurate to 0.0013

centimeters. Note that this measurement was made without stopping the rotation. The torque exerted on the upper plate was measured be means of a strain gage mounted on a steel beam. This instrument, with its associated electronics, produces a signal linearly proportional to the transverse force applied to the beam. A calibration curve is shown in Figure 3-2. As seen, the instrument is quite linear, with a correllation coefficient of 0.99996. The mechanical linkage between the shear apparatus and the strain gage is shown schematically in Figure 3-3. Referring to Figure 3-3, the force applied to the strain gage beam, F, is:

F=Torque x R

3-1

3-2

where:

Torque = $\sum_{n=1}^{r_2} T_{XZ}(r) 2\pi r r dr$

In performing this calculation it was assumed $T_{\chi_Z}(r)$ was constant across the annular gap for a given experiment. If, in fact, $T_{\chi_Z}(r)$ was a linear or quadratic function of r, the assumption of a constant T_{χ_Z} results in errors of 2 and 4 per cent, respectively, for T_{χ_Z} at the mean radius. The resolution in measuring T_{χ_Z} was 0.001 volts, corresponding to approximately 10 dyne/cm² for T_{χ_Z} .

The speed of rotation of the lower plate, and hence the maximum velocity, was measured by a frequency counter coupled to a magnetically actuated switch. A magnet was attached to the rotating disk. Each time the magnet passed the switch, the counter triggered and counted the time until



Figure 3-2. Strain gage calibration curve.

7

64

ŀ



The force measured by the gage is equal to the torque exerted by the upper plate times the moment arm, R. the next trigger. The accuracy of this method was 0.001 seconds, corresponding to a speed resolution of 0.1 cm/sec.

In order to visually record the thickness of the shearing region, the outer wall of the apparatus was made of clear plastic. The method used was to apply chalk dust to a section on the inside of the outer wall. The shearing grains wiped the chalk dust off the wall, while the nonshearing grains left the chalk dust unaltered. The method was verified by placing columns of dyed grains at various positions inside the annulus and, subsequent to shearing, excavating to examine for the depth at which the column of dyed grains remained intact. Both methods gave the same results, indicating the side wall effects were probably quite small for this type of flow. The resolution of this method was approximately one grain diameter.

The accuracies of all of these measurement systems are summarized in Table 3-2. The accuracies are also expressed as a fraction of a typical measurement.

3.5 Approximations and assumptions

In attempting to experimentally study the flow described in section 2 there are several assumptions made and approximations used. The primary areas of concern are the effects of rotation, the local influence of the side wall boundaries, the effects of the interstitial fluid, and unsteadiness in the flow.

67

Measurement	Resolution	Accuracy %
Mass of granular		
material	Ø.l gram	0.001
Displacement of		
upper plate	Ø.0013 cm	1.7
Location of		
internal boundary	0.05 cm	1.25
Shear stress	10 dyne/cm ²	Ø.2
Normal stress	70 dyne/cm2	1.4
Nominal shear rate	0.5 cm/sec	1.4
Nominal volume		
concentration	0.017	3.8

Table 3-2. Maximum errors in the measurement systems.

y

3.5.1 Effects of rotation

The flows considered in section two were purely two dimensional, that is, there was no dependence upon the cross stream direction. The experimental apparatus, however, because of its rotational nature, introduces the possible complications of radial dependence of the field variables. The two most worrisome complications are centrifugal effects, and a non-uniform shear rate across the gap.

The tendency for a non-uniform shear rate is reduced by decreasing the ratio of the width of the annular gap to its mean radius. For this apparatus the ratio was 0.35, giving a maximum deviation in velocity from that at the mean radius of 15 percent. It would have been desirable to either reduce the width of the annular gap or increase the mean radius. Unfortunately, both of these options were precluded by other considerations. The gap width could not be further reduced because a narrower gap would limit the number of grains in the cross flow direction to such a small number that the continuum assumption would be questionable. Furthermore, since it was unknown whether or not the side walls influence the local flow, it was desirable to have as wide a gap as possible to minimize such effects on the overall flow. The mean radius could not be increased because the funds available were insufficient to cover the costs of manufacturing a larger unit.

The effects of radial accelleration, or so called centrifugal effects, were always present to some extent, but rotational speeds and applied normal stresses were selected to insure that the centrifugal stress was always much less than the normal stress. This imposed an upper limit on the maximum velocity for each applied normal stress. This limit is shown in Figure 3-4, where the centrifugal stress is 25 percent of the normal stress.

Savage and Sayed (1983) measured secondary (radial) flows of granular-fluid materials in a nearly identical apparatus. They concluded these flows were quite small compared with the primary flow, and did not effect the stress measurements.

Since the interstitial fluid does not support an anisotropic normal stress, the centrifugal forces could have a significant upon the dynamics of the interstitial fluid. This will be discussed futher in section 3.6 on data quantity and quality.

3.5.2 Boundary wall effects

The mechanics for stress transfer at a solid wall boundary are probably different from those in the interior of the flow, because the wall is relatively massive and unmovable compared to a grain. In fact, the influence of the boundary is expected to be related to its surface roughness, as well as its rigidity. For a rough boundary,



Figure 3-4. The velocity at which the centrifugal stress is 25% of the normal stress is plotted as a function of the normal stress, for D=1.1mm, and $p_s=2.5$ gm/cm³.

one might expect the traditional "no slip" condition to be valid. But at a smooth boundary it is much more likely that slip occurs between the wall and the nearest grains. In this case a "no stick" condition may be more appropriate. The distinction between the no slip and no stick conditions depends upon the frictional nature of the granular-fluid material and the wall material.

For these experiments the side walls were smooth aluminum and smooth polycarbonate, both coated with a thin layer of teflon. The upper and lower boundaries, on the other hand, were roughened with one to two layers of the granular material being studied.

It is assumed that the side walls are slippery, and the upper and lower shearing surfaces do not allow slip. Thus the boundary conditions applied at the top and bottom of the flow are that the flow velocities approach the boundary velocities. The validity of the assumption that the side wall is slippery is supported by the measurements of the thickness of motion which were discussed in the previous section.

3.5.3 Interstitial fluid effects

As discussed in section 2, the effects of the interstitial fluid on the dynamics of rapidly flowing granular-fluid materials have been assumed to be negligible. The validity of this seemingly gross assumption can be judged

by considering the work of Bagnold(1954). Bagnold found that for granular concentrations greater than approximately 10 per cent, the granular-fluid resistance to shear was always much greater than the viscosity of the purely fluid phase. Bagnold separated the behavior of a granular fluid into two limiting cases, the macro-viscous regime, and the grain-inertia regime.

In the macro-viscous regime, stresses are transmitted by interstitial fluid friction, and are therefore dependent upon the fluid viscosity. In the graininertia regime, stresses are transmitted by intergranular collisions and are independent of the fluid viscosity. The Bagnold number, defined by equation 2-15, and representing the ratio of the inertial to the viscous forces, can be used to characterize the flow as either viscous, collisional, or intermediate. Bagnold found that for B <40 the flow is entirely in the macro-viscous regime, and for B>450 it is in the grain-inertia regime. Bagnold refers to the region between ranges as the transition region.

In the present experiments, granular concentrations are always greater than 0.2. Bagnold numbers can be computed based upon mean granular concentration and nominal shear rates. These numbers are given in Table 3-3. Clearly all the flows involving air as the immersing fluid are in the grain inertia regime. On the other hand, flows involving water as the interstitial fluid range from the transitional to the grain inertia regimes, as will be shown

Bagnold numbers

.....

<u>In air</u>

. –

14,000-161,000

In water

1.1 mm spheres	
fully shearing	348-2500
partially shearing	273-882

1.85 mm spheres
fully shearing 870-3422
partially shearing .247-1186

Ø.55 mm sand 280-666

partially shearing

Table 3-3. Range in Bagnold numbers for the various

sets of experiments, where :

$$B = \rho_s D^2 \lambda^{\frac{1}{2}} \frac{dU}{dz} / \mu$$

For B>450, the data lie in the grain inertia region.

73

in section 4.

3.5.4 Unsteadiness

In general, the flows reached a steady state after a few seconds of shearing. However, there were two identifiable sources of unsteadiness. The first resulted from an imperfectly designed apparatus, the second is believed to be a consequence of the mechanics of deformation of some granular-fluid materials.

The first source of unsteadiness was the insertion of a grain or grain fragment between the fixed upper plate and the rotating side wall. This caused a temporary jamming of the apparatus, and a subsequent "ringing" type of behavior after the grain was fractured or dislodged. If this behavior was observed, the experiment was stopped, the grain fragment removed(if it could be found), and the experiment repeated.

The second observation of unsteadiness resembled a "stick-slip" behavior, and occured at low shear rates. When this behavior occured, the rotation rate alternately slowed down and speeded up. This sort of behavior has been reported by Cheng and Richmond (1978) for suspensions of grains, but it is not completely understood. In the present experiments, it is believed this behavior results when the material alternately dilates and compresses, causing a decrease or increase in the material's resistance to shear.

This behavior was observed for glass spheres only near the threshhold stress for initial yield. For sand, however, the behavior was observed from the yield point up to shear rates of approximately 40 seconds⁻¹. Presumably this is related to the angularity of the sand, and the preferred orientation, or fabric, which the material develops during shearing. This interesting phenomenon merits future study, but since it complicates the interpretation of the steady flow problem, the shear rates were restricted to avoid this unsteady complication.

3.6 Quantity and quality of data

A summary of the quantity of the various experiments is given in Table 3-4. In general, the experiments involving glass spheres were consistent and repeatable. These data reveal clear trends and form the basis of most of the discussion in the next section.

In contrast, the experiments on sand, and those on 1.1 mm glass spheres with water, were less consistent. Due to both a lack of foresight and financial restrictions, the shear cell was designed to study only those granular-fluid materials having diameters ranging from 0.5 mm to 3 mm. Natural beach sand, being somewhat angular, has some cross sections much less than .5 mm. In order to prevent the sharp edges of the sand grains from jamming into the gap between the Delrin lip and the side wall (see Figure 3-1), the

Delrin was replaced with a tighter fitting and more durable stainless steel lip. This worked satisfactorily for dry sand, but caused a secondary problem for the wet experiments. Normally when shearing begins, the granularfluid material dilates and the upper plate moves upward. Air or water flows downward between the lip of the upper plate and the side wall to fill the voids created between the grains. For the experiments on wet sand, water could not flow freely between the stainless steel lip and the replaceable polycarbonate lining on the inside of the outer wall. The result was that the lining deformed, creating a tight seal with the steel lip. This caused a pressure deficit within the granular-fluid material, and prevented any dilation. This introduced a great uncertainty in the value of the normal stress, and lesser uncertainties for the shear stress and volume concentration. This set of data(sand-water) must be considered to be of very poor quality, and therefore of little value in evaluating the constitutive behavior or the yield criterion.

Experiments on sand in air had similiar problems related to the frictional nature of angular, quartz grains. The interaction with the side wall was frictional, so the 'slippery' boundary condition at the side walls is suspect. The measurents of the shear stress could have been biased by this effect, since stress could be transferred from the side walls to the granular meterial.

1 22

The second set of experiments in which the quality is suspect involves the full shearing of 1.1 mm glass spheres in water. In order to fully shear the material the minimum depth of the annular gap had to be decreased by raising the lower boundary. This was done by inserting into the annulus a 2 cm thick plexiglass toroid. This insert could have had some subtle effects upon the flow. For example, if the toroid surface was not exactly parallel to the upper plate, then the material would be forced to alternately compress and dilate. A second problem for this set of experiments could be the effect of radial forces on the interstitial fluid. Although the centrifugal forces were small compared to the intergranular forces, they were large compared to the interstitial fluid pressure. In response to the centrifugal force, the fluid should flow outward to develop a radial pressure gradient as seen in Figure 3-5. This could have provide some bouyancy to the upper plate, and consequently some error in the normal stress calculation. Furthermore, it is possible as air gap existed in the shearing region as shown in Figure 3-5. For these reasons, this data set should be regarded with some suspicion.

In summary, the 124 experiments involving glass spheres in air, the 29 experiments involving 1.85 mm glass spheres in water, and the 10 partially shearing experiments involving 1.1 mm glass spheres in water are thought to be of good quality. The 41 experiments involving sand and the 18



interstitial fluid would be to create an air pocket near the inner wall.

fully shearing experiments involving 1.1 mm glass spheres in water are of lower quality.

<u>In Air</u>	Experiments							
1.1 mm fully shearing	36	0.37-0.56						
<pre>1.1 mm partially shearing</pre>	50	0.29-0.61						
1.85 mm fully shearing	18	0.44-0.49						
1.85 mm partially shearing	20	0.30-0.53						
0.55 mm sand	22	0.43-0.58						
subtotal 146								
In Water								

. .

Number of

Range in N

1.1 mm fully shearing	18	0.55-0.58
1.1 mm partially shearing	10	0.64-0.67
1.85 mm fully shearing	12	0.50-0.51
1.85 mm partially shearing	17	0.50-0.53
0.55 mm sand	19	0.56-0.59

subtotal 76

total 222

Table 3-4. Summary of the number of experiments of each type, and the range in volume concentrations in the experiments.

AD UN	- A 1 35	463 F I E D	STUDIES GRANULA LA JOLL	ON TH R-FLUI A D M	E MECHA D MATER HANES	ANICS D RIALS(U 1983 N	F RAPII) CALII 00014-1	OLY FLO ORNIA 33-C-01	WING UNIV S 82 F	AN DIE /g 20/	GO 4	2/2 1L	
			*						END				
					1								
· ·													
								·					



4. Results and discussion

The experimental results have application to several aspects of granular-fluid flow, including the constitutive behavior, and the applicability of a dynamic Coulomb yield criterion in predicting the location of the boundary between shearing and nonshearing grains. These data can also be examined with regard to the differences between fully shearing flows and flows in which there is an internal boundary separating shearing and nonshearing regions (partially shearing flow). Lastly, effects of the interstitial fluid, and an effect of grain shape are suggested by the experimental observations.

The data support the concept that the stresses are nonlinearly dependent upon the shear rate, for flows in which the effects of the interstitial fluid are negligible. The stresses were found to be weakly dependent upon the volume concentration up to approximately 0.45. Above this concentration the stresses were found to be strongly dependent on the volume concentration. These results are consistent with Bagnold's (1954) measurements, although the material constants are slightly different. The theory of Jenkins and Savage(1983) correctly predicts the dependence of the stresses upon the shear rate. Their predicted functional dependence of the stresses upon the volume concentration has the proper trend, but it underpredicts the

stresses for volume concentrations greater than approximately 0.5, unless the influence of the volume concentration on the collision anisotropy is empirically determined from the data.

The stress ratios were found to be approximately constant, with a weak dependence upon the shear rate, and the volume concentration. The application of a dynamic Coulomb yield criterion appears to be valid, although there is significant spread in the data related to the immersed weight of the moving grains.

The stress ratios measured for the fully shearing flows were found to be consistently higher than those measured for the partially shearing flows. Flows in water tended to have higher stress ratios than flows in air, possibly because of the effects of fluid viscosity. Observations that prior flow history affects the subsequent yield for experiments involving sand suggest that angular grains develop a preferred fabric during shearing.

4.1 Constitutive behaviour

The constitutive behavior for the fully shearing experiments is well defined because in these experiments the volume concentration and the shear rate were varied separately. This makes it possible to independently assess the influence of either variable upon the stress state.

The shear stress and the normal stress are shown as a function of the nominal shear rate, U_{D}/Z_{O} , in Figures 4-1 to 4-2. As expected, the stresses are increasing functions of both the volume concentration and the shear rate.

The 1.1 mm glass spheres in air have the curious behavior that the stress appears to be nearly independent of the volume concentration for N<0.45. Savage(1978) observed the same phenomenon, and explained it as resulting from an air gap in the shearing region. Although no such gap was observed for the present experiments, it is possible one existed internally, as diagramed in Figure 4-3.

According to the collision theories discussed in section 2.3, the stresses should have a quadratic dependence upon the shear rate. In Figures 4-4 and 4-5 the natural logarithm of the shear stress (or normal stress) is plotted against the natural logarithm of the shear rate for the same experiments shown in Figures 4-1 and 4-2. In the experiments for which air is the interstitial fluid, the slopes (for constant N) are approximately 2, supporting the predicted quadratic relationship. For the experiments in which water is the interstitial fluid, the slopes vary between 1 and 2. This is consistent with earlier calculations showing that some of these experiments lie in Bagnold's transition regime, where fluid stresses play an important role. The open points in Figure 4-5 indicate the data are in the transition region. In terms of the kinetic



Figure 4-1. Stresses vs shear rate for glass spheres in air. Note the lack of dependence on the volume concentration for N<.5 (for the l.1 mm spheres). 84

A



ş

Figure 4-2. Stresses vs shear rate for glass spheres in water. The open circles indicate data with Bagnold numbers less than 45%.



-

Figure 4-3. Schematic of an gap in the granular material which may have formed at high shear rates and low volume concentrations.

86

Ţ



• • •

Figure 4-4. In stress vs ln shear rate for glass spheres in air (same data as Figure 4-1). A slope of two (at constant N) indicates a quadratic dependence of the stresses upon the shear rate.



Figure 4-5. In stress vs ln shear rate for glass spheres in water (same data as Figure 4-2). Circles indicate data in the Bagnold's transition region (B<450). Slopes (at constant N) lie between one and two, indicating the dependence of the stresses upon the shear rate is between linear and quadratic.
models discussed, it appears that the water partially dampens the grain trajectories, and hence the velocity fluctuations of the grains, thus decreasing the impact during collisions.

The 18 experiments on fully shearing flows of 1.85 mm glass spheres in air are quite similiar to the experiments reported by Savage and Sayed (1983). The only significant difference between the experimental arrangements is that Savage and Sayed roughened the shearing surfaces with sandpaper, rather than cementing the actual grains being studied onto the surfaces as in the present experiments. Because both sets of data indicate the quadratic relationship between shear rate and stress which was originally observed by Bagnold, it would appear that the different surface characteristics both resulted in collisional type flows. However, it should be noted that the actual stress levels were greater in the present experiments than they were in Savage and Sayed's experiments (at equivalent concentrations and shear rates). For example, the shear stress developed by shearing 1.85 mm glass spheres at a concentration of 0.49 were about 3 times higher in the present experiments than those reported by Savage and Sayed for 1.8 mm glass spheres at the same concentration and shear rates. This difference is believed to result from the difference in materials at the upper and lower boundaries of the flow.

89

£

The dependence of the stresses upon the volume concentration is shown in Figures 4-6 to 4-8 as plotted points, together with the prediction curves of Bagnold, and Jenkins and Savage (superimposed), for all of the experiments in which air is the interstitial fluid. For Bagnold's relationship, N_m is the measured maximum volume concentration. For the 1.1mm spheres, $N_m = \emptyset.64$; for the 1.85 mm spheres, $N_m = \emptyset.55$; for the sand, $N_m = \emptyset.61$. The proportionality constants in Bagnold's model and α (assumed constant) in Jenkins and Savage's model are empirically fit, using a minimum squared error criterion. The coefficient of restitution, e, used in Jenkins and Savage's prediction is $\emptyset.9$.

As seen in Figures 4-6 to 4-8, the stresses are only weakly dependent on the concentration up to approximately N=0.5 for the 1.1 mm spheres, and N=0.45 for the 1.85 cm spheres. Above these concentrations the stresses increase rapidly. The Bagnold curves describe this behavior quite well. The Jenkins and Savage curves predict the proper trend, but the curvature at N=0.4 to N=0.5 is not sharp enough. It is important to realize that Bagnold used his experimental results to determine the dependence of the stresses upon N, where Jenkins and Savage derive the dependence on N in the context of their 'kinetic' theory.

4.2 The stress ratio



Figure 4-6. Nondimensional stress vs volume concentration for experiments on 1.1 mm glass spheres in air. The stresses are nondimensionalized by $\rho(DU^{+})^{2}$ in order to isolate the influence of the volume concentration. Curves represent the predictions of Bagnold and of Jenkins and Savage.





Figure 4-8. Nondimensional stress vs volume concentration for experiments on .55 mm sand in air. The stresses are nondimensionalized by $\rho(DU^*)^2$ in order to isolate the influence of the volume concentration. Curves represent the predictions of Bagnold and of Jenkins and Savage.

The stress ratio, $T_{\rm XZ}/T_{\rm ZZ}$, evaluated at the lower boundary of the flow, reveals several consistent trends. The mean stress ratios, and their standard deviations, are given in Table 4-1. The standard deviations are approximately 10 percent of the mean, supporting the concept of a nearly constant stress ratio (over a range of shear rates and applied normal stresses) for a given material. Still, the variation from the means is not random. It correlates well with the shear rate, as will be shown.

Perhaps the most noticeable result is that the stress ratios for the fully shearing experiments are significantly higher than those resulting from the partially shearing flows. In terms of the momentum arguments presented in section 2, this observation indicates that if there were erodable grains at the lower boundary of the fully shearing flow, they would be mobilized into the shear flow. The solid lower boundary, although fully stressed from above, cannot partake in the granular fluctuations which would result in a higher normal stress. Thus there is a deficiency in the normal stress, and the stress ratios for the fully shearing flows.

This observation explains why Savage and Sayed's (1983) measurements of the stress ratio were higher than the dynamic angle of repose of the material. Because all of their experiments involved fully shearing conditions, the values of the stress ratio were higher than expected for a



.

....

Figure 4-9. Stress ratio vs shear rate for glass spheres in air. Note sleight tendency for increasing ratios with increasing shear rate. 95

San Internet



.....

....

. .

. .

Figure 4-18. Stress ratio vs shear rate for glass spheres in water. Note sleight tendency for increasing ratios with increasing shear rate.

Ţ



. . .

......

Figure 4-11. Stress ratio vs shear rate for sand.

•

97

Stress Ratio (mean (standard deviation))

· .

	<u>In air</u>	<u>In water</u>
1.1 mm spheres		
fully shearing	0.63 (9.9%)	0.64 (13.1%)
partially shearing	0.44 (12.5%) Ø.44 (17.8%)
1.85 mm spheres		
fully shearing	0.53 (3.9%)	0.59 (5.9%)
partially shearing	0.41 (8.5%)	0.53 (5.3%)
0.55 mm sand		
partially shearing	0.68 (13.7%) Ø.89 (15.8%)

Table 4-1. The measured stress ratios

stress state close to the yield point. The measured stress ratios, expressed as the inverse tangent of the stress ratio, are compared to the dynamic angle of repose for the various materials used in the present experiments in Table 4-2. The angle of repose consistently lies between the friction angle for the partially shearing flow and the friction angle for the fully shearing flow.

. . .

A second trend noticeable in the measurements of the stress ratio is that the ratios for experiments in which water is the interstitial fluid are sometimes higher (and never lower) than those measured for experiments in which air was the interstitial fluid.

There are at least two explanations for this observation. The simplest explanation is that the deformation of the interstitial water itself generates a much higher shear stress than that generated by the deformation of air. This stress adds to the shear stress generated by granular interactions, resulting in a higher stress ratio. However, because the fluid generated stresses are much smaller than the granular stresses, this explanation is not completely adequate.

A second explanation is is offered in the context of the kinetic theories discussed in section 2. It follows from equations 2-30 and 2-26 that the normal stress varies directly with the pseudo-temperature, while the shear stress depends upon the product of the shear rate and the square root of the pseudo-temperature. One of the effects water

tan¹(mean stress ratio) Dynamic angle of (degrees) repose (degrees) in air in water 1.1 mm spheres fully shearing 32 33 26 partially shearing 24 24 1.85 mm spheres fully shearing 28 31 28 partially shearing 22 28 0.55 mm sand partially shearing 34 42 36

• • •

Table 4-2. The measured friction angles and the dynamic angle of repose for the various materials.

100

has on the flow is that it decreases the pseudo-temperature by damping out vibrational motions, while maintaining the same mean velocities. Thus the stress ratio, which varies as the inverse of the square root of the pseudo-temperature, is higher when water is the interstitial fluid. Probably both the additional shear stress and the damping of granular vibrations due to the interstitial fluid viscosity contribute to the higher stress ratios measured when water was the interstitial fluid.

The dependence of the stress ratio upon the shear rate and volume concentration is shown in Figures 4-9 to 4-11. The ratio tends to increase with increasing shear rate, or decreasing volume concentration, particularly for the partially shearing experiments. This result will be used in the prediction of the immersed weight of the moving grains, in the next section.

4.3 Immersed weight of the shearing grains

In section 2 it was shown that the boundary between the nonshearing grains and the shearing grains in the partially shearing experiments can be explained by the conservation of momentum combined with a dynamic Coulomb yield criterion. The immersed weight of the moving grains was found to be described by:

 $\int_{0}^{z_{0}} (\rho_{s} - \rho_{f}) \operatorname{Ng} dz = \frac{\tau_{0}}{\tan(\phi_{r})} - \tau_{n} \qquad 4-1$

We will refer to the quantity on the left as the bedload,

because of its similarity to the concept of bedload in sediment transport theory.

Unforunately, the bedload is generally a small difference between the relatively large stresses, making its direct calculation somewhat unstable to slight errors in the stress measurements. Nevertheless, the data indicates there is clearly a predictive capability in estimating the bedload.

In applying equation 4-1 to predict the bedload, the results of the previous section are used to empirically express $\tan(\phi_{\mu})$ as a linear function of shear rate:

 $\tan(\phi_{r}) = \tan(\phi_{r_{a}}) + \frac{10}{9} \times U' \qquad 4-2$

The constants $\tan(\phi_{r_o})$ and K can be determined by means of a regression analysis of the measurements of the stress ratio described in the previous section. These constants are given in Table 4-3, along with the regression coefficients.

The measured bedload is compared to equation 4-1 in Figure 4-12. The correlation between equation 4-1 and the measured bedload is 0.664. For comparison, r=0.218 is significant at the .995 level for two random variables with an equivalent number of degrees of freedom. The symbol 'F' in Figure 4-12 represents data obtained under the highest applied normal stress. It is believed that the grains were abrading under these high stresses. The solid circles and numbers represent data obtained with sand, and have large errors associated with them.

103

7

	r	r(99%)	$tan\phi_r$	ĸ
In air				~
1.1 mm spheres				
fully shearing	0.86	Ø.38	0.49	0.068
partially shearing	0.75	0.32	0.34	0.081
1.85 mm spheres				
fully shearing	0.78	0.52	0.46	0.045
partially shearing	Ø.87	Ø.49	0.32	0.069
0.55 mm sand				
partially shearing	-0.42	0.47	Ø.75	-0.060
In water_				
1.1 mm spheres				
fully shearing	0.66	0.52	0.50	0.076
partially shearing	0.94	0.66	0.26	0.442
1.85 mm spheres				
fully shearing	0.80	0.61	0.53	0.060
partially shearing	0.02	0.53	0.53	0.004
0.55 mm sand				
partially shearing	0.61	0.50	0.60	0.490
Table 4-3. Peculte	of tear	eeton	analu	tie hetwe

le 4-3. Results of regression analysis between the measured stress ratios and the shear rates. Terms are defined as: $tan\phi_r = tan\phi_{r_o} + \sqrt{D/g} \ K \frac{dU}{dz}$

Ŧ



Figure 4-12. Measured bedload vs predicted bedload. Prediction (equations 4-1 and 4-2) is based upon the measurements of the stress ratio, and the application of a dynamic Coulomb yield criterion. 104

The mean (for each material) predicted bedload is graphed against the mean measured bedload in Figure 4-13. The agreement is very good, as it should be, because the values of $\tan(\overline{\phi_r})$ used in equation 4-1 are determined by averaging the actual measured values.

The correlations between the shear rate, the volume concentration and the bedload for the partially shearing experiments involving glass spheres are given in Table 4-4. For the dry experiments, the shear rate and the bedload are negatively correlated. This is consistent with the earlier observation of the positive correlation between the shear rate and $\tan \phi_{r}$. However, for the wet experiments, a positive correlation was observed between the shear rate and the bedload, even though the shear rate and $\tan \phi_r$ were still positively correlated (Table 4-3). This apparent paradox is explained by considering the relative importance of the shear stress transmitted by the interstitial fluid. As explained earlier, a more viscous interstitial fluid tends to decrease the pseudo-temperature. Hence both the normal stress, and the component of the shear stress which is generated by granular collisions are lower. The decrease in granular shear stress, however, is partially counterbalanced by an increase in interstitial fluid shear stress. So, as the shear rate increases, more grains can be moved by the increasing interstitial fluid shear stress, and the stress ratio can increase.



. . .

Figure 4-13. Mean measured bedload vs mean predicted bedload (for same data as Figure 4-12).

Dia = 1.1 mm	Dia=1.85 mm
U' N	U' N
Bedload -0.31 0.46 IN	-0.57 0.65
U' / -0.86 AIR	/ -0.83
r(99%) = 0.32	r(99%) = 0.49
Bedload Ø.80 -0.64 IN	Ø.55 -Ø.25
U' / -0.56 Water	/ -0.85
r(99%) = 0.66	r(998) = 0.53
Table 4-4. Correlations between t shear rate, and volume co	he measured bedload, ncentration. The
99% significant correlati	ons are also given.

. .

4.4 The effects of grain angularity

The primary difference between glass spheres and coarse grained sands, in the context of these experiments, is the angularity of the grains. As seen in Figures 4-6 to 4-8 (note different scales), at constant N, the sand develops higher stresses than the spheres, particularly higher shear stresses. The stress ratio (Table 4-1) is significantly higher for sand, as is the angle of repose (Table 4-2).

An interesting effect of angularity was observed while prestressing the material by slowly shearing the material back and forth in an oscillatory manner.

As expected, when glass spheres were sheared in one direction, brought to a stop, and shearing started again in either the same or the opposite direction, the results were completely symmetric with respect to the direction and the sequence. The fact that shearing took place has no observable effect upon subsequent shearing as long as the motion comes to a complete stop between cycles.

For sand, however, some interesting effects of the deformation history on the static yield stress were observed. Furthermore, the effect was different for air or water as the interstitial fluid. In air, the static yield stress required to shear sand in the direction opposite to that in which it was just sheared was the same as the initial yield stress. The static yield stress required to

begin shearing in the same direction as the previous shearing was higher than the intitial yield stress! Presumably, as shearing ceases, the sand grains align into an imbricated fabric which resists relative motion in the direction of shearing, as shown schematically in Figure 4-14. Resumed shearing in the same direction is inhibited by the anisotropically aligned grains; in contrast, motion in the opposite direction need overcome only the usual sliding friction.

When the sand was immersed in water, a different behavior was observed. Resumed shearing in the same direction required the same, or slightly less, stress than the initial yield. Resumed shearing in the opposite direction, in constrast, required a lesser stress to yield, but then the yield was accompanied by a compaction of the material (rather than the usual dilation), and a stress equal to the initial yield stress was required to continue shearing. This can be explained if the grains are left in a loosely packed, but imbricated, state as shearing stops, as shown schematically in Figure 4-15. Resumed shearing in the same direction causes granular contact to steadily increase, so the static yield stress will be required to continue shearing. Resumed shearing in the opposite direction initially has little resistance, until the grains collapse back into a more densely packed state. The yield stress will again then increase to its standard initial value.





5. Conclusions

This work addresses the subset of flows of granular materials known as rapidly flowing, granular-fluid materials. Experiments were conducted in an annular, parallel plate shear cell with two primary goals in mind. The first was to investigate the existence of an internal boundary above which the material deformed rapidly, but below which the material remained rigidly locked in place. The second goal was to examine the constitutive behavior of rapidly flowing granular-fluid materials bounded by parallel, roughened plates. The constitutive theories of McTigue(1979) and Jenkins and Savage(1983) are applied to study the steady, rapid flow of a semi-infinite granular bed under the influence of gravity and traction applied to its surface. Analytic solutions based upon McTigue's theory and numerical solutions based upon Jenkins and Savage's theory both suggest that there is a finite thickness of motion in the bed. For the limiting case where gravity is negligible and the material is fully shearing between parallel plates, the experiments can be directly compared to the analytic solutions given by Jenkins and Savage.

The experiments clearly demonstrate the existence of an internal boundary resulting in a finite thickness of the shearing layer. The thickness was measured to be between 5 and 15 grain diameters. This phenomenon occurs as a simple

result of momentum conservation in a gravity field. The stresses at the boundary between the shearing and the nonshearing regions conform to a dynamic Coulomb yield criterion. For each of the granular-fluid materials, the stress ratios at the boundary, $T_{\rm XZ}/T_{\rm ZZ}$, were measured to be nearly constant, with only a slight dependence upon the shear rate and volume concentration.

The finite thickness of the shearing layer illustrates an important problem in the mechanics of granular materials which should be addressed: the rapid flow regime needs to be systematically related to the less intense quasi-static, or plastic regime of deformation in a continuous and physically meaningful way. This is a difficult task because of the very different mechanisms for momentum transfer and energy dissipation in the two regimes. Nontheless, most geophysical flows, and many industrial flows involve a transition between the two regimes. Matching the limits of these regimes is therefore of paramount importance to understanding these granular flows.

The present experiments on the constitutive behavior of rapidly flowing granular-fluid materials demonstrate that when the interstitial fluid has no effect upon the deformation, the stresses are quadratically dependent upon the mean shear rate (at constant volume concentration). These measurements confirm many of the observations of Savage and Sayed(1983), which in turn support Bagnold's hypothesis that granular collisions comprise the primary

mechanism by which momentum is tranferred in these flows.

The stresses were found (in the present study) to be weakly dependent on the volume concentration up to values of about 0.45 or 0.5. Above these concentrations, the stresses were strongly dependent on the volume concentration; sometimes the stresses increased by an order of magnitude with less than a 10% increase in the volume concentration. These observations are in agreement with those of Bagnold (1954). The kinetic theory of Jenkins and Savage (1983) correctly predicts an increase in the stress levels with increasing volume concentration, but the predicted increase is smaller than observed for volume concentrations greater than about 0.45.

The kinetic approach to rapidly flowing granularfluid materials is rational and physically plausible. The theory of Jenkins and Savage(1983), although simplistic in its assumptions regarding granular interactions, predicts the dependence of the stresses upon the shear rate properly, and also predicts the trend of the dependence on the volume concentration. The kinetic approach will undoubtedly be improved by including such phenomenon as particle spin and friction. Further work is also needed in determining the exact nature of the collision anisotropy present in rapid shear flows. The effects of multiple collisions at high volume concentrations would also make a substantial improvement in the theory. As these improvements are implemented, the predicted dependence of the stresses upon

114

「「「「「「」」」、「」」、「」、「」、「」、

the volume concentration should improve.

The measured stress ratios, $T_{\chi Z}/T_{ZZ}$, are higher for fully shearing flows than they are for partially shearing flows. This is a consequence of the rigid lower boundary of the fully shearing flows. Had there been erodable grains at this boundary, they would be mobilized into the flow, resulting in a greater mass of material in motion, and a lower stress ratio at the bottom of the flow.

Measurements of the stress ratios and of the constitutive behavior indicate that the interstitial fluid probably has a significant influence in many flows of interest. This is evidenced by the relatively higher stress ratios and the more linear dependence of the stresses on the shear rate for experiments in which water was the interstitial fluid. Probably both the shear stress supported by the deformation of the interstitial water, and the damping of grain trajectories by the water have a significant influence upon the mechanics of the granularfluid, as suggested by Bagnold. A more rigorous theoretical basis for flows of this nature, where both granular collisions and interstitial fluid effects are important, needs to be developed. The limiting cases of a suspension of grains on the one hand, and the rapid collisional flow on the other, are fairly well formulated, and provide the asymptotic limits for future theories.

The experiments reported here provide new insights which aid in understanding some fundamental aspects of the

bedload sediment transport phenomenon.

Measurements of a nearly constant stress ratio at the level of no motion indicates there must always be a region of bedload transport if the fluid stress exceeds the threshold for motion. This follows from the fact that the fluid pressure is isotropic, so any normal stress at the level of no motion must be generated and transmitted by grain-to-grain interactions. Furthermore, as previously demonstrated, if the tangential component of the fluid stress on the bed is known, then the immersed weight of the grains participating in the bedload transport is predictable.

The present experiments suggest that a momentum based bedload transport model is close to being developed. Both the stresses at the lower boundary of the granularfluid flow, and the constitutive behavior of the rapidly flowing region have been confirmed in this work. Once the rapidly flowing granular-fluid regime is tied smoothly into the dense suspension regime, the equations of motion will be well posed, and at least numerically solvable.

REFERENCES

- Ackerman, N.L. and H. Shen, 1982, "Stresses in rapidly sheared fluid-solid mixtures," ASCE Journal of the Engineering Mechanics Division, v 108, no 1, p 95-113.
- Bagnold, R.A., 1941, "The physics of blown sand and desert dunes," William Morrow and Co., New York, 265 pp.
- Bagnold, R.A., 1954, "Experiments on a gravity-free dispersion of large solid spheres in a Newtonian fluid under shear," Royal Society (London) Proc., ser. A,v 225, p 49-63.
- Bagnold, R.A., 1956, "The flow of cohesionless grains in fluids," Philos. Trans. of the Royal Soc. of London, ser. A, v 249, no. 964, p 235-297.
- Bagnold, R.A., 1966, "An approach to the sediment transport problem from general physics," U.S. Geological Survey Professional Paper, 422-J, 37 pp.
- Bailard, J.A., 1978, "An Experimental Study of Granular-Fluid Flow," Ph.D. dissertation, Univ of Calif. at San Diego, pp. 172.
- Bailard, J.A., and D.L. Inman, 1979, "A re-examination of Bagnold's granular fluid model and bed load transport equation," Journal of Geophysical Research, v.84,no.Cl2,p7827-33.
- Cambell, C.S., 1982, "Shear flows of granular materials," Ph.D. dissertation, California Institute of Technology, pp. 259.
- Carr, J.F., and D.M. Walker, 1968, "An annular shear cell for granular materials," Powder Technology, v 1, N 370, p. 369-373.
- Cheng, C.D. and R.A. Richmond, 1978, "Some observations on the rheological behaviour of dense suspensions," Rheological Acta, v. 17, p.446-453.
- Coulomb, C.A., 1773, "Essai sur une application des regles de maximis st minimus a quelque problemes de statique relatifs a l'architecture," Acad. R. Sci. Mem. Math. Phys. par divers savants, v 7, p. 343-382.
- de Josselin de Jong, G., 1959, "Statics and kinematics in the failable zone of a granular material,", Ph.D. dissertation, Delft University.

de Josselin de Jong, G., 1971, "The double sliding free rotating model for granular assemblies," Geotechnique, v 21, p. 155-163.

Drucker, D.C. and W. Prager, 1952, "Soil mechanics and plastic analysis of limit design," Quarterly of Applied Mathematics, v 10, p157-165.

Goodman, M.A. and S.C. Cowin, 1972, "A continuum theory for granular material," Archives for Rational Mechanics and Analysis, v. 44, p. 249-266.

Inman, D.L., 1953, "Areal and seasonal variations in beach and nearshore sediments at La Jolla, California," Beach Erosion Board, Corps of Engineers Tech. Memo 39, 134 pp.

Inman, D.L., G.C. Ewing, and J.B. Corliss, 1966, "Coastal sand dunes of Guerrero Negro, Baja California, Mexico," Geol. Soc. Amer. Bull., v. 77, no 8, p787-802.

Inman, D.L., and D.M. Hanes, 1980, "Field measurements of bed and suspended load motion in the surf zone," in Proc. of the 17th Int. Conf. on Coastal Engineering, abstracts vol., 456 pp.

Inman, D.L., 1983, Teaching notes: SIO 216, Physics of Sediment Transport, University of California, San Diego.

Ishida M, and T. Shirai, 1979, "Velocity distributions in the flow of solid particles in an inclined open channel," Journal of Chemical Engineering of Japan, v 12, p 46-50.

Jenike, A.W., and R.T. Shield, 1959, "On the plastic flow of Coulomb solids beyond original failure," Journal of Applied Mechanics, v 26, p.599-602.

Jenkins, J.T., and S.C. Cowin, 1979, "Theories for flowing granular materials," Mechanics applied to the transport of bulk materials, A.S.M.E., AMD-31, p.79-89.

Jenkins, J.T., and S.B. Savage, 1983, "A theory for the rapid flow of identical, smooth, nearly elastic spherical particles," Journal of Fluid Mechanics, .

Komar, P.D., and D.L. Inman, 1970, "Longshore sand transport on beaches," Journal of Geophysical Research, v.76, no.15, p.5914-5927.

Lowe, D.R., 1976, "Grain flow and grain flow deposits," Journal of Sedimentary Petrology, v 46, no 1, p 188-199.

Mandl G. and R.F. Luque, 1976, "Fully developed plastic shear flow of granular materials," Geotechnique, v 28, no 3, p277-307. A Che Shippen

McTigue, D.F., 1979, "A nonlinear continuum model for flowing granular materials," Ph.D. dissertation, Stanford University.

McMigue, D.F., 1982, "A nonlinear constitutive model for granular materials: application to gravity flow," Journal of Applied Mechanics, v 49, p 291-296.

Mehrabadi, M.M. and S.C. Cowin, 1978, "Initial planar deformation of dilatant granular materials," Journal of the Mechanics and Physics of Solids, v 26, p. 269-284.

Ogawa, S., 1978, "Multitemperature theory of granular materials," Proceedings of the U.S.-Japan Seminar on Continuum-Mechanical and Statistical Approaches in the Mechanics of Granular Materials,(Cowin, S.C. and Satake, M., eds.) Gakujutsu Bunken Fukyukai, Tokyo, Japan, p. 208-217.

Ogawa, S., A. Umemura, and N. Oshima, 1980, "On the equations of fully fluidized granular materials," J. Appl. Math. Phys. (ZAMP), v 31, p 483-493.

Owen, P.R., 1964, "Saltation of uniform grains in air," Journal of Fluid Mechanics, v.20, part 2, p.225-242.

Passman, S.L., Nunziato, J.W., Bailey, P.B., and J.P. Thomas, Jr., 1980, "Shearing flows of granular materials," The Journal of the Engineering Mechanics Division, Proc. ASCE, v 106, no EM4, p. 773-783.

Reynolds, 0., 1885, "On the dilatancy of media composed of rigid particles is contact," Phil. Mag., 5th series, v 20, p. 469-481.

Savage, S.B., 1978, "Experiments on shear flows of cohesionless granular materials," Proceedings of the U.S.-Japan Seminar on Continuum-Mechanical and Statistical Approaches in the Mechanics of Granular Materials (Cowin, S.C. and Satake, M. eds.), Gakujutsu Bunken Fukyu-kai, p. 241-254.

Savage, S.B., 1979, "Gravity flow of cohesionless granular materials in chutes and channels," Journal of Fluid Mechanics, v 92, p. 53-96.

Savage S.B., and D.J. Jeffrey, 1981, "The stress tensor in a granular flow at high shear rates," Journal of Fluid Mechanics, v 110, p 255-272.

Savage, S. B., and M. Sayed, 1983, "Stresses developed by dry cohesionless granular materials sheared in an annular shear cell", Journal of Fluid Mechanics, (in press). Savage, S. B., and S. McKeown, 1983, "Shear stresses developed during rapid shear of concentrated suspensions of large spherical particles between concentric cylinders," Journal of Fluid Mechanics, v 127, p 453-472.

1

Sayed, M., 1980, "Theoretical and experimental studies on dry cohesionless granular materials," Ph.D. dissertation, McGill University, pp 157.

Spencer, A.J.M., 1964, "A theory of the kinematics of ideal soils under plain strain conditions," J. of the Mechanics and Physics of Solids, v 12, p 337-351.

Terzaghi, K., 1943, Theoretical Soil Mechanics, Wiley, .

Vermeer, P.A. and H.J. Luger (eds.), 1982, Deformation and Failure of Granular Materials, Balkema, pp 661.

Yalen, M.S., 1972, "Mechanics of sediment transport," Pergamon Press, New York, pp. 290.

120

電気のないでは、気気をというこ

10 P

1

A CONTRACTOR OF A CONTRACTOR O

APPENDIX: DATA

· .

--

121

,

ł

Fully shearing 1.1 mm glass spheres in air

.

.

• • • •

Exp	N	Um/Zo	Shear	Applied	Normal	Stress	Zo
		(1/sec.)	stress	normal	stress	ratio	(mm.)
				stress	at z	=Zo	
_	_	(dyne/cm/cm)					
1	0.56	41.	1443.	2191.	3360.	e. 43	8.6
2	0.56	66.	2418.	3627.	4796.	f.50	8.6
3	0.56	77.	3295.	5063.	6232.	0.53	8.6
4	0.56	88.	4143.	6499.	7568.	6.54	8.6
5	0.56	103.	4933.	7935.	9104.	0.54	8.6
6	0.56	111.	5733.	9371.	10540.	0.54	8.6
7	0.54	101.	1784.	2191.	3360.	0.53	9.0
8	0.54	140.	2896.	3627.	4796.	0.60	9.0
9	0.54	185.	3929.	5063.	6232.	0.63	9.0
10	0.54	214.	4806.	6499.	7668.	Ø.63	9.0
11	0.54	242.	5762.	7935.	9104.	0.63	9.0
12	0.54	267.	6659.	9371.	10540.	Ø.63	9.0
13	0.49	136.	2106.	2191.	3360.	0.63	9.8
14	0.49	180.	3149.	3627.	4796.	0.66	9.8
15	Ø.49	214.	4134.	5063.	6232.	0.66	9.8
16	0.49	246.	5099.	6499.	7668.	0.67	9.8
17	0.49	272.	6054.	7935.	9104.	0.67	9.8
18	0.49	298.	7000.	9371.	10540.	0.66	9.8
19	0.46	136.	2023.	2191.	3360.	0.60	10.5
28	0.46	178.	3134.	3627.	4796.	0.65	10.5
21	0.46	216.	4178.	5063.	6232.	0.67	10.5
22	0.46	245.	5123.	6499.	7668.	0.67	10.5
23	0.46	274.	6079.	7935.	9104.	0.67	10.5
24	0.46	300.	7093.	9371.	10540.	0.67	10.5
25	0.42	136.	2033.	2191.	3360.	0.61	11.5
26	0.42	179.	3164.	3627.	4796.	0.66	11.5
27	0.42	215.	4187.	5063.	6232.	0.67	11.5
28	0.42	245.	5162.	6499.	7668.	0.67	11.5
29	0.42	272.	6118.	7 9 35.	9104.	0.67	11.5
3Ø	0.42	299.	7112.	9371.	10540.	Ø.68	11.5
31	0.37	140.	2111.	2191.	3360.	0.63	13.0
32	0.37	180.	3222.	3627.	4796.	0.67	13.0
33	0.37	214.	4304.	5063.	5232.	0.69	13.0
34	0.37	243.	5279.	6499.	7668.	0.69	13.0
35	0.37	267.	6225.	7935.	9104.	Ø.68	13.0
36	0.37	288.	7083.	9371.	10540.	0.67	13.0

Partially shearing 1.1 mm glass spheres in air.

.

D		11- 19-	Chass	3	No	C h	
Ехр	N	Um/20	Snear	Applied	Normal	Stress	,20
		(1/sec.)	stress	normal	stress	ratio	(mm .)
				stress	at z	=Zo	
		(dyne/cm/cm)					
37	0.58	48.	3503.	6499.	7748.	0.45	7.3
38	0.56	87.	4009	6400	7926.	0.51	8.7
20	0.56	100	4141	6499	8194	0.50	10.4
40	Ø 56	00	4249	6400	8551	0.50	12 5
41	a 56	118	4243. Alg7	6100	9551	a 18	12.5
4.7	0.50	120.	410/.	6400	0551.	0.40	12.5
42	Ø. 55 Ø. 55	1 3 2 .	4003.	6499.	8221.	0.40	12.0
45	0.52	147.	4102.	6400	0401.	0.47	12.0
44	0.4/	109.	4097.	6499.	8194.	0.50	12.3
45	0.3/	260.	4230.	6499.	//48.	0.55	11.5
46	0.29	196.	4303.	6499.	7570.	0.5/	12.7
47	0.58	34.	2600.	5063.	6242.	0.42	6.9
48	0.58	37.	2595.	5063.	6591.	Ø.39	9.0
49	0.58	50.	2648.	5063.	6634.	0.40	9.3
50	0.57	62.	2755.	5063.	6722.	0.41	9.9
51	0.57	87.	2755.	5063.	6547.	0.42	9.0
52	0.56	107.	2794.	5063.	6634.	0.42	9.7
53	0.55	116.	2930.	5063.	6678.	0.44	10.1
54	0.53	144.	2891.	5063.	6460.	0.45	9.0
55	Ø.53	146.	3312.	5063.	6656.	0.50	10.3
56	Ø.51	158.	3111.	5063.	6656.	0.47	10.8
57	0.46	153.	3096.	5063.	6745.	0.46	12.5
58	Ø.39	153.	3175.	5063.	6628.	0.48	13.9
59	0.60	33.	1954.	3627.	5385.	0.36	10.0
60	0.61	28.	1793.	3627.	5250.	0.34	9.2
61	0.60	43.	1934.	3627.	5430.	P.36	10.3
62	Ø.58	73.	1978.	3627.	5520.	0.36	11.2
63	0.58	75.	2104.	3627.	5746.	0.37	12.6
64	0.54	109.	2216.	3627.	5385.	0.41	11.2
65	0.53	122.	2211.	3627.	5340.	0.41	11.1
66	0.56	101.	2128.	3627.	5385.	0.39	10.7
67	0.51	140.	2390.	3627.	5220.	6.46	10.8
68	0.43	168.	2233.	3627.	4866.	0.46	9.9
69	0.35	167.	2296.	3627.	4778.	0.48	11.3
70	0.57	64.	1497.	2909	3750	0.40	6.1
71	0.58	69.	1492.	2909	4262.	0.35	9.7
72	0.54	109.	1585.	2909	4116.	0.38	9.2
73	0.52	128.	1688.	2009	4168.	0.40	9.9
74	0.47	160.	1786.	2909	4020.	9.44	9.7
75	0 37	190	1855	2000	3708	0 49	9 9
76	A. 20	165	1536	2101	3080	0.50	9.4
77	0.19	157	1457	2191.	3154	0.46	8.2
79	Ø. 50	130	1439	2121	3383	0 8 4	8 0
70	0+34 0 EA	110	1224	2131.	22020	0.74 0 AA	9.4
90	0.34 0 66	47	1310	5101	3376	2V 0 70	9 0
6 V	0.JJ 8 27	7/. 01	1310.	2171.	33/0.	U.J.7	C • 7
82	r. J/ 0. 59	01. AK	1129	5101 5171.	33020	1. JO 8. JA	7.9

. • • • 124 Ø.53 Ø.52 Ø.46 Ø.36 120. 128. 165. 196. 83 962. 0.43 0.40 0.44 0.51 5.7 7.1 6.7 6.7 1473. 2214. 942. 976. 1060. 84 1473. 1473. 1473. 2362. 2214. 85 86 2066. ÷č,
Fully shearing 1.85 mm glass spheres in air.

- .

Exp	N	Um/Zo	Shear	Applied	Normal	Stress	Zo			
	(l/sec.)	stress	normal	stress	ratio	(mm.)			
				stress	at z	=Zo				
			(dyne/cm/cm)							
07	a 40	FO	2042	5863	7715	a 5 3	16.2			
6 /	0.49	59.	3002.	5003.	1213.	6.33	10.2			
88	0.49	90.	4290.	0499. 7035	0001. 14407	0.50	10.2			
89	0.49	102.	50/0.	/935.	1008/.	0.50	10.2			
90	.0.49	10/.	594/. 6934	93/1. 10007	11023.	0.52	16.2			
91	0.49	112.	7644	1000/.	14305	0.53	10.2			
92	0.49	122.	7004.	12293.	14393. 7916	0.53	17 0			
93	0.40	107.	1533	5003.	7213. 8651	0.51	17 0			
94	0.40	114	5411	7075	10091.	0.54	17.0			
95	0.46	125.	6288.	9371	11523.	0.55	17.0			
90	0.46	134.	7068.	10807.	12959.	0.55	17.0			
97	0.46	144.	7653.	12243.	14395.	0.53	17.0			
99	0.44	110.	3851	5063.	7215.	0.53	18.0			
100	0.44	120.	4728.	6499.	8651.	0.55	18.0			
าดา	0.44	133.	5508.	7935.	10087.	0.55	18.0			
102	0.44	144.	6288.	9371.	11523.	0.55	18.0			
103	0.44	154.	7166.	10807.	12959.	0.55	18.0			
104	0.44	172.	8433.	12243.	14395.	0.59	18.0			
	Partially	sheari	ng 1.85	mm glass	spheres	in air.				
	Partially	sheari	ng 1.85	mm glass	spheres	in air.				
105	Partially	shearin 35.	ng 1.85	mm glass	spheres	in air.	15.4			
105	Partially Ø.53 Ø.52	35.	ng 1.85 2624. 2727.	mm glass 5063.	spheres 7267. 7414.	in air. Ø.36 Ø.37	15.4			
105 106 107	Partially 0.53 0.52 0.52	35. 50.	ng 1.85 2624. 2727. 2796.	mm glass 5063. 5063.	spheres 7267. 7414. 7414.	in air. Ø.36 Ø.37 Ø.38	15.4 16.4 16.7			
105 106 107 108	Partially 0.53 0.52 0.52 0.50	shearin 35. 50. 61. 73.	ng 1.85 2624. 2727. 2796. 2732.	mm glass 5063. 5063. 5063. 5063.	spheres 7267. 7414. 7414. 7414.	in air. Ø.36 Ø.37 Ø.38 Ø.37	15.4 16.4 16.7 17.1			
105 106 107 108 109	Partially 0.53 0.52 0.52 0.50 0.45	shearin 35. 50. 61. 73. 118.	ng 1.85 2624. 2727. 2796. 2732. 2879.	mm glass 5063. 5063. 5063. 5063. 5063.	spheres 7267. 7414. 7414. 6973.	in air. Ø.36 Ø.37 Ø.38 Ø.37 Ø.41	15.4 16.4 16.7 17.1 15.5			
105 106 107 108 109 110	Partially 0.53 0.52 0.52 0.50 0.45 0.41	35. 50. 61. 73. 118. 128.	ng 1.85 2624. 2727. 2796. 2732. 2879. 3021.	mm glass 5063. 5063. 5063. 5063. 5063. 5063.	spheres 7267. 7414. 7414. 6973. 6900.	in air. 0.36 0.37 0.38 0.37 0.41 0.41 0.44	15.4 16.4 16.7 17.1 15.5 16.3			
105 106 107 108 109 110 111	Partially 0.53 0.52 0.52 0.50 0.45 0.41 0.51	<pre>35. 35. 50. 61. 73. 118. 128. 49.</pre>	ng 1.85 2624. 2727. 2796. 2732. 2879. 3021. 2061.	mm glass 5063. 5063. 5063. 5063. 5063. 5063. 5063. 3627.	spheres 7267. 7414. 7414. 6973. 6900. 5243.	in air. 0.36 0.37 0.38 0.37 0.41 0.44 0.39	15.4 16.4 16.7 17.1 15.5 16.3 11.6			
105 106 107 108 109 110 111	Partially 0.53 0.52 0.52 0.50 0.45 0.41 0.51 0.50	<pre>35. 35. 50. 61. 73. 118. 128. 49. 70.</pre>	ng 1.85 2624. 2727. 2796. 2732. 2879. 3021. 2061. 2086.	mm glass 5063. 5063. 5063. 5063. 5063. 5063. 3627. 3627.	spheres 7267. 7414. 7414. 6973. 6900. 5243. 5243.	in air. 0.36 0.37 0.38 0.37 0.41 0.44 0.39 0.40	15.4 16.4 16.7 17.1 15.5 16.3 11.6 11.9			
105 106 107 108 109 110 111 112 113	Partially 0.53 0.52 0.52 0.50 0.45 0.41 0.51 0.50 0.50	<pre>35. 35. 50. 61. 73. 118. 128. 49. 70. 69.</pre>	ng 1.85 2624. 2727. 2796. 2732. 2879. 3021. 2061. 2086. 2140.	mm glass 5063. 5063. 5063. 5063. 5063. 5063. 3627. 3627. 3627.	spheres 7267. 7414. 7414. 6973. 6900. 5243. 5243. 5243.	in air. 0.36 0.37 0.38 0.41 0.44 0.39 0.40 0.41	15.4 16.4 16.7 17.1 15.5 16.3 11.6 11.9 11.8			
105 106 107 108 109 110 111 112 113 114	Partially 0.53 0.52 0.52 0.50 0.45 0.41 0.51 0.50 0.50 0.49	<pre>35. 35. 50. 61. 73. 118. 128. 49. 70. 69. 85.</pre>	ng 1.85 2624. 2727. 2796. 2732. 2879. 3021. 2061. 2086. 2140. 2086.	mm glass 5063. 5063. 5063. 5063. 5063. 5063. 3627. 3627. 3627. 3627.	spheres 7267. 7414. 7414. 7414. 6973. 6900. 5243. 5243. 5243. 5243. 5317.	in air. 0.36 0.37 0.38 0.41 0.41 0.44 0.39 0.40 0.41 0.39	15.4 16.4 16.7 17.1 15.5 16.3 11.6 11.9 11.8 12.6			
105 106 107 108 109 110 111 112 113 114	Partially 0.53 0.52 0.52 0.50 0.45 0.41 0.51 0.50 0.50 0.49 0.47	<pre>35. 35. 50. 61. 73. 118. 128. 49. 70. 69. 85. 106.</pre>	ng 1.85 2624. 2727. 2796. 2732. 2879. 3021. 2061. 2086. 2140. 2086. 2169.	mm glass 5063. 5063. 5063. 5063. 5063. 5063. 3627. 3627. 3627. 3627. 3627.	spheres 7267. 7414. 7414. 6973. 6900. 5243. 5243. 5243. 5243. 5317. 5207.	in air. 0.36 0.37 0.38 0.41 0.44 0.39 0.40 0.41 0.39 0.41 0.39 0.42	15.4 16.4 16.7 17.1 15.5 16.3 11.6 11.9 11.8 12.6 12.3			
105 106 107 108 109 110 111 112 113 114 115	Partially 0.53 0.52 0.52 0.50 0.45 0.41 0.51 0.50 0.50 0.49 0.47 0.45	<pre>35. 35. 50. 61. 73. 118. 128. 49. 70. 69. 85. 106. 119.</pre>	ng 1.85 2624. 2727. 2796. 2732. 2879. 3021. 2061. 2086. 2140. 2086. 2169. 2164.	mm glass 5063. 5063. 5063. 5063. 5063. 5063. 3627. 3627. 3627. 3627. 3627. 3627. 3627.	spheres 7267. 7414. 7414. 6973. 6900. 5243. 5243. 5243. 5317. 5207. 5170.	in air. 0.36 0.37 0.38 0.41 0.44 0.39 0.40 0.41 0.39 0.42 0.42 0.42 0.42	15.4 16.4 16.7 17.1 15.5 16.3 11.6 11.9 11.8 12.6 12.3 12.6			
105 106 107 108 109 110 111 112 113 114 115 116	Partially 0.53 0.52 0.52 0.50 0.45 0.41 0.51 0.50 0.50 0.49 0.47 0.45 0.40	35. 50. 61. 73. 118. 128. 49. 70. 69. 85. 106. 119. 137.	ng 1.85 2624. 2727. 2796. 2732. 2879. 3021. 2061. 2086. 2140. 2086. 2169. 2164. 2282.	mm glass 5063. 5063. 5063. 5063. 5063. 5063. 3627. 3627. 3627. 3627. 3627. 3627. 3627.	<pre>spheres 7267. 7414. 7414. 7414. 6973. 6900. 5243. 5243. 5243. 5317. 5207. 5170. 5023.</pre>	in air. 0.36 0.37 0.38 0.41 0.44 0.39 0.40 0.41 0.39 0.42 0.42 0.42 0.45	15.4 16.4 16.7 17.1 15.5 16.3 11.6 11.9 11.8 12.6 12.3 12.6 12.8			
105 106 107 108 109 110 111 112 113 114 115 116 117	Partially 0.53 0.52 0.52 0.50 0.45 0.41 0.51 0.50 0.49 0.49 0.47 0.45 0.40 0.40 0.49	35. 50. 61. 73. 118. 128. 49. 70. 69. 85. 106. 119. 137. 56.	ng 1.85 2624. 2727. 2796. 2732. 2879. 3021. 2061. 2086. 2140. 2086. 2169. 2164. 2282. 1283.	mm glass 5063. 5063. 5063. 5063. 5063. 5063. 3627. 3627. 3627. 3627. 3627. 3627. 3627. 3627. 3627.	<pre>spheres 7267. 7414. 7414. 7414. 6973. 6900. 5243. 5243. 5243. 5317. 5207. 5170. 5023. 3535.</pre>	in air. 0.36 0.37 0.38 0.41 0.44 0.39 0.42 0.42 0.42 0.42 0.42 0.45 0.36	15.4 16.4 16.7 17.1 15.5 16.3 11.6 11.9 11.8 12.6 12.3 12.6 12.8 12.1			
105 106 107 108 109 110 111 112 113 114 115 116 117 118	Partially 0.53 0.52 0.52 0.50 0.45 0.41 0.51 0.50 0.49 0.49 0.47 0.45 0.40 0.49 0.48	<pre>35. 35. 50. 61. 73. 118. 128. 49. 70. 69. 85. 106. 119. 137. 56. 86.</pre>	ng 1.85 2624. 2727. 2796. 2732. 2879. 3021. 2061. 2086. 2140. 2086. 2169. 2164. 2282. 1283. 1386.	mm glass 5063. 5063. 5063. 5063. 5063. 5063. 3627. 3627. 3627. 3627. 3627. 3627. 3627. 3627. 3627. 3627. 3627. 3627.	<pre>spheres 7267. 7414. 7414. 7414. 6973. 6900. 5243. 5243. 5243. 5317. 5207. 5170. 5023. 3535. 3514.</pre>	in air. 0.36 0.37 0.38 0.41 0.44 0.39 0.42 0.42 0.42 0.42 0.42 0.42 0.42 0.42 0.45 0.36 0.39	15.4 16.4 16.7 17.1 15.5 16.3 11.6 11.9 11.8 12.6 12.3 12.6 12.8 12.1 10.1			
105 106 107 108 110 111 112 113 114 115 116 117 118 119 120	Partially 0.53 0.52 0.52 0.50 0.45 0.41 0.51 0.50 0.49 0.49 0.47 0.45 0.40 0.48 0.48 0.47	<pre>35. 35. 50. 61. 73. 118. 128. 49. 70. 69. 85. 106. 119. 137. 56. 86. 101.</pre>	ng 1.85 2624. 2727. 2796. 2732. 2879. 3021. 2061. 2086. 2140. 2086. 2169. 2164. 2282. 1283. 1386. 1435.	mm glass 5063. 5063. 5063. 5063. 5063. 5063. 3627.	<pre>spheres 7267. 7414. 7414. 7414. 6973. 6900. 5243. 5243. 5243. 5317. 5207. 5170. 5023. 3535. 3514. 3587.</pre>	in air. 0.36 0.37 0.38 0.41 0.44 0.39 0.42 0.42 0.42 0.42 0.42 0.42 0.42 0.42 0.42 0.42 0.42 0.42 0.42 0.42 0.39 0.42 0.39 0.42 0.36 0.39 0.42 0.36 0.39 0.42 0.45 0.36 0.42 0.42 0.45 0.36 0.39 0.42 0.45 0.36 0.42 0.45 0.36 0.42 0.45 0.36 0.42 0.45 0.36 0.42 0.45 0.36 0.42 0.45 0.42 0.45 0.4	15.4 16.4 16.7 17.1 15.5 16.3 11.6 11.9 11.8 12.6 12.3 12.6 12.8 12.1 10.1 10.9			
105 106 107 108 110 111 112 113 114 115 116 117 118 112 120 121	Partially 0.53 0.52 0.52 0.50 0.45 0.41 0.51 0.50 0.49 0.49 0.47 0.45 0.40 0.48 0.48 0.48 0.43	<pre>35. 35. 50. 61. 73. 118. 128. 49. 70. 69. 85. 106. 119. 137. 56. 86. 101. 122.</pre>	ng 1.85 2624. 2727. 2796. 2732. 2879. 3021. 2061. 2086. 2140. 2086. 2169. 2164. 2282. 1283. 1386. 1435. 1528.	mm glass 5063. 5063. 5063. 5063. 5063. 5063. 3627.	<pre>spheres 7267. 7414. 7414. 7414. 6973. 6900. 5243. 5243. 5243. 5317. 5207. 5170. 5023. 3514. 3587. 3403.</pre>	in air. 0.36 0.37 0.38 0.41 0.44 0.39 0.42 0.42 0.42 0.42 0.42 0.42 0.42 0.42 0.42 0.42 0.45 0.39 0.42 0.45 0.39 0.42 0.45 0.36 0.39 0.45 0.39 0.45 0.39 0.45 0.39 0.45 0.39 0.45 0.39 0.45 0.36 0.39 0.45 0.36 0.39 0.45 0.36 0.45 0.36 0.45 0.45 0.36 0.45 0.4	15.4 16.4 16.7 17.1 15.5 16.3 11.6 11.9 11.8 12.6 12.3 12.6 12.8 12.1 10.1 10.9 10.4			
105 106 107 108 110 111 112 113 114 115 116 117 118 112 122 122	Partially 0.53 0.52 0.52 0.50 0.45 0.41 0.51 0.50 0.49 0.47 0.45 0.49 0.47 0.45 0.40 0.48 0.48 0.43 0.43 0.36	<pre>35. 35. 50. 61. 73. 118. 128. 49. 70. 69. 85. 106. 119. 137. 56. 86. 101. 122. 123.</pre>	ng 1.85 2624. 2727. 2796. 2732. 2879. 3021. 2061. 2086. 2140. 2086. 2169. 2164. 2282. 1283. 1386. 1435. 1528. 1498.	mm glass 5063. 5063. 5063. 5063. 5063. 5063. 3627.	<pre>spheres 7267. 7414. 7414. 7414. 6973. 6900. 5243. 5243. 5243. 5317. 5207. 5170. 5023. 3514. 3587. 3403. 3440.</pre>	in air. Ø. 36 Ø. 37 Ø. 38 Ø. 41 Ø. 44 Ø. 39 Ø. 40 Ø. 41 Ø. 39 Ø. 42 Ø. 42 Ø. 42 Ø. 45 Ø. 36 Ø. 39 Ø. 40 Ø. 45 Ø. 45 Ø. 45 Ø. 44	15.4 16.4 16.7 17.1 15.5 16.3 11.6 11.9 11.8 12.6 12.3 12.6 12.8 12.1 10.1 10.9 10.4 12.7			
105 106 107 108 110 112 113 114 115 116 117 118 120 122 122 123	Partially 0.53 0.52 0.52 0.50 0.45 0.41 0.51 0.50 0.49 0.47 0.45 0.49 0.47 0.45 0.40 0.48 0.48 0.43 0.43 0.36 0.44	<pre>35. 35. 50. 61. 73. 118. 128. 49. 70. 69. 85. 106. 119. 137. 56. 86. 101. 122. 123. 111.</pre>	ng 1.85 2624. 2727. 2796. 2732. 2879. 3021. 2061. 2086. 2140. 2086. 2164. 2282. 1283. 1386. 1435. 1528. 1498. 1537.	mm glass 5063. 5063. 5063. 5063. 5063. 5063. 3627. 362	<pre>spheres 7267. 7414. 7414. 7414. 6973. 6900. 5243. 5243. 5243. 5243. 5317. 5207. 5170. 5023. 3514. 3587. 3403. 3440. 3514.</pre>	in air. 0.36 0.37 0.38 0.41 0.44 0.39 0.41 0.39 0.42 0.42 0.42 0.42 0.42 0.42 0.42 0.42 0.42 0.45 0.36 0.39 0.42 0.45 0.36 0.39 0.42 0.45 0.36 0.39 0.42 0.44 0.39 0.42 0.42 0.42 0.42 0.44 0.39 0.42 0.42 0.42 0.44 0.39 0.42 0.42 0.44 0.42 0.42 0.42 0.42 0.44 0.45 0.44 0.44 0.44 0.45 0.44 0.4	15.4 16.4 16.7 17.1 15.5 16.3 11.6 11.9 11.8 12.6 12.3 12.6 12.8 12.1 10.1 10.9 10.4 12.7 11.1			

建工

Partially shearing 0.55 mm sand in air.

· .

Exp	N	Um/20	Shear	Applied	Normal	Stress	Zo
		(1/sec.)	stress	normal	stress	ratio	(mm.)
				stress	at z	=20	(
				(d)	yne/cm/c	m)	
125	6.47	90.	1332.	1333	1673	a 9a	~
126	9.47	98.	1418.	1222	1740		2.0
127	a 17	175	1272	1333.	1/49.	0.01	3.4
120	0.47	160	13/3.	1333.	1/53.	0.78	3.5
120	0.40	100.	1302.	1333.	1753.	0.74	3.5
129	0.43	217.	1100.	1333.	1753.	0.67	3.8
130	0.56	55.	2609.	2769.	3373.	0.77	4.2
131	0.54	81.	2624.	2769.	3341.	0.79	4.1
132	0.53	101.	2629.	2769.	3341.	0.79	4.2
133	0.51	130.	2422.	2769	3341	Ø 73	A A
134	0.50	182.	2326.	2769	3341	a 7a	
135	0.58	78.	2563	A745	1701	0.70 0 E E	
136	a 50	100	2303.	4203.	4701.	6.35	3.3
120	0.30	122.	2900.	4205.	4/01.	0.53	3.3
13/	8.20	1//.	2508.	4205.	4739.	0.53	3.7
138	0.51	213.	2493.	4205.	4778.	0.52	4.4
139	0.56	77.	4567.	5641.	6136.	0.74	3.5
140	0.48	246.	3916.	5641.	6849.	0.65	3.3
141	0.48	289.	3926.	5641.	6123.	0.64	3.9
142	0.50	313.	4947.	5641	6271	0 64	1 9
143	0.55	74.	6091.	9513	0001	0 69	2 4
144	0.50	236	5783	9513	0063	0.00	3.9
145	0.50 0 60	230.	5010	0313.	0 302.	0.04	3.5
742	0.00	232.	2018.	8513.	9074.	0.64	4.4
140	0.49	350.	5727.	8513.	9037.	0.63	4.2

126

いいというかんできまする

	Fully	snearing	1.85 mm	glass s	pheres 1	n water.	
Exp	N	Um/Zo	Shear	Applie	d Normal	Stress	Zo
		(1/sec.)	stress	normal	stress	ratio	(mm.)
				stress	at	z=20	
				(dyne/cm/	cm)	
175	0.51	34.	3802.	5863.	6527.	Ø. 58	16 6
176	0.51	42.	4582.	6499.	7963.	0.57	16.6
177	0.51	54.	5362.	7935.	9399.	0.57	16 6
178	0.51	54.	5850.	9371.	10835.	0.54	16.6
179	0.51	56.	6727.	10807.	12271.	0.55	16.6
180	Ø.51	62.	7507.	12243.	13707.	0.55	16.6
181	0.50	75.	3948.	5063.	6527.	0.61	16.9
182	0.50	84.	4728.	6499.	7963.	e. 59	16.9
183	0.50	98.	5898.	7935.	9399.	0.63	16.9
184	0.50	111.	6873.	9371.	10835.	0.63	16.9
185	0.50	125.	7751.	10807.	12271.	0.63	16.9
186	0.50	136.	8531.	12243.	13707.	0.62	16.9
a			~ 1 85 -	1			
P	artially	y shearin	g 1.85 m	nm glass	spheres	in water	•
P	artially	y shearin	g 1.85 m	nm glass	spheres	in water	•
P 187	artially Ø.53	y shearin 9.	g 1.85 m 3753.	nm glass 5063.	spheres 7037.	in water 0.53	. 21.2
P 187 188	artially Ø.53 Ø.53	y shearin 9. 22.	g 1.85 m 3753. 3997.	nm glass 5063. 5063.	spheres 7037. 7131.	in water 0.53 0.56	21.2 22.5
P 187 188 189	artially 0.53 0.53 0.52	9. 22. 35.	g 1.85 m 3753. 3997. 3948.	nm glass 5063. 5063. 5063.	spheres 7037. 7131. 7225.	in water 0.53 0.56 0.55	21.2 22.5 23.8
P 187 188 189 190	artially 0.53 0.53 0.52 0.52	9. 22. 35. 44.	g 1.85 m 3753. 3997. 3948. 4192.	nm glass 5063. 5063. 5063. 5063.	spheres 7037. 7131. 7225. 7413.	in water 0.53 0.56 0.55 0.57	21.2 22.5 23.8 25.9
P 187 188 189 190 191	Ø.53 Ø.53 Ø.52 Ø.52 Ø.52 Ø.51	9. 22. 35. 44. 50.	g 1.85 m 3753. 3997. 3948. 4192. 3802.	nm glass 5063. 5063. 5063. 5063. 5063.	spheres 7037. 7131. 7225. 7413. 7413.	in water 0.53 0.56 0.55 0.57 0.51	21.2 22.5 23.8 25.9 26.2
P 187 188 189 190 191 192	Ø.53 Ø.53 Ø.52 Ø.52 Ø.51 Ø.53	9. 22. 35. 44. 50. 13.	g 1.85 m 3753. 3997. 3948. 4192. 3802. 2876.	nm glass 5063. 5063. 5063. 5063. 5063. 3627.	7037. 7131. 7225. 7413. 7413. 5507.	in water 0.53 0.56 0.55 0.57 0.51 0.52	21.2 22.5 23.8 25.9 26.2 20.4
P 187 188 189 190 191 192 193	artiall; Ø.53 Ø.53 Ø.52 Ø.52 Ø.51 Ø.53 Ø.52	9. 22. 35. 44. 50. 13. 26.	g 1.85 m 3753. 3997. 3948. 4192. 3802. 2876. 2876.	nm glass 5063. 5063. 5063. 5063. 5063. 3627. 3627.	spheres 7037. 7131. 7225. 7413. 7413. 5507. 5695.	in water 0.53 0.56 0.55 0.57 0.51 0.52 0.50	21.2 22.5 23.8 25.9 26.2 20.4 22.8
P 187 188 189 190 191 192 193 194	artiall; Ø.53 Ø.53 Ø.52 Ø.52 Ø.51 Ø.53 Ø.52 Ø.52	9. 22. 35. 44. 50. 13. 26. 38.	g 1.85 m 3753. 3997. 3948. 4192. 3802. 2876. 2876. 3169.	m glass 5063. 5063. 5063. 5063. 5063. 3627. 3627. 3627.	spheres 7037. 7131. 7225. 7413. 7413. 5507. 5695. 5883.	in water 0.53 0.56 0.55 0.57 0.51 0.52 0.50 0.54	21.2 22.5 23.8 25.9 26.2 20.4 22.8 25.1
P 187 188 189 190 191 192 193 194 195	artiall; Ø.53 Ø.53 Ø.52 Ø.52 Ø.51 Ø.53 Ø.52 Ø.52 Ø.52 Ø.52 Ø.52	9. 22. 35. 44. 50. 13. 26. 38. 39.	g 1.85 m 3753. 3997. 3948. 4192. 3802. 2876. 2876. 3169. 3120.	nm glass 5063. 5063. 5063. 5063. 5063. 3627. 3627. 3627. 3627.	spheres 7037. 7131. 7225. 7413. 7413. 5507. 5695. 5883. 5883.	in water 0.53 0.56 0.55 0.57 0.51 0.52 0.52 0.54 0.53	21.2 22.5 23.8 25.9 26.2 20.4 22.8 25.1 25.1
P 187 188 189 190 191 192 193 194 195 196	artiall 0.53 0.53 0.52 0.52 0.51 0.53 0.52 0.52 0.52 0.52 0.52 0.52 0.52 0.52 0.52 0.52 0.53	9. 22. 35. 44. 50. 13. 26. 38. 39. 44.	g 1.85 m 3753. 3997. 3948. 4192. 3802. 2876. 2876. 3169. 3120. 3120.	m glass 5063. 5063. 5063. 5063. 5063. 3627. 3627. 3627. 3627. 3627.	spheres 7037. 7131. 7225. 7413. 7413. 5507. 5695. 5883. 5883. 5883. 5977.	in water 0.53 0.56 0.55 0.57 0.51 0.52 0.52 0.54 0.53 0.52	21.2 22.5 23.8 25.9 26.2 20.4 22.8 25.1 25.1 25.1 26.2
P 187 188 189 190 191 192 193 194 195 196 197	artiall 0.53 0.53 0.52 0.52 0.52 0.51 0.52 0.52 0.52 0.52 0.52 0.52 0.52 0.52 0.52 0.52 0.53	9. 22. 35. 44. 50. 13. 26. 38. 39. 44. 16.	g 1.85 m 3753. 3997. 3948. 4192. 3802. 2876. 2876. 3169. 3120. 3120. 2145.	5063. 5063. 5063. 5063. 5063. 3627. 3627. 3627. 3627. 3627. 2191.	spheres 7037. 7131. 7225. 7413. 7413. 5507. 5695. 5883. 5883. 5977. 3883.	in water 0.53 0.56 0.55 0.57 0.51 0.52 0.52 0.54 0.53 0.52 0.55	21.2 22.5 23.8 25.9 26.2 20.4 22.8 25.1 25.1 26.2 18.3
P 187 188 189 190 191 192 193 194 195 196 197	artially 0.53 0.52 0.52 0.52 0.53 0.52 0.52 0.52 0.52 0.51 0.53 0.52 0.51 0.53 0.52	9. 22. 35. 44. 50. 13. 26. 38. 39. 44. 16. 27.	g 1.85 m 3753. 3997. 3948. 4192. 3802. 2876. 2876. 3120. 3120. 3120. 2145. 2096.	5063. 5063. 5063. 5063. 5063. 3627. 3627. 3627. 3627. 3627. 2191. 2191.	spheres 7037. 7131. 7225. 7413. 5507. 5695. 5883. 5883. 5977. 3883. 3977.	in water 0.53 0.56 0.55 0.57 0.51 0.52 0.54 0.53 0.52 0.53 0.55 0.55 0.55 0.53	21.2 22.5 23.8 25.9 26.2 20.4 22.8 25.1 25.1 26.2 18.3 19.8
P 187 188 189 190 191 192 193 194 195 196 197 198	artially 0.53 0.53 0.52 0.52 0.52 0.53 0.52 0.52 0.52 0.51 0.53 0.52 0.51 0.53 0.52 0.51	9. 22. 35. 44. 50. 13. 26. 38. 39. 44. 16. 27. 39.	g 1.85 m 3753. 3997. 3948. 4192. 3802. 2876. 2876. 3120. 3120. 3120. 2145. 2096. 2242.	5063. 5063. 5063. 5063. 5063. 3627. 3627. 3627. 3627. 3627. 2191. 2191.	spheres 7037. 7131. 7225. 7413. 5507. 5695. 5883. 5883. 5977. 3883. 3977. 4071.	in water 0.53 0.56 0.55 0.57 0.51 0.52 0.52 0.54 0.53 0.55 0.55 0.53 0.55 0.55	21.2 22.5 23.8 25.9 26.2 20.4 22.8 25.1 25.1 26.2 18.3 19.8 21.1
P 187 188 199 191 192 193 194 195 196 197 198 199 200	artiall 0.53 0.52 0.5	9. 22. 35. 44. 50. 13. 26. 38. 39. 44. 16. 27. 39. 41.	g 1.85 m 3753. 3997. 3948. 4192. 3802. 2876. 2876. 3120. 3120. 3120. 2145. 2096. 2242. 2340.	m glass 5063. 5063. 5063. 5063. 3627. 3627. 3627. 3627. 3627. 2191. 2191. 2191.	spheres 7037. 7131. 7225. 7413. 5507. 5695. 5883. 5883. 5977. 3883. 3977. 4071. 4259.	in water 0.53 0.56 0.55 0.57 0.51 0.52 0.52 0.54 0.53 0.55 0.55 0.55 0.55 0.55 0.55 0.55 0.55	21.2 22.5 23.8 25.9 26.2 20.4 22.8 25.1 25.1 26.2 18.3 19.8 21.1 23.3
P 187 188 190 191 192 193 194 195 196 197 198 200 201 201	artiall 0.53 0.53 0.52 0.53 0.52 0.55 0.52 0.55 0.52 0.55 0.5	9. 22. 35. 44. 50. 13. 26. 38. 39. 44. 16. 27. 39. 41. 46.	g 1.85 m 3753. 3997. 3948. 4192. 3802. 2876. 2876. 3169. 3120. 3120. 3120. 2145. 2096. 2242. 2340. 2194.	m glass 5063. 5063. 5063. 5063. 5063. 3627. 3627. 3627. 3627. 3627. 2191. 2191. 2191. 2191.	spheres 7037. 7131. 7225. 7413. 7413. 5507. 5695. 5883. 5883. 5977. 3883. 3977. 4071. 4259. 4259.	in water 0.53 0.56 0.55 0.57 0.51 0.52 0.52 0.53 0.55 0.	21.2 22.5 23.8 25.9 26.2 20.4 22.8 25.1 25.1 26.2 18.3 19.8 21.1 23.3 23.6
P 187 188 190 191 192 193 194 195 196 197 198 200 201 202	artiall 0.53 0.53 0.52 0.52 0.52 0.52 0.52 0.52 0.52 0.52 0.52 0.51 0.52 0.51 0.52 0.51 0.52 0.51 0.52 0.51 0.52 0.5	9. 22. 35. 44. 50. 13. 26. 38. 39. 44. 16. 27. 39. 41. 46. 19.	g 1.85 m 3753. 3997. 3948. 4192. 3802. 2876. 2876. 3169. 3120. 3120. 3120. 2145. 2096. 2242. 2340. 2194. 4192.	m glass 5063. 5063. 5063. 5063. 5063. 3627. 3627. 3627. 3627. 3627. 2191. 2191. 2191. 2191. 2191. 2191.	spheres 7037. 7131. 7225. 7413. 7413. 5507. 5695. 5883. 5883. 5977. 3883. 3977. 4071. 4259. 4259. 8849.	in water 0.53 0.56 0.55 0.57 0.51 0.52 0.53 0.53 0.55 0.	21.2 22.5 23.8 25.9 26.2 20.4 22.8 25.1 25.1 26.2 18.3 19.8 21.1 23.3 23.6 25.7

Eully chased

• • •

.

and the second

••••••

)

.

127

128

金を見たる

Ľ

Partially shearing 0.55 mm sand in water.

.

N	Um/Zo	Shear	Applied	Normal Stress	Stress	Zo
	(1) 0001)	561655	strage	311033	=70	(
			(d)	yne/cm/c	20 m)	
10.5/	53.	294/.	2/69.	3153.	0.94	4.2
0.58	57.	3113.	2769.	3201.	Ø.97	4.7
0.58	90.	3043.	2769.	3201.	0.95	4.7
0.57	92.	3658.	2769.	3345.	1.09	6.3
0.57	99.	4097.	2769.	3393.	1.21	6.9
0.59	68.	3653.	4205.	4541.	0.81	3.6
0.58	78.	3785.	4295.	4637.	0.82	4.6
0.59	85.	4007.	4205.	4733	0 85	5 6
0.58	104	4037	4205	4733	0.0J	5.0
a 59	107	4075	4203.	4/33.	0.03	3. /
<i>a</i> co	10/.	43/3.	4203.	40//.	1.02	1.2
0.30	35.	4/28.	3041.	00/3.	0.78	4./
0.57	61.	4557.	5641.	6160.	0.74	5.7
Ø.58	95.	5187.	5641.	6169.	0.84	5.7
Ø.57	101.	6530.	5641.	6301.	1.04	7.3
0.56	127.	6550.	5641.	6349.	1.03	7.9
0.57	49.	6247.	8513.	8985.	0.69	5.2
0.57	54.	6666.	8513.	8985.	0.74	5.2
9.57	58	6676	8513	9479	0 7 0	6 2
	N 0.558 0.557 0.559 0.558 0.558 0.558 0.558 0.5577 0.5577 0.55777 0.55777 0.55777 0.55777 0.55777 0.55777 0.55777 0.55777 0.557777 0.557777 0.5577777 0.55777777 0.5577777777777777777777777777777777777	N Um/Zo (1/sec.) Ø.57 53. Ø.58 57. Ø.58 90. Ø.57 92. Ø.57 92. Ø.57 92. Ø.57 92. Ø.57 92. Ø.57 93. Ø.58 78. Ø.58 104. Ø.58 107. Ø.58 107. Ø.58 95. Ø.57 61. Ø.58 95. Ø.57 101. Ø.56 127. Ø.57 54.	N Um/Zo (1/sec.) Shear stress Ø.57 53. 2947. Ø.58 57. 3113. Ø.58 90. 3043. Ø.57 92. 3658. Ø.57 92. 3658. Ø.57 99. 4097. Ø.59 68. 3653. Ø.58 78. 3785. Ø.59 85. 4007. Ø.58 104. 4037. Ø.58 107. 4975. Ø.58 55. 4728. Ø.57 61. 4557. Ø.58 55. 5187. Ø.57 101. 6530. Ø.57 49. 6247. Ø.57 54. 6666. Ø.57 58. 6576.	N Um/Zo (1/sec.) Shear stress Applied normal stress Ø.57 53. 2947. 2769. Ø.58 57. 3113. 2769. Ø.58 90. 3043. 2769. Ø.58 90. 3043. 2769. Ø.57 92. 3658. 2769. Ø.57 92. 3653. 4205. Ø.57 99. 4097. 2769. Ø.57 92. 3653. 4205. Ø.58 78. 3785. 4205. Ø.58 78. 3785. 4205. Ø.58 104. 4037. 4205. Ø.58 107. 4975. 4205. Ø.58 107. 4975. 4205. Ø.58 107. 4975. 4205. Ø.58 107. 4975. 5641. Ø.57 61. 4557. 5641. Ø.57 101. 6530. 5641. Ø.57 101. <t< td=""><td>N Um/Zo (1/sec.) Shear stress Applied Normal normal stress stress Applied Normal normal stress 0.57 53. 2947. 2769. 3153. 0.58 57. 3113. 2769. 3201. 0.58 90. 3043. 2769. 3201. 0.57 92. 3658. 2769. 3201. 0.57 92. 3658. 2769. 3201. 0.57 92. 3658. 2769. 3201. 0.57 92. 3658. 2769. 3201. 0.57 92. 3658. 2769. 3345. 0.57 99. 4097. 2769. 3393. 0.59 68. 3653. 4205. 4541. 0.58 78. 3785. 4205. 4733. 0.58 104. 4037. 4205. 4733. 0.58 107. 4975. 4205. 4877. 0.58 55. 4728. 5641. 6160. 0</td><td>N Um/Zo (1/sec.) Shear stress Applied Normal normal stress Stress ratio stress 0.57 53. 2947. 2769. 3153. 0.94 0.58 57. 3113. 2769. 3201. 0.97 0.58 90. 3043. 2769. 3201. 0.95 0.57 92. 3658. 2769. 3201. 0.95 0.57 92. 3658. 2769. 3345. 1.09 0.57 92. 3658. 2769. 3393. 1.21 0.59 68. 3653. 4205. 4541. 0.81 0.58 78. 3785. 4205. 4541. 0.82 0.59 85. 4007. 4205. 4733. 0.85 0.58 104. 4037. 4205. 4733. 0.85 0.58 107. 4975. 4205. 4877. 1.02 0.58 55. 4728. 5641. 6160. 0.74 0.</td></t<>	N Um/Zo (1/sec.) Shear stress Applied Normal normal stress stress Applied Normal normal stress 0.57 53. 2947. 2769. 3153. 0.58 57. 3113. 2769. 3201. 0.58 90. 3043. 2769. 3201. 0.57 92. 3658. 2769. 3201. 0.57 92. 3658. 2769. 3201. 0.57 92. 3658. 2769. 3201. 0.57 92. 3658. 2769. 3201. 0.57 92. 3658. 2769. 3345. 0.57 99. 4097. 2769. 3393. 0.59 68. 3653. 4205. 4541. 0.58 78. 3785. 4205. 4733. 0.58 104. 4037. 4205. 4733. 0.58 107. 4975. 4205. 4877. 0.58 55. 4728. 5641. 6160. 0	N Um/Zo (1/sec.) Shear stress Applied Normal normal stress Stress ratio stress 0.57 53. 2947. 2769. 3153. 0.94 0.58 57. 3113. 2769. 3201. 0.97 0.58 90. 3043. 2769. 3201. 0.95 0.57 92. 3658. 2769. 3201. 0.95 0.57 92. 3658. 2769. 3345. 1.09 0.57 92. 3658. 2769. 3393. 1.21 0.59 68. 3653. 4205. 4541. 0.81 0.58 78. 3785. 4205. 4541. 0.82 0.59 85. 4007. 4205. 4733. 0.85 0.58 104. 4037. 4205. 4733. 0.85 0.58 107. 4975. 4205. 4877. 1.02 0.58 55. 4728. 5641. 6160. 0.74 0.

129

. .

Fully shearing 1.1 mm glass spheres in water.

• •

Exp	n N	Um/Zo	Shear	Applied	l Normal	Stress	Zo
		(1/sec.)	stress	normal	stress	ratio	(mm .)
				stress	at	z=Zo	
				(ć	jyne/cm/	'cm)	
147	0.57	35.	941.	1473.	2252.	0.42	9.5
148	Ø.57	47.	1428.	2191.	2970.	0.48	9.5
149	0.57	66.	1964.	2909.	3688.	0.53	9.5
150	0.57	140.	3027.	3627.	4406.	0.69	9.5
151	0.57	200.	3612.	4345.	5124.	0.70	9.5
152	0.57	216.	3866.	5063.	5842.	0.66	9.5
153	Ø.58	131.	1497.	1473.	2252.	0.66	9.3
154	Ø.58	172.	2189.	2191.	2970.	0.74	9.3
155	Ø.58	198.	2608.	2909.	3688.	0.71	9.3
156	0.58	218.	2998.	3627.	4406.	0.68	9.3
157	0.58	231.	3290.	4345.	5124.	8.64	9.3
158	0.58	243.	3554.	5063.	5842.	8.61	9.3
159	8.5 5	155.	1560.	1473.	2252.	0.69	9.9
160	8.55	186.	2057.	2191.	2970.	0.69	9.9
161	Ø. 55	208.	2586.	2909.	3688.	8.68	9.9
162	8.55	227.	2954.	3627.	4406.	0.67	9.9
163	0.55	245.	3315.	4345.	5124.	0.65	9.9
164	0.55	264.	3607.	5063.	5842.	0.62	9.9
	Partially	shearing	al.lmm	dlass s	spheres	in water.	
				,	•		
165	9.66	26.	882.	1473.	2657.	0.33	12.4
166	0.65	40.	1258.	1473.	2855.	0.44	14.7
167	0.64	51.	1521.	1473.	3052.	0.50	16.9
168	0.64	64.	1843.	1473.	3151.	0.58	18.1
169	0.67	17.	1365.	2909.	4093.	0.33	12.3
170	0.65	33.	1784.	2909.	4389.	0.41	15.6
171	0.65	47.	2208.	2909.	4587.	0.48	17.8
172	0.65	17.	2506.	5063.	6357.	0.39	13.8
173	0.64	28.	2744.	5063.	6645.	0.41	17.1
174	0.66	46.	3193.	5063.	6741.	0.47	17.7

Ar

• '

