Journal of Science and Technology
ISSN: 2362-1443 (Print) 3059-9490 (Online)
2024, Vol. 4, No. 2 (Special Issue), 90-93

DOI : https://doi.org/10.3126/jost.v4i2.78967

Innovative Techniques for Rapid MSE Wall Installation

Nandkishor Sah
Department of Civil Engineering, CT University Punjab, India
nepalengineersa@gmail.com

Abhilash Thakur
Department of Civil Engineering, CT University Punjab, India
abhilash23160@ctuniversity.in

Article History:
Received : 31 July 2024
Revised: 8 August 2024
Accepted: 13 November2024

***Keywords—* Mechanically Stabilized Earth (MSE) Walls, Rapid Installation, Innovative Techniques, Construction Efficiency, Prefabrication.**

***Abstract—* This study explores innovative techniques for the rapid installation of Mechanically Stabilized Earth (MSE) walls, focusing on advancements that enhance efficiency and reduce construction time. MSE walls, known for their strength and versatility, are widely used in retaining structures, but traditional installation methods can be time-consuming and labor-intensive. This research investigates novel approaches and technologies aimed at accelerating the installation process while maintaining structural integrity and cost-effectiveness. Techniques such as pre-fabricated panels, automated assembly systems, and advanced material technologies are evaluated for their potential to streamline the construction workflow. The study incorporates case analyses of recent projects employing these innovations, assessing their impact on construction speed, quality, and overall project costs. Additionally, the research highlights the benefits and challenges associated with each technique, offering insights into practical applications and best practices. By identifying and analyzing cutting-edge solutions, this study aims to provide valuable recommendations for the construction industry to optimize MSE wall installation processes, ultimately contributing to more efficient and sustainable infrastructure development.**

I. Introduction

The growing demand for efficient and cost-effective construction methods has led to significant advancements in the field of retaining walls, particularly Mechanically Stabilized Earth (MSE) walls. MSE walls have become a popular choice for infrastructure projects due to their flexibility, durability, and ease of installation. However, the traditional methods of installing MSE walls, while effective, often involve lengthy construction times and substantial labor requirements. To address these challenges, there is a pressing need to explore and evaluate innovative techniques that can enhance the speed and efficiency of MSE wall installation. Innovative techniques for rapid MSE wall installation focus on optimizing various aspects of the construction process, from material handling to assembly. Advances in prefabrication technology, for instance, have led to the development of modular wall systems that can be quickly assembled on-site. These systems often utilize pre-engineered panels and components that reduce the need for extensive on-site fabrication, thus shortening the overall construction time. Additionally, innovations in automation and mechanization, such as robotic systems and advanced lifting equipment, have demonstrated the potential to accelerate the installation process while maintaining high standards of precision and quality.

Another key area of innovation involves the use of advanced materials that facilitate faster construction. For example, geosynthetic reinforcements and prefabricated soil layers can be employed to enhance the stability and load-bearing capacity of MSE walls, reducing the need for extensive soil compaction and traditional reinforcement techniques. These materials not only speed up the installation process but also contribute to the long-term performance and sustainability of the retaining walls. Furthermore, the integration of digital technologies, such as Building Information Modeling (BIM) and real-time monitoring systems, has revolutionized the way MSE wall projects are managed. These technologies allow for better planning, coordination, and execution of construction tasks, leading to more efficient use of resources and reduced project timelines.

II. Methodology

A. *Study Design*

This research investigates innovative techniques for rapid installation of Mechanically Stabilized Earth (MSE) walls using a mixed-methods approach. Quantitative data analysis was combined with qualitative insights from field experts, focusing on three primary techniques: pre-fabrication, modular construction, and advanced anchoring systems. The study aimed to evaluate the effectiveness, efficiency, and cost implications of these techniques compared to traditional MSE wall construction methods.

B. *Data Collection*

Data were collected from various construction sites implementing innovative techniques. Quantitative data included installation time, cost, labor hours, and structural performance metrics. Additionally, qualitative data were gathered through interviews with project managers and construction workers to gain insights into practical challenges and advantages of these techniques.

C. *Sample Selection*

Six construction projects utilizing innovative MSE wall installation techniques were selected, varying in scale, location, and environmental conditions:

- Project Greenfield (Urban Infrastructure)
- Project MetroLink (Highway Expansion)
- Project Skyline (Commercial Development)
- Project EcoPark (Residential Development)
- Project Harbor (Port Expansion)
- Project Riverbank (Flood Control)

D. *Data Analysis*

Quantitative data were analyzed using statistical software to compare the performance of innovative techniques against traditional methods. Key performance indicators (KPIs) such as installation speed, cost efficiency, labor productivity, and structural integrity were evaluated. Qualitative data were analyzed thematically to identify common patterns and unique insights related to the innovative techniques.

E. *Ethical Considerations*

All participants in the study were informed about the purpose of the research, and their consent was obtained. Confidentiality of the data was maintained, and all ethical guidelines for conducting field research were followed.

III. Result and Discussion

A. *Installation Speed*

Table 1 shows the installation times for MSE wall construction using traditional methods, prefabrication, modular construction, and advanced anchoring systems across six projects. The data indicates a significant reduction in installation time when innovative techniques are employed. For Project Greenfield, traditional methods took 30 days, whereas prefabrication reduced the time to 20 days, modular construction to 15 days, and advanced anchoring to 18 days. Similarly, Project MetroLink saw installation times drop from 45 days with traditional methods to 30 days with prefabrication, 25 days with modular construction, and 28 days with advanced anchoring.

In Project Skyline, the installation time decreased from 35 days with traditional methods to 25 days with prefabrication, 20 days with modular construction, and 22 days with advanced anchoring. Project EcoPark exhibited a reduction from 50 days using traditional methods to 35 days with prefabrication, 30 days with modular construction, and 32 days with advanced anchoring. For Project Harbor, the traditional method took 40 days, while prefabrication required 28 days, modular construction 22 days, and advanced anchoring 25 days. Lastly, Project Riverbank showed the most significant time reduction, with traditional methods taking 55 days, prefabrication 38 days, modular construction 32 days, and advanced anchoring 35 days.

TABLE I. Installation Time Comparison Across Different Techniques

Project	Traditional Method (Days)	Prefabrication (Days)	Modular Construction (Days)	Advanced Anchoring (Days)
Greenfield	30	20	15	18
MetroLink	45	30	25	28
Skyline	35	25	20	22
EcoPark	50	35	30	32
Harbor	40	28	22	25
Riverbank	55	38	32	35

Prefabrication and modular construction consistently outperformed traditional methods, with installation times reduced by up to 40%.

B. *Cost Efficiency*

Cost analysis showed that while the initial investment for innovative techniques was higher, the overall project cost was lower due to reduced labor and shorter project duration. Table 2 provides a comparison of total project costs.

TABLE II. Cost Comparison Across Different Techniques

Project	Traditional Method (USD)	Pre-fabrication (USD)	Modular Construction (USD)	Advanced Anchoring (USD)
Greenfield	5,00,000	4,50,000	4,20,000	4,40,000
MetroLink	7,50,000	6,80,000	6,50,000	6,70,000
Skyline	6,00,000	5,40,000	5,10,000	5,30,000
EcoPark	8,00,000	7,20,000	6,90,000	7,10,000
Harbor	6,50,000	5,80,000	5,50,000	5,70,000
Riverbank	9,00,000	8,20,000	7,90,000	8,10,000

The savings were primarily due to reduced labor costs and fewer construction delays.

C. *Labor Productivity*

Innovative techniques also enhanced labor productivity, as indicated in Table 3. Modular construction required fewer labor hours, leading to higher efficiency.

TABLE III. Table 3 Labor Hours Comparison Across Different Techniques

Project	Traditional Method (Labor Hours)	Prefabrication (Labor Hours)	Modular Construction (Labor Hours)	Advanced Anchoring (Labor Hours)
Greenfield	4,000	3,200	2,800	3,000
MetroLink	5,500	4,400	4,000	4,200
Skyline	4,500	3,600	3,200	3,400
EcoPark	6,000	4,800	4,400	4,600
Harbor	5,000	4,000	3,600	3,800
Riverbank	6,500	5,200	4,800	5,000

D. Structural Performance

Structural integrity was assessed through load-bearing tests and longevity predictions. Table 4 shows the results of these tests.

TABLE IV. LOAD BEARING CAPACITY COMPARISON ACROSS DIFFERENT TECHNIQUES

Project	Traditional Method (Load Bearing Capacity)	Prefabrication (Load Bearing Capacity)	Modular Construction (Load Bearing Capacity)	Advanced Anchoring (Load Bearing Capacity)
Greenfield	10,000 lbs	11,000 lbs	12,000 lbs	11,500 lbs
MetroLink	12,000 lbs	13,000 lbs	14,000 lbs	13,500 lbs
Skyline	11,000 lbs	12,000 lbs	13,000 lbs	12,500 lbs
EcoPark	13,000 lbs	14,000 lbs	15,000 lbs	14,500 lbs
Harbor	11,500 lbs	12,500 lbs	13,500 lbs	13,000 lbs
Riverbank	14,000 lbs	15,000 lbs	16,000 lbs	15,500 lbs

Innovative techniques provided superior structural performance, with modular construction showing the highest load-bearing capacity.

E. Environmental Impact

Table 5 compares the environmental impacts of different MSE wall installation techniques in terms of waste and carbon footprint.

Waste Generation: Traditional methods generated the highest waste, ranging from 10% to 14%. Modular construction was the most efficient, with waste percentages from 5% to 7%, followed by prefabrication (7% to 9%) and advanced anchoring (6% to 8%). Modular construction proved most effective at minimizing waste.

Carbon Footprint: Traditional methods had the highest carbon emissions, from 100 to 118 tons. Modular construction had the lowest emissions, between 85 and 98 tons, with prefabrication also reducing emissions (90 to 105 tons). Advanced anchoring showed improvements over traditional methods but had higher emissions than modular construction (88 to 101 tons)..

Modular construction was found to be the most environmentally friendly, producing the least waste and carbon emissions.

F. Practical Challenges

Qualitative feedback from the field highlighted some challenges, such as the initial learning curve associated with new techniques and the need for specialized training. However, once these hurdles were overcome, the benefits were substantial, including increased efficiency and improved project outcomes.

IV. CONCLUSION

The study on innovative MSE wall installation techniques reveals significant advantages over traditional methods. Installation times were notably reduced using prefabrication and modular construction. For instance, modular construction decreased installation durations by up to 40%, with Project Greenfield's time cut from 30 to 15 days. Cost analysis showed that while initial expenses were higher for innovative techniques, overall project costs were lower due to reduced labor and shorter durations. Modular construction was particularly cost-effective, reducing total expenses compared to traditional methods.

Labor productivity improved with modular techniques, requiring fewer hours and thus enhancing efficiency. Structural performance was superior across innovative methods, with modular construction demonstrating the highest load-bearing capacities. Environmentally, modular construction led to the least waste and carbon emissions, outperforming traditional and other innovative methods. Although challenges like the initial learning curve and need for specialized training were noted, the overall benefits—such as efficiency, cost savings, and environmental sustainability—highlight the superiority of these modern techniques. The study underscores the importance of adopting innovative methods to optimize MSE wall installations, balancing time, cost, productivity, and environmental impact effectively.

TABLE V. TABLE 5 WASTE AND CARBON FOOTPRINT COMPARISON ACROSS DIFFERENT TECHNIQUES

Project	Traditional Method (Waste)	Prefabrication (Waste)	Modular Construction (Waste)	Advanced Anchoring (Waste)	Traditional Method (Carbon Footprint)	Prefabrication (Carbon Footprint)	Modular Construction (Carbon Footprint)	Advanced Anchoring (Carbon Footprint)
Greenfield	10%	7%	5%	6%	100 tons	90 tons	85 tons	88 tons
MetroLink	12%	8%	6%	7%	110 tons	98 tons	92 tons	95 tons
Skyline	11%	7%	5%	6%	105 tons	93 tons	87 tons	90 tons
EcoPark	13%	9%	7%	8%	115 tons	100 tons	95 tons	98 tons
Harbor	10%	7%	5%	6%	102 tons	92 tons	86 tons	89 tons
Riverbank	14%	9%	7%	8%	118 tons	105 tons	98 tons	101 tons

REFERENCES

[1] Changkui, S.; Shanlei, L.; Shengyao, W.; Chao, C.; Quanfei, S.; Shanqiu, S.; Wei, W. Application of UAV in construction of smart city. Remote Sens. Land Resour. 2018, 30, 8–12.

[2] Tatum, M.C.; Liu, J. Unmanned Aircraft System Applications in Construction. Procedia Eng. 2017, 196, 167–175.

[3] Irizarry, J.; Costa, D.B. Exploratory Study of Potential Applications of Unmanned Aerial Systems for Construction Management Tasks. J. Manag. Eng. 2016, 32, 5016001.

[4] Lee, Y.-J.; Park, M.-W. 3D tracking of multiple onsite workers based on stereo vision. Autom. Constr. 2019, 98, 146–159.

[5] Zhang, C.; Arditi, D. Advanced Progress Control of Infrastructure Construction Projects Using Terrestrial Laser Scanning Technology. Infrastructures 2020, 5, 83.

[6] AASHTO, American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (2017). "AASHTO LRFD Bridge Design Specifications, 8thEdition, September 2017," Washington, DC 2000 1

[7] Exosite Website, "We were doing this before "IoT" was even a thing," Minneapolis, MN, (2018)

[8] Bahrami, O., "Extraction of Environmental and Operational Conditions of Wind Turbine from Tower Response Data for Improved Structural Health Monitoring," in Proceedings of Structural Health Monitoring 2017, (2017).

[9] AECOM, "M-10 Feasibility Report: Retaining Wall Stabilization Alternatives," AECOM Corporation, Grand Rapids, MI (2016).

[10] Bosch Sensortec, "BNO055: Intelligent 9-Axis Absolute Orientation Sensor," Sensor Datasheet - BST-BNO055-DS000-14, Bosch Sensortec GmbH, Reutlingen, Germany (2016).